Speech

(64)

TH (50)

3-22-66

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT BY GENERAL WILLIAM F. MCKEE ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES ON FISCAL YEAR 1967 BUDGET ESTIMATES

Gentlemen, I would like to introduce for the record a few remarks to inform the Committee of events which have taken place since suspension of the hearings last month.

Important events of interest to this Subcommittee are:

(1) The transmittal of an amendment to the 1967 budget for the development of a supersonic aircraft. This amendment provides for the 1967 requirements for the development of two prototype aircraft. The Committee has been furnished a justification statement for the amended budget and I will summarize it later in this statement.

(2) Legislation has been transmitted to the Congress for the extension of the financial authorization for the Federal-aid Airport Program for an additional three years. An appropriation authorization of $75 million per year for this period is included. It is expected that after action by the Congress on the extension act, a budget amendment requesting funds for 1968 will be transmitted in accordance with advance appropriation practices of recent years.

(3) The President's Transportation Message has been transmitted to the Congress. It contains information pertinent to a question raised by

this Subcommittee relating to a Department of Transportation to which I was not able to respond at the time of the previous hearing.

There has also been a great deal of publicity about an alleged $150 million improvement program at the Washington National Airport. I wish to clarify this for you. A consultant's report from which this publicity stems stated that the public benefits resulting from jet operations at Washington National Airport would be of a magnitude to warrant the investment of up to $150 million in the modernization of the airport. This was simply a method of stating the value of expected benefits. No specific improvement program was suggested, nor does the $150 million figure bear any relationship to the cost of the improvements which will eventually be proposed. I am confident, however, that the total cost of a modernization will be much closer to $50 million than $150 million.

I think it is clear that if Washington National is to continue to be a major air carrier airport and is to serve the increasing number of passengers using it each year a modernization program will be necessary. The details of that program will not be decided on until the various design alternatives have been thoroughly explored. We expect this to be done through a contract now under consideration in the Agency. We estimate that the design contract will cost about $300,000 and will be financed from the appropriation "Construction, Washington National

Airport" - utilizing funds which became available by reprogramming from prior years' projects for runway paving and the project for the access road to U. S. Route 1.

The amount of $280 million included in the estimates for the development of the civil supersonic transport will (1) finance the last six months of work (beginning July 1, 1966) of the eighteen-month detail design competitive phase of the program which was begun on July 1, 1965; (2) initiate the prototype aircraft construction and development effort in a timely manner; and (3) finance fiscal year 1967 supporting research and development and program management.

The eighteen-month detail design competitive phase has allowed the airframe manufacturers to resolve basic performance and design problems prior to prototype commitment. A Government assessment of the technical progress made in the airframe designs was held in December 1965 and concluded that there had been substantial progress and that the program is proceeding satisfactorily. Further, because each of the airframe manufacturers has a different design concept -- Lockheed with a fixed delta wing aircraft and Boeing, a variable sweep aircraft -- a strong and healthy competition exists. We, therefore, believe that at the completion of the eighteen-month program, we will be in a position to enter into

the next phase of the program -- construction of two pre-production prototype aircraft of a single design and the flight test of these aircraft for approximately 100 hours -- in an orderly and timely manner.

During the eighteen months of the detail design competitive phase, the engine manufacturers each have proceeded with the construction of three full-scale prototype engines and will test these in the latter part of calendar year 1966 for about 100 hours in order to verify estimated performance and provide some indication of durability. At the same time, the engine manufacturers will have verified, to the extent possible, the endurance and performance capabilities of the various engine components through a large-scale testing program. As with the airframe competition, the engine manufacturers have different design concepts -- General Electric with an afterburning turbojet and Pratt & Whitney, a duct-burning turbofan -- which again creates a good competitive atmosphere.

It is our intention to select, as the result of a detailed Government and airline evaluation, one airframe and one engine contractor to continue into the prototype construction phase on January 1, 1967. Therefore, during the first half of fiscal year 1967, engine and airframe manufacturers will submit detailed proposals for the prototype construction program.

The prototype construction phase is basically a continuation and acceleration of the current design effort directed toward building aircraft and engines for first flight by 1970. It is important that the program continue without loss of momentum from the present detail design competition into the construction phase. Therefore, the estimate provides for the manufacturers' procurement of long-lead items, such as materials and tooling, during the period July 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966. This is expected to advance the date of first flight several months and would place them in a position to transition smoothly into the prototype construction phase on January 1, 1967.

The period from January 1, 1967, through June 30, 1967, will be used by both the airframe and engine manufacturers to initiate the first six months' effort of the prototype construction and development program. This will entail the purchase of a significant amount of the materials and parts necessary for the manufacturing and development of the prototype aircraft and engines. Sub-contractors will be chosen and work will be initiated on all major systems and equipment components for the aircraft. The manufacturers (both engine and aircraft) will provide engineering development mockups of the complete airplane for formal Design Engineering Inspection by Government and airline

authorities. It is anticipated that by the end of fiscal year 1967 a work force of approximately 10,000 people will be directly involved in the SST airframe and engine effort, either in the prime contractors' or major sub-contractors' plants.

The program which the President has accepted assumes that prototype development costs should be shared by the Government and the manufacturers. The financing plan is based on the principle that the Government should recover its investment if the program is successful and a share of the manufacturers' profits if they rise above a predetermined level.

The FAA has assumed the executive responsibility for such SST economic studies as may be needed to support program management decisions. This effort will capitalize on the capabilities of the airlines, Civil Aeronautics Board, and other Government agencies. It will be conducted primarily by contracts to reputable research organizations and covers a broad spectrum of SST economic areas, including analysis of such items as air traffic demand, impact on balance of payments, SST operating costs and financial implications.

A sonic boom research and study program is to be accomplished under the leadership of a coordinating committee chaired by the President's

Special Assistant for Science and Technology. The detailed planning for this intense sonic boom investigation is near completion and the work effort will be initiated shortly. It will have as its major goal the determination, with as high a confidence as possible, of the public acceptance of the sonic boom phenomena. The Air Force, acting as the Executive Manager, will conduct the public reaction studies including supersonic overflights over populated areas. Data from XB-70 supersonic test flights will be used to the fullest in the sonic boom program. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration will continue to bear prime responsibility for all sonic boom research that deals with the physical characteristics of the phenomena.

Assuming Congressional approval of these requirements and adequate support for future needs, the first flight of the prototype SST should occur in late 1969. This will make possible commercial certification and subsequent introduction into airline service by mid-1974. We are confident that upon completion of the current detail design competitive phase, we shall be ready to proceed with the prototype construction and test program, resulting in an airplane that is safe for the passengers, reliable in service, and profitable in airline operation.

We will be happy to answer such questions as the Subcommittee may have on these programs.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM F. MCKEE, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY, BEFORE THE AVIATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, ON MAY 2, 1966, ON THE EXTENSION OF THE FEDERAL-AID TO AIRPORTS PROGRAM.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of S. 3096, a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend, for another three years, the authorization for appropriation of funds for the making of grants-in-aid for airport development.

The program of Federal-aid for airports began in 1947. Through it, over 2,000 airports throughout the Nation have received federal matching funds for airport development. Each of these assisted airports is a part of a national system of airports linking the Nation's population centers.

The development of this national system has resulted in safer more convenient, faster movement of goods and people throughout the Nation. By providing an aiport system as a part of the National Airspace System we are fostering the growth of air commerce to provide a valuable support to the national economy.

As the Congress foresaw when it first authorized the Federal-aid to airports program, air commerce has grown rapidly. The indicators promise continued growth.

The number of domestic passengers carried on scheduled U.S. air carriers is expected to increase by fiscal year 1970 to 131 million, an increase of 36 percent over our estimate for fiscal year 1966. In

1947 only 12,822,000 passengers were carried by domestic U.S. air carriers.

The composition of the civil air fleet will continue to tend more to jet aircraft. On January 1, 1965, turbo-jet service was being provided to 70 civil airports. Since that time, 42 additional locations have been added to the jet civil system. We estimate that over the next five-year period, 162 additional airports will be served by the civil scheduled jet fleet. Our estimate for the future is probably low because additional locations are almost constantly being added to our forecast as the airlines decide on re-equipment programs. The greatest immediate increase will be in the 2 and 3-engine short and medium-range jets many of which are now being introduced into local carrier service. The conversion to jets in the entire airline system will require expanded airport facilities, and this in turn will create a particular demand for airport development dollars.

The general aviation aircraft fleet is continuing to grow. By 1970 active general aviation aircraft are expected to number about 118,000, an increase of roughly 22 percent over today. Most of this increase will be in the multi-engine and large single engine categories. And a significant share of the increase will be jet aircraft.

By 1970, landings and take-offs at airports with FAA control service are estimated to reach 53 million. This is an increase of 36 percent over today's operations.

Two years ago in March 1964, the Congress extended the Federal-aid to airports program for a three-year period, from fiscal year 1965 through 1967. The Federal Aviation Agency has used this authority and the funds granted to improve further the Nation's airport system. In the last two years of our operation under the extension authorized in 1964, the FAA has allocated funds totalling more than $157 million to assist communities in all areas of our country to develop airports benefiting the public.

The allocations made in the 1965 program are assisting the constructing and improving more than 400 public airports. The 1966 allocations provide aid in the development and improvement of more than 445 public airports.

The Agency has used the additional authority and responsibility given to it under the 1964 amendments to strengthen the program and insure the effective use of public funds. Advance planning and engineering grants which were first authorized in 1964 have been used to obtain better airport layout plans and improved cost estimates and thus to reduce construction costs. Another new provision added in 1964 was the requirement that airport projects be consistent with area plans. Under that provision, FAA, has made substantial progress in making the airport a part of comprehensive metropolitan planning by working closely with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and in cooperation with state agencies and local sponsors. Airport owners are being required to recognize their responsibility for compatible land uses near the airport and the need for zoning and control.

The bill before you would authorize maximum annual appropriations of $75 million for each of the fiscal years 1968, 1969 and 1970; a total of $225 million for the three-year period. This is the same level of authorization provided for the fiscal years 1965, 1966 and 1967 when the authorization was last extended. We believe that this authorization level should be continued for the program for the next three fiscal years.

We are of course aware that many of our aviation friends concerned with airport development at the State and local level believe that an annual authorization of $75 million is insufficient. And it is true that this level of federal participation does not provide matching funds for every local dollar that is available for all eligible airport development. This is a situation which is common to all Federal grant-in-aid programs.

What is intended is that through this program the Federal government will make a significant contribution toward meeting the airport needs of the Nation's air commerce while continuing to recognize the primary responsibility for constructing, improving and operating the Nation's airports rests with State and local authorities. The aim is to provide an incentive to local communities throughout the Nation to support needed airport development. We believe the amounts proposed will accomplish this purpose as they have in the past. The proposed program represents in our judgment and that of the President a reasonable

allocation of federal funds to airport development in light of our defense requirements and other budgetary needs, including other transportation requirements.

We therefore urge the enactment of this legislation.

FAA INFORMATION

OFFICE OF INFORMATION SERVICES · FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY · WASHINGTON, D. C. 20553

AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY
WILLIAM F. McKEE, ADMINISTRATOR
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY
ATCA CONVENTION
MIAMI, FLORIDA
October 10, 1966

Mr. Grayson, Mr. Bostian, officers and members of the Air Traffic Control Association, my fellow employees. Thank you for your invitation to meet with you.

It has been a year since we last met, and, since your last convention, there have been two significant happenings.

The first was a dramatic acceleration in practically all phases of aviation activity. The second -- a consequence of the first -- was the heightened awareness or realization by people both outside as well as inside aviation -- that the big future we were anticipating looks nearer and bigger than we had formerly thought.

I do not have to prove this tremendous growth to you. You know it too well. In the fiscal year ending in June, total aircraft operations at our towers were more than 35½ million -- up 16%; IFR aircraft handled by our centers totaled more than 12 million -- up 11%; all flight services provided by our flight service stations reached nearly 23 million for a 19% increase; and three centers each had more than one million operations. This increase still goes on. Chicago O'Hare Tower logged 2006 operations in one day late last month. This is a record. There will be more records in the future.

You men have been working very hard. I think it was this kind of production Mr. Tipton, President of the Air Transport Association, had in mind when he referred to you last month as "miracle workers." A well-deserved phrase.

Now let's look ahead.

Three centers, as I noted, have already had more than one million operations in one year. Preliminary studies indicate that nine years from now in 1975 -- thirteen centers will be handling one million or more IFR aircraft. Last year, five terminals had more than 300,000 instrument operations. By 1975, instrument operations at each of these five terminals will increase by at least 100%.

(more)

But it is not only the sheer increase in the number of operations that is significant. It is the variety and mix of the traffic that will create the challenges. We shall be seeing in the future the introduction of three new aircraft.... The jumbo jets carrying 500 passengers or more.... The supersonic transport cruising at 1800 miles per hour... And new inter-city air busses with vertical or short takeoff and landing capability.

We shall be needing more controllers who are skilled professionals.

The automated equipment which is being introduced as part of the NAS system is going to require additional skills on your part. The NAS system will require, for example, a new breed of computer programmers who will be called data system corrdinators. Moreover, most controllers will be using these computers as their tools. You will, then, be receiving training and will be moving into one of the most advanced and exciting fields in American technology today.

I would warn you against an assumption that seems to be gaining attention.... While we are confident that the NAS system will prove an invaluable tool and will help us meet the heavy workload of the future, it is not by any means the final or last word in the science of air traffic control. The NAS system, rather than being the ultimate answer, merely opens the door to new developments. It is merely a foundation for future improvements. The future of air traffic control is still very much ahead of us.

In sum, you men in air traffic control today can look forward to a profession that will grow and expand -- one that will be requiring new skills and, at the same time, be offering new career possibilities.

I would remind you that as the air traffic service changes and develops, so, too, will other elements of FAA. And this again offers promise. I note, for example, that about one third of our long-term trainees -- the men who are being sent to colleges and universities for advanced studies, have ATC backgrounds. Again, ten of our current area managers, and 28 of our current supergrade personnel have controller backgrounds.

We have been talking about the changes and growth that will be needed to meet future requirements. I should like to add here that it is our hope that many of these changes and developments will be coming from you. Technology can furnish us new tools and management can provide new systems but the changes in techniques and procedures can best come from you. You are daily and directly involved with aircraft in motion. You are constantly coping with the problems facing ATC. I ask that you concern yourselves with their solutions. We need your ideas. We need new approaches. We need your help.

(more)

I make this appeal at my own urging and at the request of the President. Last month, the heads of all agencies met at the White House. President Johnson's message was direct and to the point. He wants improvement in government service. He suggested as a theme for this approach the three I's Program.... Ideas... Imagination... Innovation... Ideas, yes, we need them. Imagination -- the means of creativity... Innovation -- the new and better way of doing things. I recommend them to you most strongly.

And you have in the Air Traffic Control Association a ready system for stimulating new approaches, refining them, and bringing them to the attention of management. The meetings of ATCA chapters -- outside the structure of government and away from the pressure and demands of the job -- can be most fruitful. These sessions devoted to common controller problems can be most beneficial to you and to the FAA. We have already seen good results.

We are passing on the President's invitation frankly in recognition that you and your counterparts who are on the job every day are truly the real experts in this business. Neither ideas nor innovation, and certainly not imagination, are the exclusive prerogative of supervisors. The best ideas might be the things that you have been thinking about for some time or the inspiration that comes to you with a new experience out of being on the job. Don't be bashful or hesitant even about what might appear to be the simpler approaches or changes. Simplicity after all is the hallmark of the great idea. It is the kind of thing that makes you sit back and say -- "now why didn't I think of that before?" You have a wonderful opportunity in this respect, and we will be delighted to hear from you.

We would ask, furthermore, that in your search for the new and better you do not necessarily confine yourselves only to the problems of air traffic control. The aviation industry -- and the FAA -- is facing and will be facing in the future tremendous problems as a result of the expansion of aviation and the introduction of new aircraft.

I ask that you keep these problems in mind also. We do not ask of you vast breakthroughs or complete and final answers. Any suggestion that will in any way offer a measure of improvement will represent progress.

The first of these problems is noise. Jet aircraft noise is one of our major problems. The government, under the leadership of the President's Office of Science and Technology, has put in motion a multi-agency anti-noise campaign. We shall be promoting research on quieter engines. There is legislation now before the Congress authorizing FAA to set noise standards which new aircraft must meet for certification. Jet aircraft will be required to follow certain noise abatement procedures. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is studying the problems of insulating and air conditioning houses. The FAA and Housing and Urban Development are also concerned with techniques of compatible land use. This is not a government project alone. The various elements of industry and local and state authorities are being brought in.

(more)

There is one element of this campaign that makes it unique. The noise problem at each airport is different. Any thoughts or suggestions or ideas that you might have that would improve the noise situation at your terminal by one single decibel will be most welcome. This is a very serious problem.

The terminal area is, in fact, the source of most of our present problems. You are the most experienced in the problem of terminal airspace congestion and insufficient capacity at peak hours. Here again your thoughts would be helpful. These problems will only intensify in the future.

The past year has been interesting in another respect. I have come to know better as friends and fellow workers the men of the air traffic service. And I have learned full well the meaning of the work you do... I recall when I first took this job. The President said to me, "McKee, the first priority in this job is safety. And don't you ever forget it." You men of the air traffic service are creating safety every day -- you are on the firing line 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This, I well understand.

This 24-hour service, seven days a week, has another angle. It means Sunday work -- holidays, and starting work at any hour of the day or night. For you wives, this means irregular meal schedules -- being alone at odd hours and at times a somewhat confusing home life. It is through your forbearance and understanding that your husbands are able to perform their important jobs, and you have earned our heartfelt gratitude.

I can't overemphasize the vital service members of air traffic control are performing. But more, you are performing it extraordinarily well. The facts speak for themselves. Of our 303 towers, 248 had no system error reports last year. This is truly astounding when viewed against total tower operations of more than 35 million. And I note the Seattle, Salt Lake City and Great Falls Centers have completed 12 consecutive months without a single system error report. Well done.

I am privileged to receive further evidence of your excellence. Not a week goes by which fails to bring me several letters from individual pilots. Each carries the same message. They are letters of praise for the courteous, professional and vital help they have received from you in air traffic service. And I hope you find satisfaction in the knowledge that your efforts are being recognized and appreciated.

I want to report that the SST program goes well. The government and the airlines are currently evaluating the final design proposals of the two airframe and two engine manufacturers competing for SST prototype contracts. The objective is to determine, first, whether this nation is ready from a technological standpoint to proceed with prototype construction and, second, what airframe-engine combination has the best potential for developing into a safe and successful commercial aircraft.

Present plans call for the selection of a single airframe-engine manufacturing team to push ahead next January with the construction of flying SST prototypes. Congress, at President Johnson's request, already has appropriated $200 million

(more)

to get this work underway. Two prototypes of the same design will be built, with the first taking to the air in late 1969 or early 1970. The first production models should roll off the line in 1973 with certification and entry into commercial service accomplished by mid 1974.

And so we move forward to a busy and exciting future.... It will not be easy. We are part of a government committed to vast domestic and international programs. We face now in the Capital a stringent budget situation. It appears this will continue for some years. In this regard, I should like to emphasize one fact. We have been given a very necessary mission to fulfill. We shall fulfill that mission, and, I am determined that the personnel, equipment and funds needed to do the job will not be withheld from us.

I'm sure you have all read about the bill which will create a new cabinet-level organization, the Department of Transportation. When the bill becomes law, the FAA will be an important part of this new Department. Although the Department of Transportation will create a more efficient, economical operation, neither the FAA's responsibilities nor your own traffic control activities will be changed in the slightest. Our mission will continue to be the same.

Earlier I mentioned the numerous letters I receive from pilots praising your work. You have also come to the attention of people in other walks of life. Sometimes they too take up pen to write me about you.

I received one such letter just before I left Washington and since I believe you will find it of more than passing interest I would like to read it now:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Washington
October 7, 1966

Dear General McKee:

I would be grateful if you delivered the following message to the Air Traffic Association at its convention in Miami:

As a frequent user of the airways, I know at firsthand of the fine work you are doing. Your skill is accepted as a matter of course in the cabin of Air Force One.

Millions of Americans take to the air routinely and without second thought as a result of your dedication to duty. This is the best testimony that can be given to the trust placed in you by all of us who travel by air.

Your ability to control air traffic with safety and dispatch enables us to anticipate with confidence the technological developments which are destined to revolutionize the future of flight in all its forms.

I congratulate you and send you my best wishes for a rewarding convention.

Sincerely

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM F. MCKEE, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY, BEFORE THE TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 12, 1966, REGARDING AIRCRAFT NOISE.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the problem of aircraft noise. The problem to now has been most acute in residential areas in the proximity of large jet airports, but with the introduction into service of larger jet aircraft, and with the conversion by the local service airlines to jet aircraft, we can expect that in the future aircraft noise will affect even more people.

I would like to assure the members of Congress that we at FAA consider the noise problem to be serious, and we are treating noise abatement as a high-priority matter. We have a program underway which involves all of the agencies of the Government that have an interest in the effects of aircraft noise. I believe it would be helpful to outline the program which has been established within the Executive Branch to alleviate the aircraft noise problem, and the manner in which various offices and agencies of the Executive Branch are contributing to a solution of the problem.

In his message to Congress of March 2, 1966, the President directed his Science Adviser to work with the Administrators of FAA and NASA, and the Secretaries of Commerce and of Housing and Urban Development to frame an action program to attack the problem of aircraft noise. He directed this group to study the development of noise standards and the compatible uses of land near airports, to consult with local communities

and industry, and to recommend legislative or administrative actions needed to move ahead in the solution of the noise problem.

The organization which has been established to carry out the President's directive consists of three major groups: a Policy Committee chaired by the President's Science Adviser and consisting of the heads of the four departments and agencies mentioned above; a Program Evaluation and Direction Group, again headed by the Science Adviser, and consisting of members from interested Government agencies, representatives from the aviation indistry and other industries concerned with land uses, and officials of state and local governments; and finally a Management Working Group, chaired by the director of FAA's Noise Abatement Staff and made up of representatives of FAA, NASA, and the Departments of Commerce and of Housing and Urban Development. This latter group is responsible for the day-to-day conduct and management of the noise control program.

At present, this organization is proceeding in accordance with the principal recommendations made in March 1966, by the Jet Aircraft Noise Panel, an ad hoc group of specialists from both public and private life assembled last year in an effort to provide a good starting point for further action in solving the noise problem. In its report the Noise Panel outlined four major areas in which action should be taken. These were in the field of measurements and standards, engine noise reduction, operational considerations, and compatible land usage.

Assignments to agencies represented on the Management Working Group have been made in all of these fields and we believe we have for

the first time the broad-based and well-coordinated type of organization that will enable us to make real progress in our effort to alleviate the aircraft noise problem.

I would like to emphasize that in conducting this program, we are not aiming for domination by the Federal Government in the effort to seek and carry out solutions to the aircraft noise problem. On the contrary, and I want to make this very clear, we do not consider the problem of noise abatement to be a federal problem in the sense that the federal government should assume the responsibility for identifying and implementing all of the solutions and assuming all of the financial responsibility for noise abatement. The federal government can provide leadership in the campaign against noise. And it appears that in certain areas such as the regulation of flight, and in the certification of aircraft, noise control can and should be exercised by the federal government. In certain other areas, however, we must rely heavily upon the initiative of local governments. These governments have the primary responsibility for providing air terminal facilities for their citizens and for conducting the planning and making the difficult decisions with respect to the appropriate uses to which land should be put within their jurisdictions. Of course, in the conduct of our program, we will seek to provide local governments with appropriate planning guidelines for abating aircraft noise.

The aviation industry also has a heavy responsibility in this matter, and I believe we can look to the industry to continue to lend

its resources and expertise to the effort to seek and carry out appropriate solutions to the noise problem.

I would like to say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that I have had particularly close contact with the aircraft manufacturers regarding the noise problem from the time that I became Administrator. In January I wrote to the Presidents of Douglas, Lockheed and Boeing and stressed our concern with the growing noise problem and the need for government-industry cooperation to alleviate it. I can report an excellent response from the manufacturing industry, and I am confident that we will have their cooperation in our noise abatement efforts.

Finally, we must obtain the understanding of the general public. We do not anticipate that we will ever be able to eliminate aircraft noise, and we have a lot of work ahead of us before we can effect any widespread reduction in it.

The bill proposed by the Administration as introduced by the Chairman as H.R. 16171 adds a new section 611 to the Federal Aviation Act to authorize the Administrator to prescribe and apply noise control standards under the provisions of Title VI of the Act, which are presently limited to the promotion of safety.

Heretofore, our efforts to alleviate noise through the use of regulations has been limited to the issuance of regulations establishing minimum altitudes for certain aircraft approaching and departing airports with control towers, and directing pilots operating at certain airports to use preferential runways assigned by our air traffic controllers when wind, weather, and other safety considerations permit.

We have established such regulations under the authority the Act provides with respect to the prescription of air traffic rules.

H.R. 16171 will expand our regulatory authority in the field of noise. Under the bill, we would be authorized to prescribe aircraft noise standards and regulations in the same manner now authorized with respect to minimum standards and rules required in the interest of safety. The bill thus authorizes the application of such noise standards and regulations in the certification of aircraft, airmen, air navigation facilities, and air agencies.

In summary, the bill, in conjunction with the limited regulatory authority we already have, will permit us to impose restrictions and standards for the purpose of alleviating noise which will cover both the operation of aircraft and the development and manufacture of aircraft. The bill is a comprehensive one, and we believe it will provide us all the regulatory authority we will need for the foreseeable future.

We are attacking the noise problem on three broad fronts: reduction of noise at the source (engine and airframe design), development of flight operational techniques which will promote noise abatement, and compatible land use development. It appears that the area in which our bill may be most effective is in the reduction of noise at the source. We believe, however, that the authority it contains with respect to the prescription of maximum allowable noise levels for new aircraft is essential to progress in the operational and land use phases of the program. Without these standards, there is no definite aiming point for technicians seeking to reduce noise through the establishment of

revised operational techniques, or for community planners attempting to work out compatible land use programs.

For the manufacturers of aircraft engines and such users of large aircraft as the air carriers, the establishment of maximum noise levels will tend to equalize the economic impact resulting from measures they take in the interest of reducing aircraft noise. The ground rules will be the same for everybody. Today, of course, manufacturers who seek to reduce the noise output of their product are faced with the likelihood that adjustments they make to reduce noise may make their product less efficient and more expensive, thereby putting them at a decided disadvantage in the competitive market.

The bill would authorize the enforcement of noise standards in the same manner as we now enforce safety standards. Of course, in the case of any adverse action taken with respect to a certificate issued by the Agency, the certificate holder would have the right to avail himself of the same type of formal review before the Civil Aeronuatics Board which is afforded certificate holders in safety cases. If the pending Department of Transportation legislation is enacted, the authority vested by the bill in the Administrator and the CAB would become vested in the Secretary of Transportation and the National Transportation Safety Board, respectively.

I believe I should add a word here about implementation of our legislative proposal. If the legislation is adopted, the Agency will have to consider means of using its new authority in ways that will be

most appropriate. On the basis of past research we have now come to the point where we are prepared to establish an interim basic method of noise measurement. We have taken steps to coordinate informally with the aviation industry the proposed noise measurement system and have requested comment on the use of certain maximum allowable noise levels for new aircraft.

The primary aim of the proposal we have circulated is to insure that new types of aircraft manufactured after adoption of the bill would be designed to operate within specific maximum allowable noise levels under certain defined conditions. Type certification of such aircraft would be contingent upon the aircraft meeting those standards. We believe that if standards can be established now for new aircraft planned for introduction into the current inventory, we can reverse the trend of increased noise exposure upon introduction of each succeeding generation of aircraft.

Before closing, I would like to make a comment concerning the numerous other bills related to the noise problem which have been introduced in this Congress. These bills cover a wide spectrum of possible governmental response to the problem. I am not prepared to comment in detail on these proposals. For now, we believe that our proposal will provide the legislative tools we need to proceed to accomplish what all of these bills aim at -- the alleviation of the aircraft noise problem.