

TEXT OF SPEECH

BY

① N. E. HALABY,

AT

ANNUAL ²² FLIGHT STANDARDS CONFERENCE,

④ JANUARY 31, 1962,

③ Washington, D.C.

② [Enforcement policies],

⑤ 30 p.

⑥ FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Good afternoon gentlemen - George Prill, George Moore and other distinguished colleagues here. I'm certainly not going to give an address. In the first place I don't know enough and in the second place the purpose here is to get understanding - not to have me lecture to you.

I've been in office eleven months on the third of February, and I think it's very important for you to know what complete backing you and I have from the President. He has accepted and approved every recommendation I've made during these months. He has supported us 100%. I think we have made some progress. I think there is much more progress to be made than has been made. In my view we're just taking off, both in aviation and as an Agency. There is no tendency in this craft to stall or to shudder, but to climb and go safely and efficiently.

I do think it's important to share with you some thoughts that have become convictions over this first year, in my mind. We might ask ourselves what is public service? I think that you and I are engaged in the highest calling, next to a spiritual calling, that any American can be engaged in, and that is the career of public service. We've been chosen to do this for a variety of reasons. We've been given the opportunity as well as the obligation to perform public service and it is a very serious business in my judgment. So, although I love to crack wise at times, I'm afraid that this will be a fairly somber afternoon for all of us.

To me public safety and public security -- at a time when our whole concept of life is threatened in a deadly manner, at a time when we even have doubts about our own ability to govern ourselves, and at a time when the extremists of right and left, of fear and faith, are challenging our capacity to govern ourselves --

are paramount objectives. We have a unique opportunity, I think, to show that we in one public service organization can be creative and productive in the public service. That may mean that some of you won't be here next year at the time we have this session, because you have not been creative and productive. It will mean those of you who have been most creative and productive will be recognized and rewarded.

Now, everyone has a slightly different concept of what public service is. Some think of it as a secure job - others think of it as almost a religious mission - but I think the true public servant in our field is the man who regards the whole range of FAA's responsibilities -- from promotion of aviation through regulation -- as his calling, as his profession, as his self-fulfillment.

Now, as you know, the Federal Aviation Act places the responsibility and authority in the Administrator. It doesn't give any one of you, by legislation, any power. It places the responsibility on the Administrator, and in any organization there must be delegation of both authority and responsibility. So we have a problem of defining what our public purposes are. The areas covered by the Act range all the way from basic research in aeronautics, to why airplanes fly, why engines generate power -- all the way to the punishment of offenders against the provisions of the Act or the regulations of the Administrator under it. In other words, we do research, we do development, we educate, we engineer, we install, we repair and maintain -- and we regulate. But we don't regulate for the mere sake of regulating; we regulate for the purpose of making a system of public safety and security work.

So our role in public service, particularly that of the group of us here today, is to make a system of rules, regulations, procedures, practices and enforcement action work. Not because we love it -- or hate it -- or because it is an end in itself, but as a means of making our contribution to American government and society.

Now, this opportunity today to discuss the FAA's enforcement policies and objectives is a very important one to me. I feel a little concerned having to state policies and directives with so few months of direct practical experience. But that is simply part of the job. I am not going to state inflexible commandments, even if I had the right kind of tablet or chisel, because we are in a changing business. The technology, the industry, the economy, are all moving right out from under us unless we keep running with it. I think we are entering a new phase of enforcement, particularly in setting up the new Agency hearings and with the decentralization of air carrier enforcement -- all of which we have developed as policies in the past year, many of them with the help of some critical, skeptical and thoughtful men under Lloyd Cutler who came into the Project Tigh trope Task Force and helped us.

Today George Prill has been thoughtful enough to include not only members of the Flight Standards Service but the General Counsel and Regional Counsels, and for those of you who are not currently familiar with them I think it would be appropriate for Bud Howard to rise and be recognized as our General Counsel. Most of you know him. Jim Hill is his Associate Counsel. And, a newcomer to some of you, who is Vice Chairman of the new Regulatory Council and on my

immediate staff, Lloyd Lane, formerly Regional Counsel in the Central Region. In addition, the first three Hearing Officers are with us today, and I wish they would rise and be recognized. They are Jack Hunter, Mr. Davis -- and Glen Woodmansee, who does not seem to be present at the moment. Davis, Hunter and Woodmansee have been designated as FAA Hearing Officers, and they will soon take their posts (I guess, Glen, you must have heard us talking about you and come to defend yourself. Glen Woodmansee is the third of the three Hearing Officers that I wanted you to see). They will start the new kind of due process we are going to use in the Agency from now on.

Before getting into some of the finer points of enforcement, I might note that, personally, I found it more than a little mystifying to hear from some quarters that I have adopted a softer enforcement policy for the Agency than it previously had. Nothing could be, or could have been, further from my mind. I have strictness, not leniency, both in my mind and in my actions, to date. In fact, our enforcement policy since I entered upon duty as Administrator has been as precise and as rigorous as I could make it. Toward the end of this session I'd like to recount a few cases to indicate what I mean, particularly for some of you who have the impression that either Democrats or Southern Californians are less strict than Republicans or others.

In this connection, I'd like to note one of the two basic principles that we all should keep firmly in mind. First, you should look upon any enforcement policy expressed here today as the Federal Aviation Agency's policy - not

Halaby's policy or any other individual's policy. I'm determined that this Agency be put on a long-term, enduring, institutional basis; and the model best fitting our future has not yet been built. It is some version with the esprit of the FBI and the Marine Corps. Now if that seems too tough for you, bear in mind they have different missions from the FAA; but they are about as lean and clean and keen as we've got in this government. I want this Agency to rank and stay ranked with them, in leanness, cleanness and keenness in all respects.

So it's not whether Quesada, or Halaby, or Lee, or anyone else is the Administrator that counts, in my judgment. The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 gives me or any other Administrator the same mandate, the same responsibility to the American public to see that the law is complied with and that it's enforced. You and I and all of us in FAA are responsible under the Act to the entire public -- and I repeat, the entire public -- not just that segment known as the aviation community. We are responsible not only for aviation safety, but also, as I hope any would-be hijackers or law breakers aloft are constantly reminded, we are responsible for air security as well.

I think many of us who've been aviators, or associated with aviation for many years, tend to forget that our first responsibility is to the non-aviation public. They have no one else to provide for their security, and health and protection. I think it's very important that we not identify ourselves in our work solely with pilots, and mechanics and dispatchers, and controllers and all of those members of the aviation community with which we are so familiar. In fact, those who do not assume the risks of aviation are the ones who need our help most, and who put the greatest faith in our doing what's right for the

common everyday citizen. He counts on us that no falling object will hit him, that no falling airplane will hit him. He counts on us to assure, insofar as we can, that his trip in a car or truck or bus, or even on horseback, will not be interfered with by an airplane; and they, of course, are by far the largest number of American citizens.

I don't regard this responsibility to the public and the aviation community as antithetical, or conflicting in any way; but I do think we sometimes tend to put it the other way around, to feel more responsible to the aviation community than we do to the general public. I think it's up to each one of us to recognize that we are not hired by the airlines, not hired by the airline pilots or the International Association of Machinists or any other single group, or even a large grouping such as the aviation community. We are public servants; and, in my judgment, this becomes very important in dealing with matters like noise, in dealing with airport standards, as well as in dealing with the airmen and aircraft with which we are daily most concerned.

The promotion of air commerce, in other words, is not in conflict, in my judgment, with regulation for public safety and the improvement of the aviation community. Bringing law and order to the air does as much as anything I can think of to promote that degree of public acceptance of flying which is indispensable to its maximum development and to its contribution to our economic well being. I still, in my own mind, believe the reason only 10 or 15% of the public fly in airplanes is that they're anxious and afraid, rather than that it costs too much or it's too unpredictable. In our safety public service we, in my judgment, are promoting air commerce in a very important way.

As you probably are aware -- I hope all of you have read the resulting report -- in April of last year, shortly after coming aboard, I set up an independent, outside task force to study the Agency's processes in adopting and enforcing safety regulations. The resulting Tightrope report was recently completed and thereafter widely distributed both within the Agency and to the public. Since publication of the report, our Washington Offices have been active in getting together the necessary directives and guidance material to place a number of its recommendations into effect. In addition, we have been working on the problem of decentralization of air carrier enforcement. I believe that the procedural changes adopted from the project Tightrope report, including a right for the certificate holder to a more formal hearing before an FAA Hearing Officer before an Order of Suspension or Revocation is issued, will gain greater respect for our enforcement procedures and thereby increase their effectiveness. I further believe that decentralization of air carrier enforcement will quicken our reaction to violations and make our enforcement that much more effective.

In thinking along these lines, I know you all have dwelt upon and debated the distinction between compliance, deterrence and punishment. After I've finished this little talk, I hope we can get a little discussion going, because unless we have a common philosophy and a rational basis for going ahead with our work, and can make the distinction between compliance and punishment, and get a common view of what we're talking about in the way of enforcement policy, I'm afraid that we're liable to go off in all directions.

Those of you who had occasion to review the Project Tightrope Report will recognize that they were careful to point out that criticism of the Agency was

by no means wholesale. The report stated, among other things, "The various aviation groups from whom we heard (this is the Task Force reporting) though understandably voicing disagreement with some of the Agency's enforcement decisions, had no complaints about the methods and attitudes of those in charge of reviewing violation reports." The report also stated that "Available statistics, insofar as they are relevant, reliable and complete, testify on the whole in favor of the claim that the Agency has acted fairly and objectively." In submitting this report to me the members of this group said "we found a remarkable degree of esprit and enthusiasm - the intangible qualities that are more essential to the success of any administrative effort than its tables of organization and its procedures."

We're now entering into the fourth year of existence of this Agency, and my purpose this afternoon is to try to bring more sharply into focus what must be done in the days ahead to build solidly on this four years of experience. All of you, it seems to me, must first be alert to the meaning of the duties and responsibilities we have under the Federal Aviation Act. Let us not soften and get complacent; let us be alert and vigorous. Let us not be hard or fierce; let us be straight. Let us place foremost our obligation to the public, and secondarily to that segment of the public we call the aviation community.

The so-called four "Fs" -- that we must be fair, factual, fast and firm -- are still with us. These are enduring adjectives and truths. The fifth "F", added a little latter -- "finesse", I believe it was -- were the last words on this subject you received directly from the Administrator. To me, the first

four adjectives sound right, but the fifth hasn't been clearly understood and is not a proper guide in my judgment. The idea of smooth elegance that "finesse" connotes is not my concept of how the public servant proceeds with this job. Perhaps, there isn't just the right fifth word beginning with the right letter to clarify what is meant. But the road we should travel, in my judgment, is one of straight-thinking and integrity.

No enforcement policy is realistic which does not keep in mind the end we seek. This end result is the highest level of compliance with our safety standards that can be practically achieved. What are the key elements needed to achieve this maximum level of compliance? First, those we regulate must never be in the dark as to what our safety standards are. We must deprive them of any excuse for not knowing what is expected of them and must keep them continuously notified and informed of our standards in terms which are readily understood.

This is a big order, especially with our five-foot shelf of regulations, some of which are now thirty-five years dusty. We must bear the burden of initiative in forecasting what elements of our safety standards will be difficult to understand, and carefully explain them through programs of education. Where mere knowledge is not enough, and automatic reflexes and instincts come into play, we must also provide for adequate instruction and training. All these are administrative actions which, if performed well, will cut down any tendency on the part of individuals and companies to deviate from our standards. These elements have a tremendous part to play in the worthy task of achieving maximum compliance with our standards, but they are by no means a substitute for enforcement.

Enforcement represents the teeth in the regulatory standards, our means of assuring that they are complied with by anyone who is either not disposed to comply or neglects to comply. Enforcement is often referred to as the ultimate weapon for achieving compliance. In using the term "ultimate weapon," I mean it should be precise and should do the necessary job of deterrence. I would at the same time caution you that this does not mean it should be used only when all else fails, or that the violator is to be permitted to violate once or twice with impunity before he's curbed in his practices. If he has in fact violated, either through neglect or inclination, appropriate enforcement action must be taken, in my view. It's a cardinal principle of sound enforcement that every violation be identified as such, and when so identified be appropriately acted upon. Any organization whose enforcement personnel are free to act upon some violations, but to ignore or not act upon others, finds itself in a "never-never land" in which continuity of effort and fairness and equality of treatment are difficult, if not impossible, to attain. Consistency, effectiveness and fairness in the discharge of our enforcement responsibilities are not achieved by our decision as to whether to take action, for all violations should be acted upon. Rather, they are attained in a policy which is carefully spelled out, applied and monitored, permitting action ranging all the way from mere issuance of a warning by the cognizant inspector, to revocation of a certificate, as the sum of the circumstances in any case may require.

Moreover, we are not in the least bit interested in seeing how many violations we can chalk up against a violator or group of violators. We are interested in prompt and immediate compliance. Thus, it is your job to advise the violator

promptly that he is engaged, or is about to engage, in deviations from our standards, make him stop forthwith, and take appropriate enforcement action on the violation he has already committed. Perhaps another way to say all this in simpler terms is that through notification, information, education, instruction, training, and all our administrative tools, we must make it as difficult as possible for those we regulate to depart from our standards through ignorance of them. No pretext must be given for claiming unwitting violations. If a violator fails to follow our standards, whether through neglect or deliberate choice, or even ignorance despite our efforts to educate, suitable sanctions must be properly imposed. Certainly, violation through neglect or deliberate choice is reprehensible and we must be in a position to consider violation through ignorance very serious and act accordingly. Bear in mind, that ignorance of the law, as we all know, is no excuse for violation.

Perhaps we should turn our attention now to the element of fairness. Fairness is of course the essence of the American way. It is a responsibility of good citizenship and public service, and should be second nature to all of us in government. But it has an even more pointed significance in our goal of achieving compliance. In achieving compliance there must be added to our own efforts a disposition on the part of those we regulate to comply. We can never achieve compliance through naked force or anxious fear. Any effort to do so will be impracticable and destructive. Fairness is a key element in convincing those we regulate that compliance is a worthy objective for them as well.

I've gone up and down the land during the last year, about 80,000 miles, trying to regain a higher degree of respect for what this Agency is doing, not for any reason of wanting it to be a popular Agency but because I want it to be a respected Agency, one whose high purpose is public service. I've tried to point out that we are a public service agency, that the openhanded regulator is also a strict regulator, and that this is in the interest of those who comply, most of all. I've talked to many airline pilot groups, and have tried to point out to them that they have the most to gain by a respected, effective FAA. Since they have the greatest self-restraint, the most discipline and training -- and surveillance by their own companies -- they have much more to gain throughout the aviation community if there is real compliance by others. I think this applies to every group within the aviation community. I like to think, on going home at night or at the end of the week, that this year there is a little more community, a little more unity -- certainly not unanimity -- but a little more community of interest in this brotherhood of aviation, than there has been in the past. But that's only the beginning -- it helps you do your job better if you have more respect and less fear in those whom you are serving.

I think we must be very careful and correct in separating the relatively few violators from the many law-abiding citizens. Incidentally, there is no group of which this is truer than the supplemental air carriers, with whom we have one of our most serious problems. Thus, from the largest air carrier in the business down to the smallest local service operator and individual airman, all must know and realize that they will get fair and equal treatment, that the rules

are being written for everyone and will be enforced accordingly. Attainment of this objective depends almost entirely upon the attitudes and day-to-day activities of you men: our individual inspectors, attorneys, hearing officers and managers of this Agency. Each of us must be conscious of the fact that he is the living portrait of the FAA in the eyes of those persons with whom he deals.

Now this idea of public service -- to a national system for aviation -- is one I deeply and determinedly believe in. I think we're actively engaged, after this first year period of review, in a renewal of the nation's aviation and our part in it. The aviation community is composed of first, individuals, airmen, mechanics, dispatchers, controllers, individual partners in the game; and then, it's composed of groups -- the airlines, the military, general aviation and the government. Unless we regard it as a community, in which we have been given responsibilities different from, and often conflicting with the groups within the community, we'll get into trouble. There is no legitimate purpose for the FAA except to provide a creative, productive public service. No one of us has any God-given right to his job or his function. In fact, if we lived in a perfect society with a perfect technology and economy, there would be no need for the Federal Aviation Agency.

To get on with this concept of a national aviation system, we need a system of rules, a system of procedures, a system of airspace utilization, a system of weather forecasting and reporting, a system of airports, and a group of men, such as we have here today, who see this need and who are prepared to dedicate themselves to meeting it. I think we have such a group, and it seems to me -- and I hate to repeat this so often, but I guess it bears repetition -- that they must always be mindful that their highest obligation is to the public interest.

When I speak of the public interest, I mean the interest of the public as a whole, not just that relatively small portion of the public represented by the aviation community. Thus, in your relationship with those we regulate and inspect you should always be courteous, fair-minded, understanding and, in my judgment, a little bit clinical. I don't expect white smocks and test tubes, but I do expect you to rid your mind of as much emotion, pride, prejudice and pique as you can -- as nearly the way an X-Ray technician, a diagnostic internist or other high professional man deals with as little emotion and as much objectivity as he can.

Friendliness to the point of losing the respect and dignity of your position as a public servant, or compromising your responsibility to the public, is out from my point of view. Arrogance and toughness, on the other hand, have no place on this team. Tough-mindedness, mental courage, as distinguished from "toughness," goes, and is needed in every public servant. That penetrating quality of slicing through the fat and the guff and getting down to the facts and the heart of the matter is the most important quality that we can have.

I think we have a problem, particularly with our friends, of often finding ourselves in the position of protecting ourselves from their friendship. An arm's length relationship is essential, and this is particularly true for some of us under financial pressure, because our friends are potential employers. If anyone is bucking for a job in industry from the Flight Standards Service, I want to assure him that he can leave tomorrow and take it. I'm not, on the other hand, saying that there will not be, as there have been in the past, fine men in this Service picked up and hired by industry; but the guy who is bucking for a job in a company he is regulating has no place in this Agency.

The difference between "toughness" and "tough-mindedness" is a very important one in my book. I don't want you to be cold, aloof or arrogant, in order to prove that you're pure and objective -- that's infantile -- but I do think courtesy and cooperativeness, without being obsequious or overly anxious to please and certainly without incurring any obligations, will earn, command and keep the respect of yourselves, of the public, and certainly, of this Agency.

By this code of conduct, the roles of the individual inspector, attorney, hearing officer, all the rest of us, become particularly sensitive. There are no more critically important and difficult and demanding jobs in the whole Agency than you gentlemen have. If we can only develop and sharpen the tools for you to work with; and if we can give you suitable guidance and procedures, the opportunity to contribute will be a real challenge to your abilities. We can train, instruct, and so on; but, in the end, it's up to you as individual human beings with minds and spirits and hearts. I only wish ~~that~~ the tangible rewards were as high as the demands upon you. In this administration and within this Agency, we're trying very hard to increase the rewards to match the responsibility. Until that happens, you have one of the most difficult, demanding, and in some respects unrewarded jobs in the Government. However, we do it, we get on with it.

The basic objective of the Agency is to achieve air safety. A good enforcement program, obviously can also serve the purpose of improving our safety standards themselves, both in the sense of technical excellence and in the sense of enforceability and ease of administration. I therefore urge each of you to be

alert and imaginative in the broader aspects of your job. If you see better ways of doing things, if you see how to make our programs more effective and less costly to the Government in money and manpower, or how to make them less burdensome (less burdensome but still fully effective) on those we regulate, you should be quick to point changes out. As you know, I set aside two hours each week to speak to any guy or gal in this Agency who has an idea (five minutes each). I'm getting some good suggestions, and I hope you encourage your subordinates to come to you. At least once a week, set aside a few minutes for anybody to walk in from any part of the organization and talk to the boss. You'll be surprised how little this burdens you and how much it helps you and the organization.

We're working very hard to achieve greater respect for the Agency's enforcement procedures. It is my conviction that an important change for the better is the designation of the independent FAA Hearing Officers. These three men that I spoke of earlier, Davis, Hunter, and Woodmansee, report directly to me; and they are going to be as independent as anybody on the Agency payroll can be. They're going to be as objective -- I hope and pray and will insist -- as can be. So, as I see it, we will have a process which will command greater respect and, commanding respect, will be more effective, in my judgment.

In a proposed enforcement action against a certificate, the accused will be advised of the penalty proposed by the Agency, and will be offered a formal hearing before an FAA Hearing Officer, at a reasonably convenient location for him and us. If, within a given period of time, the accused does not accept

the proffered hearing, the Agency will proceed to dispose of the case by appropriate order. If the accused requests a hearing, it will be conducted before an independent hearing officer. I believe that, except when the accused waives a hearing, we should be required to prove the guilt of the accused in a fairly formal proceeding, and before an official order is reached in most cases. Such a hearing grants the accused the customary right of confrontation and cross-examination, prior to adjudication of his case. This procedure will greatly enhance our enforcement program and rid us of the charge of "punishment first -- trial later." Where the accused exercises his right to a hearing, he would still, of course, retain his right under the Federal Aviation Act to appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Another change is under way: the decentralization of the air carrier enforcement function from Washington Headquarters to the Regions. All air carrier enforcement, and all manufacturer and military enforcement actions, will be transferred to the Regional Offices for final processing at that level. Flight Standards Service and the Office of General Counsel are working out further details of the plan for decentralization, and revised policy directives and manuals will soon be forthcoming to carry out these changes.

I want you all to know that I realize the full significance of decentralizing air carrier enforcement, and I am depending heavily on each and every one of you to perform your duties to the best of your ability in the field, not as individuals, but as organized individuals. You should undertake this new responsibility with a serious purpose, and give full recognition to the inherent

differences between air carrier and general aviation enforcement.

And please, gentlemen, be aware of the need for a national program, a national standard. I have been told by no less an authority than my predecessor that this will not work, that you will be so inconsistent and so various in your rulings in the Regions that it will break down. I've also been told that you're not competent to coordinate between Regions, not competent to manage the decentralized authority I am giving to the Regions. I challenge you to prove this counsel wrong.

For a number of reasons, including the closer and more effective organization of air carrier interests and the interests of their certificated airmen personnel, our handling of the air carrier enforcement program is more sensitive than other areas of enforcement. For example, the associations representing airman certificate holders are fully aware of what is happening to each of their members anywhere in the nation, and abuses on our part would be quickly brought to public attention and to the attention of the Congress. Similarly, the airlines are quick to react to real or imagined grievances. Both the carrier and the certificate holder associations are in a position to compare quickly what is happening to them in the different regions and to complain of inconsistency. It is therefore urgent that there be clear guidelines from Washington and that they be carefully followed by each of the several regions. In the ultimate sense this means that each of you, the inspector corps, the lawyers, and the hearing officers, have to assure this consistency.

One of the dangers in regionalizing authority is that each of you may go off into your own FAA. Then, instead of having the Air Traffic Service FAA, Flight Standards Service FAA, the Legal FAA, and the FAAs we've had in the last three years -- by corps and function -- we would have 8 FAAs, the 7 regions and Washington. To avoid that, again I challenge you. There is no earthly reason why, when in doubt, you can't make a call to Washington; there is no earthly reason why you have to be reminded that what you do in Kansas City has an effect on what they do in Ft. Worth. This is mature management, and it is a problem in every company or organization that is national in scope. But I'd far rather see a few inconsistencies and possibly a few faltering steps by a well organized group who have authority and responsibility on the scene, while they learn how to generate management. I'd far rather have that, than to continue the centralized organization and management of an Agency that will soon be 50,000 in number spending 800 million dollars a year.

Now, perhaps this would be a good moment to have a brief break -- I know in the afternoon after lunch -- particularly after as somber and sober a discussion as this -- that it's good to stand up and turn around. I have about ten more minutes, and then we'll have some questions and answers; so let's have a seventh inning stretch, please.

Gentlemen, shall we resume?

When we start thinking about levels of sanctions in the enforcement program, I guess there is a natural tendency on all our parts, in an area as difficult as the dispensation of justice, to hope for some pat answer in a capsule, or a computer, which will make our tough decisions for us; but there just ain't any. In the interest of quick action, and complete uniformity, valiant efforts have been made in the past, I'm told, to compose a so-called "laundry list" for all the various types of offenses against our Civil Air Regulations. If I ever had any doubt that this could not be realistically achieved, the doubt was removed a month or so ago at Washington National Airport. I asked for the case book, immediately. I looked under "wing tips" -- and I didn't find much, either clarity or consolation. The offense of brushing wing tips, even though 1/8" deep, could be punished in a range all the way in importance from lifting a certificate for a while or a fine, down to merely a note in the files. The penalties imposed in a number of actual taxiing incidents of this nature ranged from a \$100.00 fine -- actually a \$100.00 fine -- down to filing a memo for the record. And I think this is probably right, because circumstances in each case are always different. Accordingly, I gave up any thought of the magic solution.

You all have had this problem. You will again, and I'm afraid that there are no computers or capsules for it. But I do think that, by recodification, we're going to be able to help clarify, bring up-to-date, and make it easier to find the regulations, to cross-reference them, and so on. I think that, through the Regulatory Council, we'll get a more consistent body of Federal Aviation Regulations. But, when all of this is done, we still need basic guidelines for enforcement action.

I have asked Flight Standards and General Counsel in Washington to give you some sharper tools for this work. For one thing, a time-honored principle of justice is the consideration of precedents; accordingly, a very high priority has been given to the completion of FAA Enforcement Summary Material. I think of it as the "case book" or the "digest of relevant decisions." Better organization and distribution of material reflecting CAB decisions will also be helpful, and this is under preparation. In addition, a proposed revision of MOP 22 would incorporate more detailed guidance on enforcement sanctions, and the legal policy directives will be improved on the basis of our experience and our expectations. Further, Headquarters personnel will make frequent trips to the Regions to monitor the programs, and return with lessons that can be applied nationally.

In this effort to assure uniformity in the field of enforcement, however, we must not lose sight of two very important matters. First, we must not default our FAA enforcement responsibility to the Civil Aeronautics Board by merely trying to guess what the Board will do. We should bear in mind Board precedents, but we should seek the sanction or penalty that we think is right in the circumstances. Second, we must always leave room in our own thinking for the so-called enforcement crackdown, in the type of situation where a critical or unusual condition calls for sterner and more intensive enforcement measures. After all, we are in the business of assuring compliance and deterring violation.

Finally, on this matter of sanctions, I'd like to add that I've noted a tendency in some quarters of the Agency to feel that some violations of our safety

standards, even though inherently serious, can be taken lightly because, as these people say, "safety was not involved." In other words, it was not involved in that particular instance in a way that shone forth to the individual considering it. Now, when you apply this in the extreme, this misconception could merely be ignoring a violation because an accident or near-accident did not occur. This is like saying that driving past a red light is not serious if a hole opens up in the traffic at the last second and lets you through without killing anybody. Another example is our tendency to ignore violations of crucial reporting or record-keeping requirements; and I am sure the handful of you who were with me the other day before the House Armed Services Committee were quite impressed with how serious, after the event, a long series of reported failures to keep records can appear, after an accident. While I admit that the latter, that is, failure to keep records, if infrequent, may not necessarily be very serious, continued willful evasion of our requirements for reports and record-keeping, a pattern of neglect in other words, can very seriously affect safety. Failure to report and to disclose makes our surveillance task so difficult at times that it loses its main purpose or its proper level of intensity, through being watered down by inefficient and non-productive effort.

I would like now, if I may, to indicate very briefly and without any special organization of the material, several case histories of enforcement action during the past year as examples. To me, as a common lawyer, examples of action taken are a lot more impressive than words. First, let me talk about

the investigation. It was, it seems to me, and still is, an extremely surcharged situation. You had a labor-management controversy of white-heat intensity; you had violence; you had what the union called scabs or strike-breakers; you had one of the worst situations in recent aviation history. The action of the company in replacing striking ALPA pilots with non-union pilots resulted in mass charges by the ALPA of incompetence of the replacement pilots. These totaled 276 charges and were dramatized by pamphlets strewn through the corridors of the Senate and House of Representatives. As a result of our investigation of these charges, and a special investigation of the company by the FAA to insure that its operations and personnel met our standards, we've taken the following significant actions: Captain Donald Stanton - ATR revoked for lack of good moral character. One of the few and perhaps only actions of this kind, according to the advice I've received, in CAA/FAA history; and I think you ought to contemplate the difficulty and the delicacy of taking an ATR rating from a man for lack of good moral character. And yet, in this case, it certainly had a significant bearing upon his qualification to carry the innocent travelling public in his airplane. Donald Hulihan - found to be posing as an airline pilot with a forged certificate. All certificates revoked and the matter sent to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution. I wonder how many of you and your men have been looking carefully at those certificates and how many of you sweetly assume that the certificate is the valid article. Herbert Brannon - all airmen and medical certificates revoked for a history of mental illness. Harry Susemihl - one of the striking ALPA pilots and head of the ALPA Local, who engaged in intimidation by fist fights,

damaging the private plane of a Southern Airways employee, and was just issued a Notice of Proposed Revocation for lack of good moral character. I think one of your toughest jobs is, and always will be, in the labor-management controversy area. I'm very proud of the way the General Counsel and Flight Standards personnel conducted this intensive investigation of Southern Airways. It is holding up under the scrutiny of the Congress and under a special investigation that is now underway by the Feinsinger Commission.

In another area, the year was marked by an outbreak of incidents of drunkenness aboard air carriers, carrying of firearms, and the new sport of "skyjacking." I think this is probably symptomatic of the kind of world we live in where there is a higher and higher level of anxiety and fear; and those who are not capable of adjusting to their personal problems and dealing with them resort to acts such as these: Raymond Moore, a passenger, was fined \$1000 for drunkenness; Joseph Newkirk - fined \$500 for drunkenness in which violence in the cabin occurred. We levied approximately ten fines in all for drinking, most of them fairly stiff for the "stiffs" involved. As a result of the hijackings, particularly the incident at El Paso, Texas, on Continental, the Agency caused a bill to be introduced providing for heavy fines and prison sentences for aircraft piracy, interfering with flight crewmembers, carrying deadly weapons, committing other offenses aboard aircraft in flight. This Bill was enacted, Public Law 87-197, effective September 5, 1961; and to my knowledge there have been no comparable cases of attempted skyjacking since. There have been several cases of carrying firearms. In one case, carrying a pistol occurred immediately before the law was passed. We levied a penalty of \$300 against the

passenger. And, in the first case which occurred immediately after the law was passed, the passenger was convicted in a Federal Court and was fined \$100. We believe the first wave of these incidents has subsided as a result of the new law and the effective deterrence of Agency action.

In my judgment, this problem of what I call "air security" will be with us from now on. I am afraid there has been some relaxation by the carriers and perhaps by you, since the detour to Havana became less fashionable and profitable. I cannot tell you enough how important I think our obligation to the public is to see that this law is enforced. Since it's a new law, and since we are in the best position to observe violations or projected violations, I think that we, along with the FBI and the local federal authorities, have a particularly heavy responsibility. As you know, we have a project underway within the Agency to make available on predictable, forecastable occasions, men with special training to deal with this problem. I think your men who are riding with the carriers have the responsibility of seeing that that door is closed and kept closed, and that the crews are alert and vigilant not only for the drunk, but for the deadly criminal who may, and I think will over the coming years, use the airplane as a dramatic device for his purpose.

Safety deficiencies found in the supplemental air carriers became a great problem during this year. For two years now, the accident record of the supplemental carriers has worsened. I believe it was three years ago that they had four years of no fatalities on the supplemental carriers. Then, in 1960, the rate was 4.2 fatalities per hundred million passenger miles; and,

last year, largely as a result of the Shannon President Airlines crash and the Richmond Imperial Airlines crash, the rate went to 6 per hundred million passenger miles. This, I'm happy to tell you, was the only category in the aviation community that deteriorated in safety in terms of fatality statistics in the year 1961. But it was dramatically bad.

Now, I have never had anything to do with supplemental air carriers and had never even ridden on one -- and still haven't -- and I came into office ignorant of the problems, except that there seemed to be so many complaints about them. I guess the hardest days of these 11 months have been spent in connection with the Richmond crash, and some of the hardest lessons learned. Imperial Airlines has been suspended, and they will not be returning to flying status until they've carried a very, very heavy burden of proving that they have full time, competent management and financial responsibility, to the satisfaction primarily of the CAB but secondarily to me. It's not just, in a case like this one, where there is a long record of contempt for the law and foot-dragging compliance -- it is not satisfactory -- that they only be required to clean up, once again. They are going to have to demonstrate a lot more than that before they are permitted to resume operations again.

Stewart Air Service, in Englewood, has had its operating certificate revoked. Travis Transportation Company, Far West Airlines, both doing business as Golden Gate Airways under Part 45, have had their certificate revoked. Within the past several days, three air taxi operators in Alaska were also handed an Emergency Order of Revocation for gross violations. As a result of action

by the CAB in revoking its authority for violations of the Board's economic regulation, we have also revoked the operating certificates of Great Lakes Airlines, Curry Air Transport Company, and Trans Alaska Airlines. We also suspended temporarily, until they've completely cleaned up their training and other operations, one of the larger and better supplementals, Aaxico.

Now, I'm not citing these to show that the Agency is tough. I'm just pointing out to you that the day of letting the supplementals alone, a kind of laissez-faire¹ policy on the part of the Board and the FAA, is over. They are going to have to meet our standards, not only operating but financial and management; and I think the result is going to be, and I predict, fewer and better supplemental carriers. A lot will depend on the Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board. But I ask you, and tell you, to continue an intensive surveillance of the supplemental air carriers, and let's see that they meet and maintain our standards.

I realize how very difficult this is for you. As General Joe Kelley of MATS testified, you can't always find them. There is at least one entire airline operated out of the cockpit of the only airplane the airline owns; so the entire management is in the cockpit. Wherever he lands, that is where the corporation is; and I know how tough a thing this is for you men to deal with. We have some ideas that will be put into effect in the coming weeks for improving our surveillance capability. But it will never, of course, be completely adequate. Nor is the hiring of additional hundreds of inspectors the answer. We plan to submit to Congress in the coming week a rigorous program to deal with the supplemental air carriers. It will mark a high point, I believe, in harmony

and effective cooperation between the Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman and the FAA Administrator.

During the year we've tried to intensify, as you know, our surveillance of the maintenance standards of scheduled airlines, and have collected a large number of civil penalties in the process. I hope we have deterred them from deficient maintenance and encouraged them toward improving maintenance. Among the more important were a \$9,000 fine against National, \$14,000 Braniff, \$5,000 Delta, \$6,000 Seven Seas, \$3,000 Pan American, \$10,000 against Capitol Airways, etc. Both scheduled and nonscheduled airlines were involved. We intend to seek an increase in the maximum civil penalty per violation for air carriers from \$1,000 to \$5,000. This will require legislation, which I hope will be forthcoming in the new session.

In actions against airmen, in addition to the Southern Airways cases, I've already mentioned, we've revoked the ATRs of Captains Scott and Jones of Associated Transport for hazardous flight taken with a load of military personnel. We've revoked the certificate of Captain Cunningham, of Riddle Airlines, for taking a company plane without authorization, while intoxicated. We've revoked the ATR of Captain George Robertson for engaging in commercial operations without an operating certificate, the ATR of Captain Carl Loveless of Arctic Pacific for a hazardous flight with a load of 58 military personnel, and all the certificates of another captain for a series of violations. The Board also recently affirmed our revocations of Captains Roddy and McNeil of Capital Airlines, for trading command positions without knowledge of the company,

where McNeil, who took over, was unqualified in the type of plane which was flown.

In another area of great interest to you, the defiance of the Air Line Pilots Association against permitting our use of the seat behind the Captain in enroute inspections on jet planes where they have a third pilot, I believe has subsided, as a result of our success in court action and the levying of civil penalties against individual pilots involved. I noticed in one publication yesterday that Quesada was tough, Halaby is soft. Quesada took their license away from them; Halaby only fines them \$250. I haven't been able to find out which ATR was lifted. As far as the record shows, there weren't any for this offense, whereas we recently collected a \$250 civil penalty from Captain Knuth of Pan American for refusing to permit an inspector to occupy a jump seat on a flight from Frankfurt to London. If you have had any such instance, I'd like to know about them, because there will be absolutely no sympathy or concession to those who defy your authority to be there and do your job.

Recently we've been getting a small spate of deviations from ATC clearances. We have had approximately a dozen of such cases recently, and we've met it by imposing certificate action of ten to thirty days in each case. In those cases where the copilot took the clearance, we suspended both the pilot and the copilot on the grounds that receiving an ATC clearance correctly was such an important function that the captain should not completely delegate it to another crew member.

There are many other examples that could be cited. I only cite these to indicate the kind of enforcement action I feel is appropriate in the circumstances of such cases. I hope I've clarified my position, as Administrator, on the Agency's enforcement responsibilities and objectives. Let me repeat, with all the emphasis I can summon, that the prime objective in enforcement is to achieve compliance and deterrence. The prime objective of the Agency is to achieve maximum safety and security in the air and on the airport.

The year ahead is one of great challenge to each of us who are part of this Agency; a firm groundwork has been laid; a great opportunity for us all has been created; we are depending on all of you who are present here to carry out your duties and responsibilities in a way that will be a lasting credit to you, yourself, and to the Agency and the Government.

Now, with so large a group, there may not be many questions and comments. I hope there are, because it's part of my approach to exchange ideas, to go all 360° around the pattern before making a decision. So I would welcome any questions about any remarks I've made; I would welcome any omissions that you may have noticed. Subsequently, we're going to hear from the General Counsel's Office; and there will be another opportunity, after they have talked to you, for questions and answers. But, if there are any questions on what I have had to say, I'd like to receive them now.

There followed a question-and-answer period.

FAA



NEWS

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY
APRIL 4, 1962 - 1:00 PM

REMARKS OF N. E. HALABY, ADMINISTRATOR
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY
SOCIETY OF AUTOMOTIVE ENGINEERS,
NEW YORK, N. Y., APRIL 4, 1962

I am very happy to be able to talk with you today about the supersonic transport and the way we are moving ahead to meet this next great challenge in civil air transportation. Despite all the considerable problems which absorb both government and industry these days, none of us can ignore the traveler's approaching leap beyond the speed of sound. We all recognize we must prepare for it in a manner that will keep the United States where it has always been in air transport -- out in front in safety, efficiency, comfort and speed.

Safety is our first order of business and it will take an unprecedented effort to assure the necessary level of public protection as well as convenience in this giant bird of the seventies.

To assure continuing American supremacy, we have an effort under way which is managed by the Federal Aviation Agency -- but only as first among equals. It is carefully designed to bring all the nation's talents, both in government and industry -- to bear on the problems involved. And these problems vastly overshadow any we have seen before in the development of civil airliners.

5648 - c. 2

(more)

One of the many ways in which President Kennedy imparted vision and energy to the New Frontier was to give immediate support to the program for the civil supersonic transport. He authorized and we convinced Congress it should give us \$11 million to get a research program going to provide the answers we need for our ultimate decisions.

Then last summer, the President's Project Horizon Task Force studied the situation and recommended development of a U. S. civil supersonic transport as one of 24 national aviation goals for the 1961-1970 decade. The report found such an airplane technically feasible and economically and socially justified. The task force also pointed out that substantial international prestige as well as payments will come to the nation whose supersonic transport dominates the world market with its safety and economy of operation. So the group urged that the United States move ahead with an expeditious development program.

At the same time, the Horizon report observed that a unique government-industry effort would be required to overcome the unusual technical and economic problems involved. It recommended a program of applied research to determine preferred design characteristics. We have laid the ground work for this joint government-industry effort, and we are moving ahead with the exploratory research.

We expect to decide by next summer whether and if so, how the government should assist U. S. industry in developing a civil supersonic transport. If we decide to go ahead, our research efforts will give us the technical basis for determining its development and the economic basis for deciding how it will be financed.

We are asking Congress for \$25 million in the next fiscal year to complete this exploratory research program. All of this research money is going to industry for work on a broad variety of unanswered questions. But the \$36 million program we hope to run in Fiscal 1962-1963 could scarcely provide all the required information. We will draw heavily on work done by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, by the Air Force and other elements of the Defense Department and by industry.

Close cooperation among all groups concerned is vital to the success of the program. We have an organizational structure to assure this. On the policy level, the program is run by a steering group of which I am chairman and which includes Dr. Brockway McMillan, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, and John Stack, NASA's Director of Aeronautical Research.

This group ties together the government effort, but we need constant advice on such factors as the aerospace industry's technical capacity and financial position and the financial and operating capabilities of the airlines. To get this -- and to assure a continuing flow of

information and advice from various segments of industry -- we have established the Supersonic Transport Advisory Group. It is headed by retired Air Force General Orval Cook, who more recently was President of the Aerospace Industries Association. The group includes private citizens with backgrounds in finance, aeronautical research, airline management, airport operations and both airline and supersonic test flying.

At the working level, FAA has the Supersonic Transport Program Management Office. This office works with a group of representatives from NASA, Defense and the Air Force to execute national policy for the program. And here again, we are seeking industry advice. Frank Kolk of American Airlines and Russell Rourke of Trans World Airlines -- both SAE members -- are serving as technical advisors.

Coupled with this individual counsel, we will be holding periodic general meetings with industry to explain the progress we are making and to seek any new knowledge which might have been overlooked. Research efforts such as these always progress most effectively when there is the widest possible dissemination and discussion of knowledge as the program moves along.

Now let's look at the technical problems all this organizational machinery has been established to solve. There is a strong view in the United States that favors a Mach 3 plus, or 2,000 miles per hour, speed range. This looks like an attractive objective, but it is by no means fixed at this point. We want a flexible airplane that will grow in step with requirements and capabilities. We do know that the U. S. supersonic transport must be capable of operating economically in both domestic and international operations.

Perhaps the best way to put it is that the government and industry consensus favors steel or titanium alloys as the basic structural material. This seems the best bet to meet high temperature and long life requirements with built-in potential for later speed growth. We are open to a number of approaches, and we are looking for efficient operation all the way from subsonic flight to Mach 3 and beyond.

Aerodynamics is one key area of investigation. There are a number of possibilities, including the delta wing and the variable sweep wing which NASA finds so encouraging.

At this early stage, the only metal-cutting we will finance is concerned with steel and titanium test samples. But this reflects our very basic interest in metals problems. We are taking a number of approaches -- research will be done on skin stringer combinations, honeycomb sandwich and multiwall construction concepts. One thing we must do is determine whether it is technically feasible to develop a structure at half the cost of the Mach 3 RS-70 structure.

We will spend more than half our \$11 million budget this year on research in the propulsion area, which is critical. The trick will be to sort out from the various possibilities the most promising concepts for a supersonic cruise engine that will be efficient and reliable at Mach .85, Mach 2 and Mach 3. We will investigate these concepts further in Fiscal 1963.

And now, for the first time, noise is a design factor. We are determined to find an engine that will operate at sound levels acceptable to an airport's neighbors. Noise is an increasingly potent problem in airline operations, and we have dealt with it in a number of partially successful ways. But this time we are going to the source, and a reasonably quiet engine is one of our research goals. In fact, we feel we must require a non-afterburning engine to meet the community tolerability - and this is one of the reasons military engine models will not do.

As many approaches as seem promising will be investigated in each basic area. But we are conducting the whole research program with the total system in mind so all this work will contribute to an integrated concept when we are through. If Congress grants our \$25 million request, the money will be spent to continue the most promising projects growing out of our initial effort.

After careful evaluation and negotiation, we are about ready to announce the first contracts under our \$11 million budget for Fiscal 1962. All the money is expected to be under contract by the end of May. More than 1,000 requests for proposals were furnished to about 350 companies, and industry response has been highly encouraging.

The technical questions remaining unanswered are serious, but they are joined by an equally serious operating problem -- the sonic boom. It's not going to do us any good to quiet the engine down if we can't also take care of the boom.

On a typical flight, the airplane will fly supersonically about two thirds of the time. It probably will have to climb above 40,000 feet before it can accelerate through Mach 1 in order to reduce sonic boom effects on people and buildings along the flight path. Such operational factors as acceleration, deceleration and flight maneuvers join speed and altitude in determining overall boom effects. And engine and airframe configuration also will be important.

We are in the midst of an active and intensive joint FAA-NASA-Air Force research program to find out more about the boom and how it will affect the supersonic transport. In August 1960, we began a series of low altitude fighter flights and high altitude bomber flights to obtain ground level pressure measurements. In this initial phase, the flights were planned and instrumented only to produce data which could check out existing theories.

Last September, an expanded joint research program was launched at Edwards Air Force Base. We have used the B-58, F-104, F-106 and F4H military supersonic aircraft. Investigations were conducted on sonic boom generation and propagation design considerations and operational procedures for minimizing boom intensity, and on sonic boom effects from the community reaction standpoint.

The first part of this project has been completed. In it, we devoted particular attention to the problem of predicting ground pressure signatures for high altitude operation of large aircraft and for flight maneuvers.

The second phase was concerned with obtaining data on which we could base a realistic evaluation of these pressure signatures in terms of possible adverse community reaction and nuisance damage to buildings. Data is being processed and some results are expected to be available this summer.

Work is progressing in several other operational areas, such as flight procedures, simulation and systems worthiness standards. A preliminary report on standards for airworthiness was published a year ago, and a public symposium was held on it last December. We are now primarily concerned with identifying the flight worthiness problem areas.

This will be followed by preparation of proposed standards and statements of objectives which will lead ultimately to systems worthiness standards. We call it "systems worthiness" rather than "airworthiness" since our problem extends beyond the requirements of safety and reliability. The airplane and its equipment must also be compatible with all related elements of the air transportation system. It must operate from our major airports and it must fly in the airspace utilization system we are now in the process of modernizing.

In the expected operational environment, we are looking into such phenomena as radiation, ozone, weather and airfield noise.

Although our testing and research is spread over a broad number of individual facets, I can assure you it is all aimed at the integrated package of information and analysis we will need when the day of decision arrives.

On that day, we will have to decide whether a supersonic transport is both economically and technically feasible and be prepared to advise the President whether the nation should move ahead with the investment it will take to supplement industry resources to do the job.

The cost estimates for development and flight test vary, depending on the condition you impose. Should there be parallel engine development programs, or just one? Should we have competing airframe designs or just select one and stick with it? How fast do we want to go? These are questions that remain to be answered. But it appears now that it would cost at least \$400 million to fly a few prototypes, and it might cost twice that amount if we decide to reach immediately for the Mach 3 speed regime.

Then the size of the market will have substantial bearing on our decision. It has been estimated at \$3 billion to \$4 billion -- well worth going after. But our research efforts may furnish some breakthroughs that will significantly reduce operating costs and thus broaden the market as we see it now.

We're not the only ones, of course, who have perceived the commercial advantages and the international prestige attached to a successful supersonic transport. Our English and French friends are conducting a courtship that could produce a Mach 2 transport using today's aluminum structure concepts. It would be a short-to-medium range airliner in the French version and the British version might be stretched to transatlantic capability with extra fuel capacity.

The Soviet Union is quite active in this area, too, although as usual we have no precise information to go on. Some time ago, I talked with a Russian who probably holds a position in his government roughly equivalent to mine. He said Soviet designers were trying to rig a supersonic military aircraft to look like a transport -- probably to harvest some international propaganda of the type produced by their Tu-104. But he also said they are developing a supersonic transport specifically tailored for Aeroflot use.

But whether a tricked-up Boudier or their first safe and profitable transport, we know they see the point in being first - if not best.

In view of all this, we may well not be the first nation to fly a civil supersonic transport. But if we decide to enter the race -- and I trust we will -- then you can be sure we will be the first to field the best supersonic transport. While we plan to move with all deliberate speed, we are going to take enough time to make sure our airplane is the safely operable and maintainable as well as economically efficient machine the world's airlines will want -- not just a showpiece.

If the President and Congress tell us to proceed, we will be launching a national program of the highest importance. It will demand the highest talents and the best effort we all -- together -- have to offer. Then we will fly a supersonic airplane that will turn a profit for manufacturer and airlines alike, and give a credit balance to the Nation. It will extend the hand of freedom, quicken the exchange of minds and men and prove once again the triumph of a free society.

64-2534
FAA



140.8
NEWS

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY
(Noon)

SPEECH BY N. E. HALABY, ADMINISTRATOR,
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY, BEFORE THE
WOMEN'S PASSENGER TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION,
NEW YORK, MAY 8, 1962

Any man in a technical field -- especially any man in a technical field -- should take every opportunity to talk to the ladies. Women have, through the ages, been able to reduce enormously complicated, technical, typically-male matters to, What It All Means -- if anything.

It's always a good idea to stop and put things in perspective, to see if you are on the right track to see if it is really worth it, or to see if there might not be some better way to do it. There couldn't be a better time to do that than just before speaking to a group like yours. I say this because almost by definition, you will want to know what American aviation is up to for a reason nearly as fundamental as being female. Your business is helping people move from one place to another, and I suppose in the long view, that is exactly what I am up to -- helping people move from one place to another as safely, swiftly and predictably as possible, by air.

I know better than to talk to you about our Horizon, Beacon and Tightrope Task Forces and their reports, about the management modernization and decentralization within the Agency, or even about my determination to begin developing a true national aviation system -- except how it will affect people. So let me extract from all the tribal hieroglyphics I deal in everyday what it will all mean to your travellers in the next few years.

5652-C.2

I should start out by painting what should be a very happy picture for those in the travel business. Our studies have shown that while air travel has increased over the years, there are still an amazing number of Americans who have never been in an airplane. Not even ten percent of the total U.S. population flies in any one year. An even tinier fraction of the 3 billion or more world population flies annually. Being responsible for fostering civil aviation under the law -- and having a great personal fondness for airplanes myself -- FAA is going to do what it can to make air travel the accepted routing for a far greater percentage of our people on the move.

To get more people to fly, there seems to be little question that we must make flying safer -- and also make flying appear to be safer. This will require us to climb to new levels of design, engineering, operations and maintenance. It will require new systems of safety. Most of all it will require great care and self discipline.

Next, the relative cost must be reduced to something at least close to what automobile travel is, and then it has got to be made a lot more convenient or people are going to continue to use their cars even if it is uneconomic or if they are charged with conspicuous consumption while they do it.

I don't mean to imply when I say this that wonderful strides have not been made in air travel in really a very few years. I remember traveling across the country in a Curtiss Condor, not really so many gray hairs ago - 1932 - when we went up and down for fuel like the bargain-basement elevator at Macys. It was an exhausting trip -- nearly a Homeric adventure -- yet it costs no more to jet across the nation in five hours today, looking at the latest movies or playing the gourmet.

And certainly there are a remarkable number of communities in the country being served by air now compared to the favored few just a few years ago. So I do not discount the progress that has been made. Its been remarkable.

But it is just as clear we are going to have to pick up the pace in improving safety, cost and convenience of air travel. This will have some effect on the flying machines we see now, but the big jets we've grown accustomed to in such a big hurry should provide valuable, competitive travel service for many years. Areas which are going to require far more improvement than the aircraft themselves include our own FAA air traffic control -- particularly if all your customers insist on leaving at 9:00 a.m. and arriving at wherever it is at 6:00 p.m. We must do better at the airport, too, the business of tickets, baggage and just getting on and off the airplanes. We've got a lot to do to getting people between the airport and the place where they live or work.

I won't burden you with a detailed description of what we are working toward in air traffic control, except to say that we plan to put more and more commercial flights under full-time positive control, not only for safety reasons, but to handle them more systematically around the terminal areas and reduce waiting time in the air as well as on the ramp. We expect that the pilot will know his flight program almost to the minute when he sits down in the cockpit. This will be pretty nearly necessary when supersonic transports begin to operate, but we expect to have the system going long before that.

The supersonic transport is, of course, the most dramatic piece of equipment on the horizon of air travel. To your travelers it will mean flying from New York to Paris in three hours, to Los Angeles in less than two, at speeds around 2,000 miles an hour. You will arrive an hour before you left. Just think -- a late, late breakfast! And the aircraft will fly so high -- 75,000 feet -- that the weather will be a factor only at the beginning and end of the flight. But except for the speed, the smoothness of the flight because of the great altitude, and perhaps more quiet, the ride itself won't be much different than it is in a modern jet.

We -- the FAA -- are looking into the technical problems of the supersonic transport now, and before too long, we expect to make a recommendation to President Kennedy. He will decide whether the government should initiate a national government-industry program to buy a nest of these great birds. We hope our American research will eventually produce an airplane that will dominate world service when the airlines take this great step forward in air transportation.

We also are looking into the possibilities at the other end of the spectrum -- where people want to fly straight up, move fast for short distances, then come straight down. These vertical and short takeoff and landing types hold the promise of licking the vexing ground congestion that more and more vitiates the gains made in the air.

Especially here in the east between Richmond and Boston, land is being developed so fast that it won't be too long before there is a carpet of people and buildings over the entire area. This growth is fine for the economy, but it's tough on transportation.

What we need here is some kind of Metroplane that can take off vertically from a downtown site in, say, Washington, and fly to a downtown landing in Philadelphia. Only this portal-to-portal type of movement will provide truly useful air transportation on the short-haul routes.

Fast intercity service is valuable to businessmen, of course. But I think it also will open up new possibilities for pleasure travelers.

The Richmond citizens who wouldn't think of fighting the ground and air complications now involved in a weekend trip to New York might change his attitude when he can catch a convenient Metroplane flight that will carry him very close to his New York hotel -- perhaps to its air terrace on the roof!

V/STOL aircraft also offer some hope for the woeful segment of air transportation that lies between the airport and the travelers home or office. We must move people faster over this link to preserve the vital time advantage offered by airplanes.

The FAA is probing a number of these areas under a rather gay, springy program called Hummingbird, and we are working with the military services on some of their more promising V/STOL projects. We feel the civil operators can help the military forces by trying the new machines out under commercial operating conditions. And, of course, we will cooperate in making sure that any really promising aircraft can be easily certificated for civil use when they are fully developed.

We aren't absorbed exclusively in helping to develop air vehicles. A trip to our new international airport at Chantilly, Virginia will convince you of this. There is a mechanical marvel out there that will work a real revolution in the way airports handle their passengers. Some of us call it the arch preserver, others say it's the mobile lounge.

This machine, which is the world's largest rubber-tired motor vehicle, is designed as an integral part of the terminal. Washington travelers will check it, then walk a few yards directly from the ticketing area into the mobile lounge. At flight time, the lounge doors will close and up to 90 travelers will be transported across the ramp area to step directly into their airplane seats.

You can see what this means to the beleaguered passengers. No more sprinting down long finger passages with handbags, packages, coats and children flapping along in his wake. If he misses a flight, he does it comfortably right there in the main terminal. And if he makes the flight, he doesn't spend the first hour aloft recuperating. And then, of course, he is protected from the inevitable noise and blast, and occasional bad weather, found on any airplane ramp.

The terminal building is another striking feature of the new airport. It was designed by the late Eero Saarinen, and many architects feel it is the greatest of his great works. Whatever their judgment, it is a beautiful sight with its sweeping design, rising from the Virginia countryside to greet visitors to the nation's capital -- to announce America.

We are very pleased to have this new gateway for the world leaders who visit here in a constant stream. Now they have to come to Washington through New York, Miami or some other gateway. This fall, they will be able to fly directly to the capital. The new airport also is a fitting entry, of course, for other foreign visitors and for our own citizens.

All of these elements -- airmen, aircraft, airports, the airspace utilization system -- fit into the National Aviation System we are trying to develop. Once they went their separate ways, joining forces only where necessity dictated. But the demands of an increasingly complex business now make this impractical. We cannot continue this random activity if we are to keep aviation safe and help it reach its tremendous potential.

We intend to develop an integrated national system that considers all phases of the journey from doorstep to doorstep. We must blend all these elements to make sure a traveler moves smoothly and quickly through his entire journey, not just when he is en route aloft. The FAA is determined to enlist the aid of everyone-including you ladies -- to help aviation meet and conquer the challenges and opportunities that lie upward and onward.

#

Goodman
dwc/1

PRESS CONFERENCE
NAJEEB E. HALABY, ADMINISTRATOR
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Friday, May 11, 1962
10:55 a.m.

Mobile Lounge
Dulles International Airport
Chantilly, Virginia

5654 - 0.2

MR. HALABY: As you know, we came through the lower level of the Terminal, and came up through the basement, so to speak, on to the grand concourse, the main concourse area, and out the south concourse, and down about the entrance to the restaurant, and on to the feeder gates, that is, the area where the mobile lounge was parked was where the feeder aircraft would taxi in to deplane passengers who would then go into the Terminal.

We simulated a run of the mobile lounge out to what we call the jet gates. These little structures that are being built here on this side of the field, you can see the fueling plumbing there, and then these little structures will contain minimum turnaround field maintenance, fuelers, mechanics, food handlers, and so on.

So we are roughly where you might be before boarding. As soon as the press conference portion of the trip is over, we will take you over to the try-before-you-buy area. There we built a mockup of all of the entryways into all of the currently operating aircraft, in order to try this concept, and this particular design, against a mockedup entry into a DC-8, Viscount, even a Britannia, I think you have there: all of the ones likely to use this Airport, and that will give you an example of how the walkway there extends and fits into each of the entryways on all the aircraft.

Then, I believe, Ward, you have bus transportation

back into town from there.

I think at this point we ought to just make very brief summing up remarks here, and then have question and answer period, because this is intended to be one of our regular periodic press conferences.

You will note that a great deal of work remains to be done on the Terminal. You will also note that the runways, except for the lighting and some other finishing touches, are pretty well finished. You also see, as you see whenever you build a house, or an apartment building, or any other structure, the groups of contractors and subcontractors and individual workmen all working to finish a structure that has been planned for twelve years and under way for four years, come September.

The whole picture is attempted to be laid out in this packet that you were given by Bill Swatek and Fred Pelzman, and I am sure you will have some questions about these statistics, and we will be glad to field them for you.

Before going on, I would like to reintroduce to some of you, and introduce for the first time to others, Mr. Ward Hobs, who is the Director and General Manager of both the Washington National Airport and this Airport, and then the Manager of this Airport when it becomes operational, Bill Cullinan, who is at the end of the room here. Bill is a career airport engineer in the CAA-FAA, having previously had

experience with the early days of Idlewild and other New York airports.

In addition, we have with us today some of those with whom we have been working on this job, in particular for the Prime Contractor, the Engineer Ammann and Whitney, Mr. Richard Huber, who is right here in the center.

We also have from Eero Saarinen Associates, the man on the job here, Mr. Kent Cooper, and we have from one of the principal construction contractors, Bud Humphrey, of Humphrey and Harding.

The engineer for the FAA who has had the continuing responsibility for the last -- what, Dick?

MR. DATE: Year and four months.

MR. KALABY: Mr. Richard Date.

Now they have associates here who will help them answer questions, who have been working with them on the development of this very complicated and, I think, unprecedented Airport.

You were brought out under the tour guidance of Hans Omenitsch of the Bureau of National Capital Airports, who has the task of articulating and explaining this whole enterprise to those who have a right to see it before its first birthday.

Well, with that background, I would like to throw it open to questions.

QUESTION: Are you going to make that October date?
That is the obvious question.

MR. HALABY: Well --

QUESTION: Maybe Mr. Humphrey would like to answer that.

MR. HALABY: Well, let's put it this way. This Airport has had a long history, and it is a complicated enterprise, and you noticed, in setting up those magnificent windows, which are called curtain walls, you have an intricate and unique construction problem.

I have been saying since I came into office that the Airport opening was underestimated and the cost was underestimated.

Last year, I got three experts in from New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and they said it could be opened this Fall, but that it would cost another \$25 millions to open it, even without hangars, and so we went to Congress, got that money, and I think I have fairly consistently said that it would be operational this Fall, and this is what we and the airlines intend.

In order to do this, we have set ourselves a date of October 1, 1962, and we have a contract with the Corbetta Construction Company, who are preparing that tower and have all that scaffolding around the tower, to meet that date, and we have a contract with Mr. Humphrey and his firm of

Humphrey and Harding which originally called for completion August 1st, and we have, by formal action, extended his completion date to October 1st.

There is a clause in the contract which requires the payment of \$5000 per day beyond that date. There are factors, as you can see, in going there and looking, that may make the full completion of the construction portion of the Terminal open to question, but I think Mr. Humphrey is quite prepared to state his position on this, and we are working intensively with him. The Architect-Engineer, the architects, in trying to break whatever bottlenecks arise.

Bud, would you like to comment on this?

MR. HUMPHREY: Well, as you all know, this is a beautiful building, and it is intended to be here for a good many decades. For matters of expediency, I think we are all agreed that we should not sacrifice quality in workmanship, or substitute unworthy materials for purpose of expediency. Mr. Halaby has talked about the building being operational on the 1st of October. To this end, we are all cooperating with each other, and we believe that date can be met on an operational basis.

I would suspect that next Fall, if you inspect the building, you will see a lot of voids that would lead you to believe that we are not complete, and perhaps in every instance, we won't be complete, but these voids, perhaps, will be tenant

spaces that have not been leased, tenant spaces in which the tenant does not have the same urgency that Mr. Halaby has, and those spaces will not be complete.

There may be architectural specialties that are purposely held up. Fixtures and adjustments to be made that are best made after substantial completion. I anticipate that we will be on this job far beyond October 1. Just the balancing of the air conditioning does not happen until next air conditioning season, after tenant occupancy and tenant changes. There are numerous items in that category, but we are striving for the October 1 operational date.

MR. HALABY: Do you want to pursue that any further?

QUESTION: Yes, do you expect to have the fixed-base operations going when the Terminal officially opens?

MR. HALABY: The question is, do we expect to have the fixed-base operations going when the terminal becomes operational this Fall? The answer is no, that we are offering for bid on a competitive basis very shortly -- what date, Mr. Hobs?

MR. HOBS: This very week.

MR. HALABY: This week, to fixed-base operators who wish to come in and obtain the concession. We are offering that this week. We do not believe they will be in here and operating the day the Airport is dedicated to operations.

QUESTION: Can you say approximately when they will be?

MR. HOBS: I do not think we can, at this time. There are so many ramifications involved in it. I do not think that we can say a definite date.

QUESTION: Mr. Halaby, I note in the fact sheet here that it will be a sole based operator --

MR. HALABY: Be what?

QUESTION: That there would be a sole fixed-base operator. I was wondering if this was in contradiction with your stand in regard to Logan, or whether the rub there was that the contract was negotiated, rather than -- it is on Page 12, I think, or is -- or whether the rub in the case of Logan was that the contract was negotiated rather than let open for bid?

MR. HALABY: I am looking for where it says that, because if it says what you say it does, it is wrong. It says one base operator will be selected by the FAA.

QUESTION: One base operator will be selected by the FAA as an agent.

MR. HALABY: Well, that is not correct. It will be competitive, multiple operators.

QUESTION: It will be multiple operators?

MR. HALABY: Yes.

QUESTION: That is what I was wondering.

MR. HALABY: I think in the urgency of getting something for you gents to look at, there are one or two problems I have with this statement, and that is, I think, probably the most serious misstatement in it. But 90 percent of it is correct. That is incorrect, and in fact, as you know, I have been strictly construing and enforcing the Anti-Monopoly provisions in the Federal Airport Act, and the Surplus Property Disposal Act, which require that there be no discrimination in the use of airports that Federal funds have aided, and I am losing friends fast at Logan International Airport, as you know, if I had some up there.

QUESTION: Mr. Halaby, how are the international carriers coming in on the taking of space?

MR. HALABY: Well, at the hearing last Tuesday, I think it was, or was it a week ago Tuesday? May 2nd?

MR. HOBBS: Yes.

MR. HALABY: The hearings Tuesday, May 2nd, we announced that there had been substantial agreement reached with the air carriers, and someone after the hearing asked a member of my staff what air carriers we were talking about, and the gentleman gave him a list of all the carriers that could under CAB authorization use the Airport. He did not intend to say that all of those carriers had reached agreement.

For example, BOAC is authorized to operate in here, and they had not, as I understand it, Mr. Hobs, been in these

negotiations, but they have indicated an interest, and we suppose that they, as well as Pan American, who is the other authorized international carrier, will be coming around and either signing this letter of agreement which we believe will be signed shortly by the domestic carriers, or if they prefer to negotiate further, they may try to do that.

QUESTION: Do you have an agreement with the counties involved on private development around the Airport? That would keep it under control, to your satisfaction?

MR. HALABY: I think you are referring to zoning restrictions, probably.

QUESTION: Yes.

MR. HALABY: The question is, do we have an agreement with the county?

You know, there are two counties involved here, Loudoun and Fairfax -- this being 10,000 acres, it is in two counties -- and we have discussed with them zoning restrictions, in addition to the very large amount of property we own, on the approaches, and on the exits from the runways.

Could you describe the nature of that understanding at this point, Ward?

MR. HOBS: We have been meeting with Loudoun County and Fairfax people almost on a monthly basis, and we feel that they concur with us that there is a necessity to seriously control and zone these areas, and as of this moment, we feel

we have their full cooperation in this.

QUESTION: Have you got anything on paper?

MR. HOBS: What was the question?

QUESTION: Have you got anything on paper?

MR. HOBS: No, sir.

MR. HALABY: I do not know that they could lawfully make a contract to zone. I think that is a public action of the zoning authorities in those counties. I think what we do have is a kind of understanding, which of course they, being elected officials, may follow or not, depending on the public sentiment. This is a Federal Airport in the State of Virginia, on two counties.

QUESTION: I think the root of this question is does FAA have any recommendations to offer, specifically, in this zoning, and if so, what?

MR. HALABY: Well, the first recommendation, where it is practicable, is to buy enough land for your airport, in a location that will give you controlled landing and takeoff, so that there do not need to be any artificial arrangements to reduce noise and other irritable aspects of normal airline operations. And that is what was done here.

The location is considered by some remote. I suppose if we look back from 1975, this will be in the center of the metropolitan area, but it was considered remote, and that is one of the reasons why we have had to have the high-speed

access highway.

We have, under the Federal Airport Act, the authority, although not all the appropriations required, to assist other airport owners to purchase navigation easements, and to purchase land for clear zones. We have at present criteria that relate to this subject, and in about ten days, we will be announcing some additional practice with respect to airports all around the country that we think would be desirable.

QUESTION: Going back to this question on the carriers, you mean you have not got an agreement yet with BOAC or Pan American?

MR. HALABY: Let me explain how that works. The carriers negotiate with an airport owner as a group, and the Air Transport Association frequently sits in with the individual carrier negotiators.

Incidentally, I think I miscast those negotiators. I referred to them as gladiators. I now think of them as knights. The knights of the round table, with whom Mr. Hobs sat, were mainly the domestic carriers. The last three or four days of the sessions, a man from BOAC sat in on the negotiations.

Did a Pan American man sit through the entire negotiations?

MR. HOBS: Well, Mr. Halaby, there is the top negotiating committee, on which Pan American and BOAC

were represented, but the actual nail hammering down was done with a subcommittee of three, one representing each sized carrier, one the major carrier, one the intermediate, and one the small carrier.

MR. HALABY: Yes, the letter of intent, which is the legal document, has gone to Pan Am and BOAC as of May 8th, and we believe they will be signing as will the others on the terms agreed by Mr. Hobs with the negotiating committee.

QUESTION: Is there any reason to believe that they would act differently than the domestic carriers?

MR. HALABY: None that I know of, and I do not think we would let them be given any preferred position.

QUESTION: How about the foreign carriers, such as Air France, and Lufthansa?

MR. HALABY: As far as I know, they are not authorized to operate in this area. Just BOAC.

QUESTION: Mr. Halaby, what is the future of Washington National?

MR. HALABY: Well, the public will decide that, and in this way: we anticipate no change in the jet restrictions at this time, and therefore, jet operations will naturally come to this Airport, for which it was designed, authorized by Congress, and funded by the Nation's taxpayers.

Secondly, with those jets, many of which jet flights will come over from Friendship, you will naturally have feeder

flights to feed the long-range operations, so we would guess that some of the feeder flights out of Washington National would come over here. Not all.

Then we can be quite clear that the shuttle will continue to operate in and out of Washington, and that most of the general aviation aircraft who now wish to and need to operate in and out of there will continue to do so.

It is the so-called briefcase traffic, the man who comes down to Washington for the day, we think will continue to flow through Washington National Airport.

Now we cannot tell you how many operations there will be here, because as I say, the public will decide that. The airlines will anticipate what the public want, and they will adjust their schedules accordingly.

As of March of this year, Washington National had on an average day 900 to 1000 operations per day, of which about 600 were scheduled airline operations; scheduled airline operations, that is, the number you would read off the schedule.

We do not know how many will move out here, but we think the public demand might cause about 42 of the Electra, Viscount, DC-3, F-27 operations out here, and then a fairly large percentage of the jet schedules into this region would come in here, but again, the public, through the airlines, will decide how many.

So we have to make an educated guess, which we have

done in setting the level of operations here.

QUESTION: Is that 42 a day?

MR. HALABY: Yes.

Now I have testified to Congress and to you gentlemen and ladies before that the first decade of Chantilly's operations here are going to be subject to public demand and convenience and necessity, and probably due to the high cost of this Airport, be run at a deficit. And this, despite the fact that Mr. Hobb and Mr. Arnold, and there is Mr. Munson, all the men negotiating with the airlines, have done an extraordinary job in negotiating very substantial fees for the use of this Airport.

The landing fee per thousand pounds of landing weight here is 30 cents, but when you add 12 cents per trip of the mobile lounge, the total is about 42 cents. This compares with 35 cents at Idlewild, 23 cents at San Francisco, 15 cents at Baltimore, and 13 cents at Washington National.

There is also --

QUESTION: Would you repeat the figures?

MR. HALABY: There is also a premium being paid for rental space in this magnificent Terminal, so the airlines will want to generate a lot of traffic through here, and the public, I think, once the dynamism of this whole complex gets going, will want to fly in and out of here, and of course, if international traffic greatly increases -- and of course,

one additional flight would be a 100 percent increase there -- this would have a major contribution.

QUESTION: How much would it be for a fully loaded jet to land here, at 42 cents per thousand pounds, approximately?

MR. HALABY: About \$70.

QUESTION: For each landing?

MR. HALABY: This would be maybe, oh, \$18 more than at Idlewild.

QUESTION: Will this 42 cent figure make Dulles the most expensive landing field in the States?

MR. HALABY: I guess so. It will also make Dulles the safest and the most convenient, and the most beautiful airport, and I guess you do not get something like that for nothing.

QUESTION: How do you figure most convenient?

MR. HALABY: Pardon?

QUESTION: How do you figure most convenient?

MR. HALABY: Well, have you with a handbag rushed from your taxi at X into your airplane at Y, lately?

QUESTION: Yes.

MR. HALABY: If it could be made more inconvenient, I do not know how.

QUESTION: I mean convenient for --

MR. HALABY: Here you will walk about 175 feet, and I cannot imagine any greater convenience. This is the greatest

thing for the foot since the arch preserver shoe, or for the heart, since the ferryboat, or shuttle train. So I think it is a major matter of convenience.

We made it out, despite all the delays in that bus, which was under some wraps, in about 42 minutes this morning, which amazed me. I thought it was going to be more like an hour because we have several miles of the accessibility knocked out, and of course we did have very little delay in the first portion of the trip, which is going to be the slowest most of the time.

So I think this is going to be, even though remote from the city center, the most convenient Airport in the world.

I hope it sets an example for others to follow, because I think the pedestrian air traveler is one of the most neglected individuals in America.

QUESTION: Are you sold on the mobile lounge concept, now?

MR. HALABY: Well, Vern, sold on it? Anybody in my business who is not sceptical should, you know, seek other employment. And I have some scepticism about some of the problems that are going to arise, but the principle is just as sound as can be, and before we bought 20 of these at a very substantial cost, we have accumulated three years of testing time, and in a moment, we will take you over to the -- what do you call that thing?

MR. HOBS: The mockup.

MR. HALABY: The mockup. It has had a little more erotic names from time to time, but over to this mating device, or mockup, over here. When you see that, you will know we have emplaned and deplaned in a simulated manner many hundreds of times. And we haven't found any major flaws in it, Mr. Hughland.

Now the problems that will have to be worked out are those such as the errant child who refuses to get off the airplane and onto this thing, or the lovely elderly lady who may have to have assistance to go from the airplane into the lounge, and that impatient, irritable commuter type who gets up to the first place in line to get off the airplane as soon as the wheels touch down is going to fume a little bit, but I think it would be better for him to fume a little there -- and even he will think so -- than to walk the mile and a half from the airplane in to his taxi.

QUESTION: Has this been officially named yet, and if so, what?

MR. HALABY: This machine?

QUESTION: The Airport?

MR. HALABY: The Airport's name?

QUESTION: Yes.

MR. HALABY: Well, let me give you the background on that. We have been through this before, but I always enjoy it.

Put it this way: President Eisenhower, immediately after the late Secretary of State Dulles' passing, issued a very short proclamation, a Presidential Proclamation, that this should be the John Foster Dulles International Airport. The Congress has called it the Additional Washington Airport at Chantilly, Virginia.

Now the latest word I have heard on this is from the home town Congressman here, Joel Brophy, who last Tuesday stated here that he thought this ought to be named Washington National Airport, or Chantilly Airport. Now on the books or the legislation, it is the Additional Washington Airport at Chantilly, Virginia; in the White House files, it is John Foster Dulles International Airport.

I have talked to the Dulles family about whether they did not agree with me that the proper name for this is Washington International Airport, which it is, and wouldn't it be appropriate to dedicate the terminal to the late Secretary's memory. There was polite interest and consideration of this, and I am told, subsequently, that they opposed the change of the name.

It would be discourteous and quite thoughtless of me to recommend to the President that he change the name over the objection of the Dulles family, and I am not going to press him to name it Washington International Airport, although I personally, without any doubt, feel that that is what it is,

and that is what it is going to be named.

You all are going to name it in the end.

QUESTION: Well, we have named it Dulles already.

MR. HALABY: No one calls it New York International Airport; they call it Idlewild.

QUESTION: But who has the official job of naming it?

MR. HALABY: I would think the Congress has the primary official job, but President Eisenhower took it upon himself to name it the John Foster Dulles International Airport, and so, if the President were to take any action on it, he would have to issue a Proclamation changing the name, and I am not about to recommend that that be done, in the face of the feelings of the family of the late Secretary.

QUESTION: What is the schedule for delivery on the additional mobile lounges?

MR. HALABY: Well, we have one now which is the test article, and which as you can see is quite operable. There has been a suggestion that Yarborough drive it over to the mating area, because he has broadened his horizons now to include other wheeled vehicles, and it is operating.

We plan to have 20 additional units on a schedule that looks like this: five on October 1st, five on November 22nd, five on January 3rd, '63, and five on March 8, '63. About a new one every two weeks.

QUESTION: What number of flights do you

believe will have to leave Friendship to come down here?

MR. HALABY: I said I did not know.

I think it will be a fairly large percentage of the jet flights, because they are long-range, north and south, particularly to Florida, and east and west to California, and we think that they will find it more convenient to operate through here, but if the public does not want to buy a ticket into this Airport on a jet, the airlines will find out about it very rapidly, and they will adjust, as they do, usually, to that public demand.

QUESTION: Another subject, Mr. Halaby, is there any progress on the near miss and communications, tentatively, since we last met?

MR. HALABY: The question is, is there any progress on the near miss and communications difficulty since we last met?

I think we have made progress. I have been out here three times in the last few weeks. Mr. Humphrey and I have had several interesting conversations, and all of them have wound up on a friendly and hopeful note, and he has forcefully assured me, as he did this morning, that he is going to do everything he can to meet his contract October 1st.

One of the things we have been looking out here is to be sure that the holding areas and the landing and approach patterns here are completely secure and safe, and I can assure

you that the jet holding areas will be well to the west, the Marshall holding area, and the Martinsburg holding area will be out of the Washington National traffic, and out of the Andrews traffic, and so we have taken that very much into account.

We have not had an incident such as the Springfield incident, since that time. We have had, as we do each day, reports of incidents and near accidents, but one of the things that has been very helpful here has been that all of the controllers and the pilots are cooperating very closely in reporting their altitude each time they report their position, and this is a self-correcting thing.

I have been visiting Centers -- I spent three hours in the New York Center day before yesterday morning -- and talking to controllers. The controller who was involved in the Springfield incident is now serving temporarily in the headquarters of the Air Traffic Service, in an intensive study of stopgap interim measures before we get the new system that we should take. He has been very helpful there, and his case is before the New York Regional Headquarters, and he is answering the charges that have been made against him with respect to holding these two aircraft at the same fix in the same altitude for some time.

When the case is appealed, if he appeals it to me, I will rule on it. Until then, I can only tell you what I

think is the kind of philosophy this agency ought to have.

It seems to me that there are three kinds of cases. The first one is where through no fault whatsoever of his own, the controller is involved in a situation unanticipated, either equipment or traffic, that he cannot deal with. In that situation, he is faultless, it is a system problem, and we can only fix the system up until we get a modern, full-scale system.

The second case is where negligence or carelessness or irresponsibility is a factor, and in that case, we are simply not going to tolerate any shortcomings that endanger the public.

And then, there is the middle ground, where negligence, carelessness, irresponsibility, do not seem to be a factor, but serious questions are raised as to whether the controller is capable of doing the job under those difficult circumstances. In other words, his judgment and efficiency, and the high level of physical and mental performance required, whether he can handle it or not, and there is the case where we just have to look at the man and his record, and the merits of that individual case, and maybe he needs to be put in a less demanding assignment, maybe he needs to be retrained, and this is the way we are going to deal with these cases, and I hope that we can do justice, first to the public, and second to the individuals involved.

QUESTION: How long will this individual be at the Air Traffic --?

MR. HALABY: I would say he has been there about two or three weeks, and we think he can be useful in this study for 60 to 90 days, Mr. Hughland.

One other announcement is that I have decided that the first job for Gordon Bain who is the new Assistant Administrator for Appraisal, is that of looking, in an objective, clinical manner, at this whole air traffic network we now have, to be absolutely sure that the very dedicated men in that service, the air traffic controllers, led by David Thomas, to be sure they have not overlooked anything, and so he is taking a completely fresh view, with a small FAA team of picked people, to be sure that we haven't missed any bets on a safe, self-correcting network with our present obsolescent equipment.

QUESTION: Would you comment on whether or not the proposed high rise apartments on the Merrywood Estate pose any air safety hazard?

MR. HALABY: I never duck a question.

Let me be very candid with you. Anything that rises above the highest tree along the Potomac on the way into Washington National Airport is undesirable, from an aviator's point of view, whether he is a helicopter pilot or a large transport pilot. Anything that rises above the

current obstructions, he is "agin", and on that basis, I find it undesirable to see a high rise apartment along there.

Secondly, as a citizen, and not as an FAA Administrator, I think one of our priceless assets is that beautiful valley, and you came along it. It is the scenic route to the airport. It is one of the things that we cherish and love in this area, and naturally, as a citizen, one hates to see it marred.

Now the legal position is that we will look at any plans for a high rise building there, and if it is within our criteria, we will not take legal action.

QUESTION: Would the 150 feet total of 350 over the riverbed be within the criteria?

MR. HALABY: Well, that is a hypothetical question. I don't quite understand how a 17-story apartment can rise only 150 feet above the present level, but it may be built for midgets, on the top three floors.

So we would have to wait until we got the facts, and look at those.

QUESTION: Would you review again briefly the intricacies of this curtain wall that you mentioned on the way out?

MR. HALABY: I am going to ask Mr. Humphrey. He has been sweating that problem, and maybe he would want Mr. Cooper or Mr. Huber to supplement what he says. This you can see, it is a big, big window, and Mr. Humphrey, would you

like to explain how difficult it is to get it in there, and so on?

MR. HUMPHREY: Well, to approximate the size of the glass that must go into these window openings, I think it is just short of two acres of space that we must enclose in those walls. The frames you see going up now are structural steel, to which will be attached porcelainized aluminum, mullions and muttons, in turn to receive gaskets into which the glass will be placed. Some of these panes are as much as 18 feet long, and on the north side, that is equivalent to approximately a five story building, and on a windy day, handling a piece of glass that big is going to be quite a problem all in itself.

QUESTION: Mr. Humphrey, are you anticipating problems, or have you already had them?

MR. HUMPHREY: Well, I have been --

MR. HALABY: The question is, are you anticipating problems, or have you already had them?

MR. HUMPHREY: Well, I have been in this business all my life, and I guess you would not have general contractors if it were so easy that it just jumped up by itself.

QUESTION: Let me put the question differently. Are you now on schedule or off?

MR. HUMPHREY: That is a difficult question to answer. What we are attempting to do at the present time, in

cooperation with Mr. Halaby, the architects and engineers, is to accelerate a program that has fallen behind through no fault of any of ours.

There have been changes. The changes have been occasioned by requests from outsiders. I believe that the airlines made a certain request for their accommodations, which only very recently made substantial changes in the work. I think better to answer your question, have you had any troubles? Yes, we have new ones and different ones every day and sometimes every hour.

I just walked away from one about two hours ago.

MR. HALABY: You walked away from it, or you walked into it?

MR. HUBER: He handed it to me.

MR. HUMPHREY: The problem is still going on, but I am over here.

MR. HALABY: This contract Humphrey was for \$7,934,500. It was let in June, 1961. It called for completion August 1 of this year. Because of the changes and other matters that we recognized, we have added two months to that, October 1. Mr. Humphrey feels that some more extension should be permitted. We have not permitted it at this time, and the legal position is right where I said.

Now he and I have had several conversations, not as public as this, in the last few days. We have met twice in the

last two weeks, and we are going to meet once a week with Mr. Huber, Mr. Cooper, and all of those involved, and together, we are going to drive this Airport into completion.

I think if you have no more questions that it would be fitting, as we look here at this magnificent structure, to think of the man who designed it, because it takes a great spirit and a great deal of courage to conceive of a building like that as a Federal building. It is one of the most fabulous breakthroughs in the political architecture of the United States I have ever seen, and when that scaffolding is taken away, and that beautiful tower rises there as the most modern and functionally perfect tower we have ever had, and those glass panes are set in place, and the landscaping is completed, you will have an edifice worthy of the very greatest in American art and architecture, which Eero Saarinen in this and other buildings, and through his associates, have been able to prove, and this is the kind of thing that does something for America and the rest of the world.

We are not just interested in air conditioners and seasonal tablets and girth of girls and all of the things that we are depicted as being infatuated with. We are not only capable of doing something beautiful, but the test is going to be, can we keep it beautiful, and that is where I think we are going to need a lot of help from you.

We do not want a bunch of gincrack, gegaw, junky stuff in there. We want to keep this an announcement of America, the greatest in America, and I just think that we can.

Why don't we go on over to the other area here now, and then you can take off for Washington.

(Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the press conference was concluded.)

Goodman
dwc/28