Duplicate

NO. 190

REMARKS BY N. E. HALABY, ADMINISTRATOR
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY
AVIATION COMMITTEE LUNCHEON
WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE
MARCH 16, 1965

IT'S GOOD TO BE BACK AGAIN WITH YOU. I CAN'T THINK OF A MORE PLEASANT TASK THAN TALKING ABOUT THE FUTURE OF AVIATION IN WASHINGTON. WE CAN BE NO OTHER THAN BULLISH. THE NATIONAL CAPITOL AREA IS LARGE --- IT'S PROSPEROUS AND ITS GROWING TREMENDOUSLY. THE SAME CAN BE SAID FOR THE AVIATION SEGMENT OF THE ECONOMY.

BUT THERE IS MORE. THE WASHINGTON AREA DOES NOT STAND ISOLATED. IT IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE FANTASTIC NORTHEAST CORRIDOR THAT PRESIDENT JOHNSON MENTIONED IN HIS RECENT MESSAGE ON HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS. HERE IN THIS CORRIDOR -- WHICH MAKES UP ONLY 1.8% OF THE NATION'S LAND AREA --

LIVE 21% OF THE TOTAL POPULATION. AND THIS CORRIDOR AREA IS ALSO BUSY, PROSPEROUS AND GROWING. NOR DO OUR PLANNERS SEE ANY DIMINUTION OF THESE TRENDS IN THE NEXT TWENTY YEARS. I WAS, IN FACT, STUDYING YESTERDAY SOME RECENT PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES OF THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT ON TRANSPORTATION IN THIS AREA DURING THE TWENTY YEAR PERIOD 1960-1980.

THIS REPORT USES AS A MEASURING STICK PASSENGER TRIPS BETWEEN THE CITIES OF THE CORRIDOR BY THE VARIOUS MEANS OF TRAVEL. IT ESTIMATES, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT IN THE TWENTY-YEAR PERIOD PASSENGER RAIL TRIPS BETWEEN CITIES IN THE CORRIDOR WILL SHOW A 123% INCREASE; AUTO TRIPS WILL GO UP 199%; BUS TRIPS 235% AND TRIPS BY AIR WILL BE INCREASING A SPECTACULAR 291%. IT IS AGAINST THE BACKGROUND

OF A NEARLY 300% INCREASE IN INTERCITY AIR TRAVEL THAT I WANT TO DISCUSS THE FUTURE OF AVIATION IN WASHINGTON.

BECAUSE OF STATISTICS SUCH AS THESE -- AND BECAUSE IT IS TIME FOR A RE-EXAMINATION -- THE FAA IS LOOKING INTO THE FUTURE OF WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT. THIS AIRPORT -- THE FOURTH BUSIEST IN THE NATION -- IS UNIQUE AMONG MAJOR AMERICAN AIR TERMINALS. WE DO NOT ALLOW JET AIR-LINERS TO OPERATE THERE. THE FACT IS, HOWEVER, THAT WITHIN A FEW YEARS, MOST OF AMERICA'S AIRLINES WILL HAVE CONVERTED ALMOST ENTIRELY TO JETS. THERE-IN, LIES THE PROBLEM.

OUR REASON FOR NOT PERMITTING JETS TO OPERATE FROM WASHINGTON NATIONAL AT PRESENT IS A SIMPLE ONE.

THE FIELD IS NOT EQUIPPED TO HANDLE THEM. WE COULD NOT HANDLE THE TRAFFIC -- THE PASSENGER TRAFFIC IN THE TERMINAL -- THE AIRCRAFT TRAFFIC AT THE RAMPS -- AND TO SOME EXTENT -- THE AIR TRAFFIC OVERHEAD.

SOME OF THE IMPROVEMENTS WE LOOK TO INCLUDE HAVING THE NEW TRANSIT SYSTEM ENTER AND LEAVE DIRECTLY TO AND FROM A NEW WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT TERMINAL. WE ALSO WANT A COMPREHENSIVE MOBILE LOUNGE SERVICE THAT WILL PICK YOU UP IN FRONT OF YOUR HOTEL, TAKE YOU OVER HIGH SPEED ROADS TO THE AIRPORT, DRIVE RIGHT UP TO THE WAITING AIRPLANE AND DEPOSIT YOU PRACTICALLY INTO YOUR SEAT ON THE AIRPLANE.

WE ARE CONSEQUENTLY, EXAMINING THE WHOLE PROBLEM. AND OUR FIRST STEP IS A FEASIBILITY STUDY.

WE WANT TO KNOW WHAT EFFECTS INTRODUCING JET AIRCRAFT WOULD HAVE. FIRST, THE ECONOMIC EFFECT. WE WANT TO KNOW THE TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACT ON WNA ITSELF, ON DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, ON THE AIRLINES, THE PASSENGERS AND ON THE WHOLE WASHINGTON AREA. THE FACT IS THAT IMPROVING AND MODERNIZING WASHINGTON NATIONAL WOULD INVOLVE A SUBSTANTIAL

CAPITAL INVESTMENT. WE WANT TO KNOW IF ITS JUSTIFIED.

OUR STUDY WILL PURSUE THE ECONOMIC IMPACT FOR EACH YEAR THROUGH 1970 AND FOR 1975 AND 1980. WE SHALL SEE WHAT HAPPENS UNDER A VARIETY OF ALTERNATIVES -- EXCLUDING ALL AIR CARRIER JET OPERATIONS -- ALLOWING ONLY TWO TO THREE ENGINE, SHORT AND MEDIUM RANGE JETS; OR ALLOWING ALL JETS INCLUDING FOUR ENGINE LONG RANGE JETS.

WE SHALL ALSO EXAMINE ANY POSSIBLE NOISE DIFFICULTIES.

THIS STUDY, TO BE DONE BY A PRIVATE CONTRACTOR, WILL TAKE ABOUT FOUR MONTHS. AND IT WILL BE ON THESE FINDINGS THAT WE SHALL MAKE OUR DETERMINATIONS ON THE FUTURE OF WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT.

I WANT TO EMPHASIZE TWO THINGS ABOUT THIS STUDY. THOUGH IT IS CONCERNED WITH THE ADVISABILITY OF LETTING OR NOT LETTING AIR CARRIER JETS OPERATE AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL, IT DOES NOT EXCLUDE EXISTING TRAFFIC. THE RESEARCH WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE NATURE OF EXISTING TRAFFIC AND WILL ANTICIPATE THE PROBABLE GROWTH OF THIS TRAFFIC -- BOTH PISTON POWERED CARRIERS AND VARIOUS TYPES OF GENERAL AVIATION AIRCRAFT.

I ALSO WANT TO NOTE THAT THE STUDY MAKES NO PROVISION FOR THE USE OF THE OLD BOLLING FIELD FOR ANY TYPE OF CIVIL AVIATION..... SEVERAL YEARS AGO THE MILITARY WAS PERSUADED TO RELINQUISH THESE FIELDS BECAUSE OF THE CONGESTION THEY INTRODUCED INTO LOCAL AIR TRAFFIC. SINCE THEN THERE HAS BEEN NO LESSENING

OF FLIGHT OPERATIONS IN THIS AREA. THE FACT IS THERE ARE MANY MORE. IF IT MADE SENSE TO CLOSE THEM ORIGINALLY -- AND I BELIEVE IT DID -- IT MAKES NO SENSE TO THINK ABOUT OPENING THEM NOW.

THERE HAS BEEN, CONTINUOUSLY, MUCH INTEREST IN BUILDING A DOWNTOWN WASHINGTON HELIPORT. YOU MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, DISTRICT GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND WE OURSELVES IN FAA HAVE BEEN CHAMPIONING THE CAUSE. BUT THE PROBLEM -- LIKE ALL PROJECTS INVOLVING THE SEAT OF THE NATION'S GOVERNMENT -- IS NOT SIMPLE. IN ORDINARY CIR-CUMSTANCES, A LOCAL GOVERNMENT WOULD MAKE THE

DETERMINATION THAT A HELIPORT WAS NEEDED, SET UP SOME AUTHORITY TO MANAGE IT, AND BEGIN RAISING FUNDS. WE IN FAA WOULD BE CALLED IN TO APPROVE THE SITE AND ASSIST FINANCIALLY. BUT HERE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, IT BECOMES A GAME OF MIRRORS. THE DISTRICT OFFICIALS, THEMSELVES, ARE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES; THE LAND IS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY ANOTHER FEDERAL AGENCY; AND WE, IN FAA WHO WOULD NORMALLY BE SORT OF AN INTERESTED THIRD PARTY, ARE OURSELVES AN ARM OF THE GOVERNMENT. BUT THE PROBLEM IN THE DISTRICT DOESN'T END THERE. THE FINE ARTS COMMISSION GETS INVOLVED -- SO DOES THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD -- AND THERE ARE SEVERAL MORE. MOST IMPORTANT OF ALL, A GOING HELIPORT NEEDS A HELICOPTER SERVICE TO

OPERATE FROM ITS FACILITIES. AND FOR VARIOUS REASONS, WE DON'T HAVE THAT. I FEEL FAIRLY CERTAIN, HOWEVER, THAT THERE WILL BE IN THE FUTURE ENOUGH JUSTIFICATION AND ENOUGH PRESSURE -- THE DRIVE WILL WORK UP A REAL HEAD OF STEAM -- SO THAT WE SHALL HAVE A HELIPORT. AS YOU ARE AWARE, HOWEVER, PRESIDENT JOHNSON IS PROPOSING -- AND I HAVE TESTIFIED IN SUPPORT OF HIS PROPOSAL -- THAT HELICOPTER SUBSIDIES BE DISCONTINUED AT THE END OF THIS YEAR. I THINK, THEREFORE, THAT BEFORE WE CAN HAVE ANY REASONABLE, MEANINGFUL DISCUSSION OF A HELIPORT, THE AVIATION INDUSTRY NEEDS TO LOOK INTO HOW IT CAN PROMOTE HELICOPTER OPERATIONS WITHOUT RECOURSE TO GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES.

I'D LIKE TO SEE MORE PEOPLE PAYING MORE ATTENTION TO THE HELICOPTER. IT HAS A DEFINITE SERVICE TO RENDER. AT THE MOMENT, IT PROVIDES THE FASTEST DOOR TO DOOR TIME FOR SHORT AND MEDIUM RANGE TRAVEL THAT WE HAVE. IF YOU WANT TO GET THERE FAST, GO BY HELICOPTER. I THINK THE CARRIERS OUGHT TO LOOK INTO THIS. THEY CAN BE THE EVENTUAL WINNERS IN ANY EFFICIENT, ECONOMICAL HELICOPTER OPERATION. THIS STOOP TO STOOP SPEED MUST BE DRAMATIZED..... JUST THINKING ALOUD, WHY NOT SOME KIND OF A RACE? A WASHINGTON TO NEW YORK DERBY INVOLVING THE VARIOUS KINDS OF TRANSPORT?..... ONE PASSENGER TO TRAVEL BY BUS -- ANOTHER BY TRAIN -- ONE BY PRIVATE AUTO -- A FOURTH BY AIRPLANE AND THE FIFTH BY HELICOPTER, HANDICAP THEM SO THAT THEY

START AT DIFFERENT TIMES AND SEE WHICH PASSENGER REACHES DOWNTOWN NEW YORK FIRST... PERHAPS TIE IT IN WITH THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW PAN AM HELIPORT IN NEW YORK LATER THIS SPRING... I CAN SEE IT NOW. FIVE PRETTY AIRLINE STEWARDESSES RUSHING TO ARRIVE FIRST AT A LUNCHEON IN NEW YORK..... AND POINTS COULD BE GIVEN FOR THE ONE THAT ARRIVES THE FRESHEST AND FOR THE ONE THAT IS IN THE BEST TEMPER.... THE MORE I THINK ABOUT IT THE MORE FUN IT SOUNDS.

WASHINGTON WILL GET A GLANCE AT THE FUTURE OF AVIATION SOMETIME WITHIN THE NEXT FEW WEEKS WHEN THE MCDONALD COMPANY DEMONSTRATES ITS NEW STOL AIRCRAFT. STOL IS THE TRADE EXPRESSION FOR STEEP TAKE OFF FROM A SHORT RUNWAY LIFT QUICKLY AND THEN CRUISE LIKE A NORMAL PLANE. AND AT THE END OF

FLIGHT IT WILL MAKE A STEEP APPROACH AND FINISH OFF WITH A SHORT ROLL OUT. I THINK THEPPROPOSED LOCATION OF THIS DEMONSTRATION WILL GIVE YOU THE BEST IDEA OF ITS CAPABILITIES. THE PLAN IS TO LAND THIS FOUR ENGINE AIRPLANE ON SOME OPEN SPACE CLOSE TO THE CENTER OF THE CITY.

NOW I THINK OUR CITY PLANNERS MUST PREPARE FOR VEHICLES LIKE THESE. THEY OFFER SOLUTIONS TO MANY OF OUR CURRENT TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS. THESE STOL VEHICLES CAN OPERATE IN CROWDED AREAS. THEY COULD, FOR EXAMPLE, OPERATE FROM THE ROOF OF THE NEW PARKING, EXHIBITION AND TOURIST CENTER BUILDING THAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED FOR UNION STATION. BY STRENGTHENING SOME OF THE SUPPORTS AND EXTENDING THE ROOF FURTHER OUT OVER THE TRACKS, THE NATION'S

CAPITAL COULD HAVE A DOWNTOWN STOL PORT. THESE VEHICLES ARE NOW TECHNOLOGICALLY FEASIBLE. AND THEY ARE CAPABLE OF ALL WEATHER OPERATIONS. FOR MINIMUM OPERATIONS, THEY WOULD NEED ONLY A STRIP 250 FEET WIDE AND 1000 FEET LONG. OPERATIONS -- WITH SIMULTANEOUS LANDINGS AND TAKEOFFS -- WOULD REQUIRE AN AREA ONLY 500 FEET WIDE AND 1500 FEET LONG. THIS REQUIREMENT COULD BE MET AT UNION STATION WITH A REASONABLE AND JUSTIFIABLE AMOUNT OF EXTRA EXPENSE. THE UNION STATION LOCATION A WOULD PERMIT AIRCRAFT TO OPERATE OVER THE TRACK AREAS. IT WOULD FIT IN WITH THE CURRENT PHILOSOPHY OF USING EXISTING RIGHTS OF WAY. OR THESE STOL PORTS MIGHT BE PLACED OVER HIGHWAY INTERCHANGES. WE MUST BE CONCERNED WITH THIS ONRUSHING ADVANCE

OF TECHNOLOGY. OUR PURPOSE MUST BE TO PROTECT THE FUTURE -- NOT NEGLECT IT.

PERHAPS THE NEAREST NEW EVENT IN WASHINGTON AVIATION -- AND THE ONE THAT WOULD MOST DELIGHT THE HEARTS OF ANY BOARD OF TRADE -- IS OUR PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL AEROSPACE AND SCIENCE EXPOSITION AT DULLES INTERNATIONAL. WE ARE NOW AWAITING A FINAL GO-NO GO DECISION. OUR PLAN IS TO SET ASIDE TWO

MILLION SQUARE FEET AT DULLES AND SET UP A TEMPORARY AEROSPACE TRADE FAIR. OUR PRIMARY PURPOSE WILL BE TO DISPLAY TO FOREIGN CUSTOMERS THE LATEST AIRCRAFT AND AERONAUTIC EQUIPMENT; THE LATEST SPACE TECHNOLOGY AND GENERAL AEROSPACE EQUIPMENT. OUR PROGRAM CALLS FOR THE EXPOSITION TO OPEN IN MID 1966 AND RUN FOR TWO WEEKS. IT WILL BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC ON WEEKENDS AND IN THE AFTERNOONS BUT THE MORNING SESSIONS WILL BE RESTRICTED ONLY TO BUYERS. WE WANT TO SELL AMERICAN MADE PRODUCTS AND WE WANT A SALES INDUCING ATMOSPHERE. WE INTEND TO TAKE ORDERS.

THE EXPOSITION WILL ALSO FEATURE CIVIL AND MILITARY FLYING DEMONSTRATIONS BY FOREIGN AS WELL AS U. S. AIRCRAFT.

WE ANTICIPATE THAT THIS WILL BE ONE OF THE WORLD'S LARGEST AIRSHOWS AND WE EXPECT THAT IT WILL LURE --- AND THIS SHOULD BE MUSIC YOU MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRADE --- A TREMENDOUS NUMBER OF FOREIGN BUYERS. FOR TWO WEEKS, OUR CITY WILL BE THE AEROSPACE CAPITAL OF THE WORLD.

WE HOPE, TOO, THE EXPOSITION, MIGHT ATTRACT A FEW NEW CUSTOMERS TO DULLES. WE ARE NOT DISSATISFIED WITH THE DULLES GROWTH RATE BUT WE ARE IMPATIENT. PASSENGER VOLUME HAS SHOWN AN INCREASE FOR EACH YEAR THAT WE HAVE BEEN OPENED. OUR PASSENGER TOTAL OUT THERE LAST YEAR RAN ABOUT 775,000. WE EXPECT IT WILL APPROACH A MILLION THIS YEAR.

WE'VE HAD SOME PLEASANT SURPRISES WITH DULLES. ONE IS WHAT I MIGHT CALL ITS WEATHERABILITY. IT SEEMS DULLES CAN STAY OPEN WHEN OTHER EAST COAST AIRPORTS ARE CLOSED DOWN. CHRISTMAS EVE SAW 55 AIRLINERS FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD PARKED OUT AT DULLES. AT THIS BUSIEST PEAK OF A BUSY TRAVEL SEASON, MOST OF THE OTHER EAST COAST FIELDS WERE FOGGED IN. THIS DULLES WEATHERABILITY IS QUITE AN ADVANTAGE.

I THINK, TOO, THE PROMOTION EFFORTS OF SUCH GROUPS AS YOUR'S HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE. WE APPRECIATE THIS COOPERATION. VIRGINIA STATE AUTHORITIES AND LOCAL COUNTY OFFICIALS OUT THERE, HAVE, FOR EXAMPLE, PUT UP FUNDS TO FURNISH COUNSEL IN OUR EFFORTS TO BE DESIGNATED AS THE PORT FOR THE CARIBBEAN TRADE.

THIS IS OF TREMENDOUS ADVANTAGE AND VERY NECESSARY.

NOW I THINK THAT PRETTY MUCH EMPTIES THE CRYSTAL BALL. IF, HOWEVER, THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS, I'LL BE HAPPY TO TRY AND ANSWER THEM.

# # #

FAA INFORMATION

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

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 18, 1965

REMARKS BY N. E. HALABY, ADMINISTRATOR
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY
ON RECEIVING THE MONSANTO SAFETY AWARD
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
MAY 18, 1965

THE SEARCH FOR SAFETY
* * * TO OVERCOME DEATH, DELAY AND DISTURBANCE WITHIN OUR MEANS * * *

The business of learning to be a pilot is, at first, an early flush of excitement -- the sheer thrill of flying. But this does not survive. It is instead, joined by a care for competence -- by a measured respect for the vagaries of the airplane and the air in which it flies. With each hour logged at the controls, there develops -- increasingly -- the instinct for air safety. That instinct and effort for safety -- whether at the controls of a plane or at a desk in Washington -- becomes inherent within one.

There comes also with experience in flying a gradually developing sense of professional pride. Piloting an airplane does, after all, require an element of skill and judgment. And with time, the airman will find fulfillment when he succeeds in demonstrating this skill and judgment. His reaction to the alternatives of skill and judgment -- ineptness and error -- whether he finds it in himself or others -- is outrage -- the outrage of one

who knows the potential consequences of miscalculations in the air.

The career of the airman involves again the accumulation of experience and technical knowledge. No one takeoff, as you, here, realize, is exactly like any other takeoff. Each landing has an element all its own. The weather differs, airports vary, and each type aircraft has its own demands. The pilot anticipates. The controller plans ahead. The career airman becomes, with time, a professional.

What I am describing here is the approach and attitude of the average aviation safety officer, whether in government, management or labor. And this instinct for safety and judgment of danger is intensified many times, for the safety officer's responsibility covers not one airplane or one flight. His concern is for many planes and many flights and many airways over many nations. It is to the searchers and sentinels of safety that we award today -- our respect, our thanks and our pride.

Only through our FAA people over drawing boards and desks, stationed at airports, in the traffic towers, and at the en route centers is an Administrator able to do anything.

Their network of safety is responsive to any unsafe condition--to any hazardous procedure--to any their response is to correct immediately and alert. It is this response of their that make up the pages of the hundreds of notices to airmen, the volumes of airworthiness directives, and the always available weather advisories. This response of safety is present again in the direction being given at any moment of the day -- in all areas of the country -- By our air traffic controllers. It is evident again in the millions of flight hours our FAA aircraft log in safety checking the navigation aids. This concern for safety is evident in the original installation and maintenance of these same navigation aids --these electronic miracles on which rest the safety in flight.

But our FAA people and their partners in industry are not content to maintain safety. There is never safety enough. Our people are equally active in adding safety to the system. Let me list for you some of the endeavors made by our FAA safety officials in just the few years of my own term of office. In numbers and variety, these new safety departures are astonishing. They vary in size from our joint civil-military program which doubled our radar coverage for en route traffic control down to hundreds of minor improvements in all phases of operations.

We've been upgrading the proficiency of our flight instructors; we've been introducing new tools to help our air traffic controllers identify aircraft and report their altitude; we've been advising aerial applicators on the hazards of continued exposure to some of their chemicals; we've been hacking away at the problem of air-to-ground communications and gradually improving these

communications; we've set up a system of self inspection for airport operators; we've eliminated undesirables from aviation by clamping down on the falsification of records; we've joined with the CAB to set up a new accident investigation school; we've been evaluating parallel ILS approaches; we've required better performance in emergency evacuations; we've set up operating rules governing rotorcraft carrying external loads; we've taken action to protect the pilot from demented passengers; we've stepped up our medical investigations of fatal general aviation accidents; we've enlarged the area of positive control to cover virtually the entire country; we moved into the turbulence problem and I think we have an answer; we've developed better approach and runway lighting equipment -- demanded better pilot proficiency -- increased our VOR coverage 17% and added 58 ILSs, and on and on through some 17 pages of new developments.

These FAA requirements for more safety are not abstract programs. They are directly tied to the safety of the air passenger. The plane that brought you to Albuquerque had on its cabin wall and airworthiness certificate as evidence that the original type had been manufactured according to FAA standards of safety. The stewardess' little speech at the beginning of flight was made according to an FAA regulation. And the "no smoking" sign was also FAA required. The pilot who flew may have been checked by an FAA inspector. Your permission to taxi and your permission to take off was given by an FAA controller. The runway from which you lifted off was probably partly engineered by an FAA airport engineer. And some of the funds that helped build it were FAA administered. The airway over which you flew was set up by the FAA, and FAA controllers, of course, directed you in flight. I could go on but most of you here today are familiar with the techniques of our system. The important fact, however, is the result -- the effect of this effort.

One effect is that American air carriers have the best safety record in the world. And it is constantly improving. Now, no one element of the aviation community -- be it the airlines, the pilots, the manufacturers, the airport operators, nor the FAA -- can claim any disproportionate share of the credit of this achievement. But all have contributed to it. In fact, it could not be maintained without the successful cooperation of all parties.

The particular fact of this safety record, however, is that it was achieved under conditions that can only be described as abnormal. Aviation scored this fine safety record while it was, in fact, establishing itself! Consider, gentlemen, that the first air transport was built only thirty years ago...that mass air transportation is, in reality, a post World War II creation...that at the end of this war -- just twenty years ago -- civil aviation had no precision approach radars -- no airport surveillance radar -- and a grand total of nine ILSs. We had, in fact, not one single adequate airport. Consider, too, that the modern air route system -- jet transports -- weather radar -- the FAA itself -- all these, for example, are less than ten years old.

This tremendous change was important. But more important, perhaps, was the surging violent expansion that accompanied it. In these nineteen post war years, our air transports increased their revenue passenger miles 1,000%! Can any other industry boast of a beginning and an expansion period as successful as this! The expectation would have been that in the face of such tremendous strain and speed, the safety record would have deteriorated. But the contrary is true. The improvement in the safety ratio gained at the same rate as the increase in passenger miles.

(He who seeks to criticize in public should first examine his facts.)

But statistics and rates and charts -- while comforting-- are dull dry things. Of far more value, are the hundreds and hundreds of thanks and expressions of gratitude from the flying public that have been tendered our people. The pilots who have been talked down through bad weather to safe landings -- the fliers whose instruments failed ... the pilots who could not cope with poor visibility ... the pilots who were simply lost -- all these saves are the things that make our job worthwhile.

We are also proud of the good feeling that prevails in our relationship with the Department of Defense whose aircraft we guide in flight. This has been a good working partnership -- and there is mutual respect on both sides.

But neither aviation nor its quest for safety stand still. There are awaiting on the horizon new challenges, new problems. And they must be resolved. There is, first of all, the overriding necessity to utilize the new technology coming from our laboratories, our universities, our manufacturers, and our Government -- to utilize this technology in the pursuit of aviation safety. The spin-off that can befall aviation safety from the current technological revolution will not come automatically. We shall need a major research and development program powered by sufficient funds. Only such a top priority endeavor will enable us to adopt these inventions to the special needs of aviation safety. And I point out that there is the very demanding element of time here. Our air transport industry is growing tremendously -- not year by year, but month by month. The importance of time is also underscored by the complexities of our new technology. The research projects that begins today -- May 18, 1965 -- will become a practical operating model only in May 1970. Ponder on that for a while....

We should seek to develop this new technology in three general areas in which we are already deeply involved. In weather -- in improved forecasting -- in locating weather areas -- avoidance -- and in the distribution of weather information. The second area is air traffic control -- in installing the semi-automatic capability and identification and altitude reporting features of NAS stage a throughout the whole system. And finally we need a pretty thorough examination of the pilot and his environment -- the pilot not as a medical

nor as a psychological curiosity or phenomenon but as a complete human -- the operating unit of a highly complex machine.

There are other problems that will require prompt solutions -- problems that have arisen only recently -- arisen from the increasing complexity and growth of aviation. The industry, for example, is now making available to the general aviation pilot, complex, high-powered, turbine aircraft. We must insure that these hot ships are piloted by carefully trained, highly competent professional airmen. We shall have to take a long look at mechanics schools to assist them in raising the skill and knowledge of their students; we must continue our lightning studies. Nor can we stop examining turbulence. Communications also must be listed as a constant object of safety scrutiny. We are far from perfection here.

Saturation at certain airports and insuring the safety of holding pattern airspace are two additional areas that will demand constant attention. We must also prepare new suitable procedures and criteria for the supersonic aircraft.

In general aviation again, our major emphasis must be on upgrading flight instructors and improving their professional status and competence. We must push as hard as possible toward all-weather instrument landing systems. The arrival of the new V/STOL aircraft combined with the growing strangulation of ground transport will require us to turn more and more attention to the problems of operating over congested areas. The growing complexities of air traffic control may require us to "system rate" pilots planning to use these congested areas. We may, again, be forced to look more critically at landing areas and come up with something approaching certification of these fields.

I think I have described enough of our forthcoming problems to show that while we can eventually triumph, the demands of aviation safety will grow more rigorous. There is nothing about aviation that is either simple or easy. Indeed, it grows more difficult and more complex every day. And so it is with air safety. We can anticipate, then, that the pursuit of safety, will in the future, require even more energy, more time, more funds, more imagination, more skill, and more determination than ever.

And it promises no conclusion. Those who pursue air safety know that there is no stopping off place, no plateau, no ending of the effort. The eternal struggle will continue as long as men fly. But we also know we now possess the skills, the experience and the technology that will enable us -- when we combine them with fierce purpose -- to keep ahead.

This, then, is the story of air safety -- past, present and future. We have tried hard...I have tried hard. I began my task four years ago with the determination, and knowledge, that the safety of those that fly and those countless others who require protection on the ground should be the primary purpose of

the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. I have given the best I had to this job. I cannot say what I tried to do was always understood -- either by the knowledgeables inside the industry or by the uninitiated outside. But I have been always encouraged by the loyal support of those who worked with me -- and by an occasional tribute from the outside. Such a tribute is this award you have given me this morning. I am especially proud that it comes from you aviation/space writers who so well know aviation. I do not think any man -- winding up one career as I am now -- could ask for a better recognition. To be cited for contributing to the safety of flying....to me, this is the final and the enduring comment. Yes, the best, last word in the dialogue has been said by my friends.

Thank you very much.

# # # #

FAA INFORMATION

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

INFORMATION COPY

STATEMENT MADE BY N. E. HALABY, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY, DURING NATIONAL AIRCRAFT NOISE SYMPOSIUM ON JUNE 9, 1965, AT JOHN F. KENNEDY INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, NEW YORK

This may be the last time I visit New York to discuss aircraft noise problems as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. I remember the last time I participated in a meeting of this sort here -- I flew one of the Agency's jet transport aircraft to evaluate certain flight procedures designed to minimize noise exposure in communities adjacent to this airport. We have continued to try to come to grips with the vexing problems of noise since that time.

I have been accompanied here today be several of my associates who are prepared to discuss in more detail the Agency's efforts in this area. In leading off the discussion, I would like to emphasize that the FAA has continued to follow the policy that public safety is our prime responsibility. We recognize, however, that the public must also be protected from disturbance as well as danger and that aircraft noise must be minimized if aviation is to serve the public effectively. Many allegations have been made in the past and are being made now that government aeronautical agencies and the aviation industry turn deaf ears to the segment of the public that is demanding less noise in the vicinity of our Nation's airports. I would like to go on record now in stating that these allegations are not true. Much has been done in an effort to alleviate aircraft noise. Annual expenditures have risen from $100,000 in 1961 to $1.3 million to be spent by FAA alone in 1965. On the other hand, I am among the first to say much remains to be done.

14920

My purpose today is to stimulate your thinking about possible avenues of approach to the noise problem. I didn't bring any firm solutions. I am hopeful that the industry representatives here can also offer some possible new approaches to the problem. Agencies of the Federal Government along with engine and aircraft manufacturers are supporting research programs in an attempt to find ways to reduce engine noise at its source. From a realistic viewpoint, we feel that regardless of the success of these research programs, there is always the residual noise with which we must cope at a local level.

During the time that I served as Administrator, I have seen continuing urban development in the vicinity of our Nation's airports. We have traditionally built and developed airports in fairly remote areas. For example, when the John F. Kennedy International Airport opened, there were relatively few close neighbors who welcomed the prosperity and prestiege of an international airport and its payroll. During the ensuing years, we have seen this airport grow to the point where more than 14 million passengers are passing through it thereby contributing to the employment of more than 31,000 employees and an annual payroll in excess of $260 million.

The urban development, particularly in the areas of flight paths used by aircraft approaching and departing our airports, has resulted in people that live in these areas becoming extremely annoyed by the noise generated at the airport. Thus, we see the beginning of a vicious cycle wherein we expend large sums of money developing an aviation facility to serve the needs of a community; this facility attracting people to live as neighbors; and the neighbors that

were attracted begin to clamor to close the airport or move it. Unless we are able to somehow change the traditional urban development pattern, this cycle will probably continue.

Ideally, the solution to the aircraft noise problem would be the development of a silent engine. On the other hand, I frankly do not believe that research programs designed to reduce noise at its source will be successful to the extent that we will be able to "tip toe" out of an airport with a 350,000 pound aircraft. I do not mean to infer that the problem is hopeless; in all fairness, I think that we must all appreciate that the very physical laws involved mitigate against a high degree of success. In this connection, we will probably see an increase in jet operations in our major urban areas due to increased requirements for air commerce. We will also experience the introduction of jet service at more airports across the country. This increase in total noise units may well offset any significant gains we may be able to make in reducing noise at its source.

We in the FAA have given considerable thought to the possibility that noise criteria should be used as a requirement for aircraft certification. The main stumbling block to this approach is the lack of technically defensible methods available for use in establishing meaningful criteria that can be used for certification purposes. In this connection, we are pleased with the work being done by the Society of Automotive Engineers, Subcommittee A-21, in devising methods of data reduction and measurement of aircraft noise. Further, we should always bear in mind that noises generated by aircraft are tied directly to the manner in which the aircraft are operated. If we pursue the

policy of using noise as a part of the aircraft certification program, we must carefully evaluate procedures that may be evolved in meeting the criteria. We are hopeful that we can come up with standardized flight procedures that would be used for all operations.

The concept of using noise criteria as a requirement for aircraft certification raises certain pertinent policy questions. For example, what liability does the Federal Government assume vis-a-vis the airport operator? Is it shared -- is there no change in today's legal philosophy? Do we assume enforcement responsibility to insure that certain noise levels are not exceeded at airports? I do not have the answers to these questions but they are bound to arise.

Considerable thought has been given to devise means to encourage aircraft operators to undertake retrofit or modification programs designed for reduction of noise that is generated by current aircraft. For example, it may prove feasible for the Federal Government to adopt a new tax philosophy wherein aircraft operators could be given a tax credit for any expense involved in modifying aircraft for noise reduction purposes. It could be argued that this is a direct subsidy by the taxpayers for the benefit of aircraft operators. On the other hand, it could be argued that this would provide stimulus to the aerospace industry, create jobs, and, by virtue of increasing employment, tax revenues would not suffer. Another approach would be to treat the costs incurred by retrofit and modification programs as allowable and deductible expenses. The FAA has no firm recommendation as to the most advantageous

approach; we bring it up at this time as a possible avenue that could well be explored by appropriate elements of the Federal Government and the industry.

There are other aspects of the aircraft noise problem that are becoming increasingly important to us in aviation. In many instances, the areas under flight paths where high thrust and high noise levels are required are not controlled by the aviation industry from the standpoint of noise. Compatible land use in the vicinity of airports is one solution. We recognize, however, that there are many airports that are encroached upon by high density residential development. These areas would require major land use changes in order to achieve land use compatibility. Recognizing the difficulty of achieving major land use changes, it might be appropriate to consider ways to obtain the right to make noise in these areas. We have seen increasing litigation wherein residential neighbors of airports are seeking relief from the courts, various legislatures, and the Congress. These problems are fraught with legal implications and constitutional questions involving the relationship of the Federal Government with local authorities. What part should the Federal Government play in obtaining easements for the right to make noise in residential areas? What should be its role in the overall problem of land acquisition, zoning, and land use compatibility? We have encountered much opposition whenever we talk about land use in the vicinity of airports even though the vast majority of our citizens have accepted the necessity of land acquisition through condemnation for purposes other than aviation.

The basic point is that the beneficiaries of air transportation - the travellers, shippers, airline and airport operators et al - should share

equitably the costs of achieving these benefits with those who suffer real detriment of loss of enjoyment of their property rights.

We did not hesitate to evolve a policy relating to airport design that incorporated the concept of clear zones at the ends of runways for obstruction purposes. Perhaps it is time that we consider the possibility of including noise as part of the criteria for the establishment of clear zones. This policy could well result in additional land acquisition programs. Fear has been expressed that this type of program would be so costly that it would be a crippling blow to the industry; however, little has been done, from a national viewpoint, in looking at the overall economics of the problem. Who is to say that the displacement of residents from noise sensitive areas coupled with major land use compatible with airport operations would not result in a stimulant to our overall economy by virtue of making the property more valuable for uses other than residential? The fact remains that we have displaced thousands of homes in the name of progress in other fields. While we are talking about land acquisition, we believe that officials in the public road, highway, and freeway programs could help our airports. We have seen many instances where routes in the vicinity of our airports could be planned to coincide with flight paths and still meet the requirements for local surface transportation. The Federal Government has not backed away from financial aid in connection with the land acquisition program required to support our national surface transportation system. I feel it is incumbent on all of us to discourage ill-planned land uses in the vicinity of airports that tend to create pressures to restrict, close or move the airports.

Our expanding economy, the continuous and massive moving from rural to urban areas, our increasing requirement for air commerce, and the maintenance of our free world leadership dictate a requirement for a healthy and vigorous air transportation capability. Mix in the social and political pressures to achieve a significant reduction in aircraft noise and you have factors that are incompatible. If we are unsuccessful in balancing the equities between all concerned, we may well see pressures develop that work in the direction of limiting the usefulness of aviation facilities to our national growth and economy. If we fail to make progress in reducing noise, these pressures may perhaps ultimately exclude the availability of aviation facilities to our centers of trade and commerce. I feel that it is essential that we all recognize the price that we may be forced to pay for a tolerable environment next door to our airports.

In closing, I would like to emphasize that the role of the Federal Government in the noise problem is not all encompassing. Responsibility for achieving solutions is shared by all aviation interests and local authorities. A positive approach must be maintained if progress is to be made. We should consider that the noise problem is another challenge that must be met if aviation is to continue its healthy growth. We have always responded to challenges in the past; it is my hope that we will respond to this one.

# # # #

Distr: WRNC-2; FAE-1; FIA-0