

FAA News

Washington, D.C.



September 8, 1994

Contact: Sandra Allen
Tel. (202) 267-3883

STATEMENT BY THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) wishes to make clear that under no circumstances will the FAA condone any sort of training program involving physical harassment of any employee, man or woman. Nor will the FAA permit programs that involve patently offensive behavior like that which has been alleged in this case regarding a June 1992 training course.

Because allegations regarding sexual harassment in training courses conducted by the FAA or FAA contractors are the subject of civil litigation, which is yet to be served on the agency, the agency is limited in its response to the particular details of this case.

Today, FAA Administrator David R. Hinson directed the FAA's Human Resources office to ensure no such training is in fact occurring in any of its facilities.

"The FAA is strongly committed to diversity in the workplace and to appropriate training to achieve that important goal. If events like those recently reported took place, they are clearly not in accordance with the spirit or the intent of the agency's goals, nor are they consistent with the Clinton Administration's commitment to diversity.

"Before I came to the FAA, agency management addressed concerns regarding the nature of some training programs and directed that changes be made. I intend to see that those earlier actions dealt with whatever problems were found then," Hinson said.

In the late 1980s, the FAA began conducting diversity training to address and correct inappropriate workplace behaviors. In early 1993, the FAA requested that the Civil Aeromedical Institute (CAMI) review the training to make sure the Agency's diversity training focused on workplace problems or issues. Based on that review, guidelines were issued for experiential diversity training in 1993.



U.S. Department of
Transportation

News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20590

September 8, 1993
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Richard Mintz
(202) 366-4570

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERICO PEÑA ON THE FAA EMPLOYEE TRAINING PROGRAM

There have been a series of allegations about the FAA Employee Training Program which predate my tenure as Transportation Secretary. When they first came to my attention, I directed the DOT Inspector General to undertake a comprehensive investigation. The investigation is looking at the the overall program including allegations from the Chicago trainings. The investigation is almost complete, and I will take appropriate action based on the Inspector General's findings.

I am deeply troubled by these allegations. If true, both FAA employees and taxpayers have a right to be outraged. The activities in question clearly have no place in any credible training program, and certainly not in one supported by the federal government.

#



US Department
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Office of the Administrator

800 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20591

September 13, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO ALL FAA EMPLOYEES

With all that has appeared in the media recently about the FAA's diversity training, it's very important that you know where I and the entire FAA management team stand on the issue of work force diversity. I am fully committed to making the FAA a workplace that welcomes everyone. I am equally committed to taking the actions necessary to identify clearly to all employees what behavior is acceptable in the workplace and to root out those systemic issues which have led in some locations to hostile work environments.

Our diversity training program is a major factor in our plan to make the FAA a more diverse and harmonious workplace. I still expect all supervisors and managers to attend diversity training and all employees to attend diversity awareness training. We will continue to work with our union partners to create courses that are mutually acceptable. To date, we have trained more than 20,000 FAA employees in various aspects of diversity, and I intend for the training to continue until we reach everyone in the FAA.

We do not condone the types of harassing behaviors which are alleged and will take measures to assure that the training we provide is both appropriate and effective.

David R. Hinson

The United States Secret Service and the Federal Aviation Administration(FAA) today released the following statement:

This week's crash of a small aircraft on the White House lawn is presently under investigation. We now are considering all aspects of the incident and the two agencies are working cooperatively to determine the sequence of events. Because the FAA's primary mission is managing the nation's airspace, we believe this information is vital to the Secret Service in its ability assess its performance and its responsibility to safeguard the security of the President.

Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen and Transportation Secretary Federico Pena met yesterday to discuss the incident and the on-going investigation. The FAA will assist the Secret Service in the conduct of a thorough review of Secret Service security procedures. Secretary Bensen has tasked Under Secretary Noble with completing this assessment. FAA and the Secret Service have heightened security procedures pending completion of this comprehensive review.

Until the joint investigation and the Treasury Department's review are completed, it is inappropriate to discuss further the relationship between the Secret Service and the FAA. To do so may compromise the facts and the Secret Service's ability to perform its essential security role. Further, it is premature to speculate on information previously released as we believe doing so may compromise security measures.

SEP 14 1994

FAA News

Washington, D.C.



September 17, 1994

Contacts: Drucella Andersen

Tel. (202) 267-3462

Don Zockert

Tel. (708) 294-7067

STATEMENT BY ADMINISTRATOR DAVID R. HINSON

"I am fully committed to making the FAA a workplace that welcomes everyone. I am equally committed to taking the actions necessary to identify clearly to all employees what behavior is acceptable in the workplace and to root out those systemic issues that have led in some locations to hostile work environments.

Our diversity training program is a major factor in our plan to make the FAA a more diverse and harmonious workplace. I still expect all supervisors and managers to attend diversity training and all employees to attend diversity awareness training. We will continue to work with our union partners to create courses that are mutually acceptable. To date, we have trained more than 20,000 FAA employees in various aspects of diversity, and I intend for the training to continue until we reach everyone in the FAA.

In addition, FAA takes its commitment to affirmative action equally seriously and has an action plan to remove the barriers that have concerned minorities and women. I hold every manager accountable for ensuring that opportunities for hiring, promotion, and training are available to everyone. Improving FAA's diversity is one of my most important goals.

I also want to emphasize that we do not condone the types of harassing behaviors that are alleged and will take measures to assure that the training we provide is both appropriate and effective."

FAA News

Washington, D.C.



September 22, 1994

Contact: Drucella Andersen
(202) 267-3462

Statement of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) on National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA) Unfair Labor Practice Complaint Settlement

The FAA and NATCA have resolved the union's allegations that the agency had not met its bargaining obligation on diversity training for air traffic controllers. This resolution means that the hearing on this matter, which was scheduled for Thursday, September 22, will not take place.

The FAA is pleased to put this dispute behind us, so that we may move forward to make the agency a diverse workplace where people of various cultural, ethnic, and religious backgrounds feel welcome and can work in harmony with one another. A major strategy for achieving that end will continue to be appropriate diversity training for all FAA employees. We look forward to working with NATCA and other employee groups representing FAA employees to achieve these goals.

FAA News



Washington, D.C.

September 28, 1994

FAA

Contact: Sandra Allen

Tel.: (202) 267-3883

FAA ADMINISTRATOR WARNS OF AIRPORT CAPACITY CRUNCH

FAA Administrator David R. Hinson today said that searching for new ways to expand airport capacity is one of the major challenges facing the aviation industry. Speaking in Toronto at a meeting of the Airports Council International-North America on September 28, Mr. Hinson said that while progress was being made in modernizing the air traffic control system, a more coordinated effort was needed to assure adequate capacity at the nation's busiest airports.

"Within the next 20 years, we will have to accommodate more than one billion passengers a year -- twice as many as today," Hinson said, citing FAA forecasts. "Providing for this surge of new travelers is a challenge we are going to be hard-pressed to meet."

Hinson expressed confidence that the new air traffic control technology the aviation agency is now putting in place will be able to safely handle all the increased air traffic predicted by even the most optimistic forecasts. "We'd like to think that airport development will keep pace with everything else that is happening in aviation," the FAA Administrator remarked. "Frankly, I worry that it will not."

Hinson announced that he had named FAA Assistant Administrator Cynthia Rich and Executive Director Monte Belger to head a high-level group to accelerate the development of capacity initiatives. "The time has come," he said, "to re-examine the entire spectrum of responsibilities involved in the management of our national airport system."

-more-

Referring to the many environmental, legal and financial issues which can stall new airport construction, Hinson observed that "airport openings will become increasingly rare events in this country -- which means that the emphasis must turn to expanding capacity at already existing high volume airports."

"Much of our innovative technology is designed to do just this," Hinson said. As one example, he mentioned a new system which allows independent, simultaneous approaches on closely-spaced runways, even in low visibility.

The FAA head urged that innovations in ATC technology should be matched by new ideas for planning and financing airport expansion. "Just building a new runway can take five years or longer," he noted, "and adding a single runway today can cost as much as we once paid to build an entire airport."

Given the urgency to reduce the deficit, Hinson doesn't expect growth in the federal share of support for airport development. "What we need are ideas about how to make the best use of what we have," he said.

Hinson told airport managers that several approaches to innovative financing are now being studied by the Department of Transportation and the FAA at the behest of Congress. These include loan guarantees, loan insurance, a revolving loan fund seeded with money from the Airport Trust Fund, and steps which would make it easier for airports to secure loans from private lenders by pledging land or the revenue from passenger facility charges. The aim, according to Hinson, is to leverage existing resources to "provide selective assistance to those airports where lack of capacity has a system-wide impact."

"Secretary Peña and I are prepared to maintain a steady federal focus on this issue," Hinson stressed. "We're prepared to keep up the pressure until a comprehensive plan of action is negotiated."



U.S. Department
of Transportation

Federal Aviation
Administration

INFORMATION

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DAVID R. HINSON
ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
AIRPORTS COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL - NORTH AMERICA
THIRD REGIONAL CONFERENCE & EXHIBITION
SEPTEMBER 28, 1994
TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA

Good afternoon.

I want to thank Lou (Louis Miller)
for that generous introduction.

And I want to thank Minister
Young and his associates at Transport
Canada for their hospitality. The FAA
has had a long and productive
relationship with Transport Canada
Aviation -- a partnership which has
allowed us to build a virtually seamless
air traffic control system all the way
from the Arctic Circle to the Rio
Grande.

It is clear that aviation is
converging toward a single set of
international standards. Every nation is
destined to become fully integrated
within the global system which is
emerging.

The United States and Canada,
working together, have been at the
forefront of this trend. We can offer
the rest of the world a model for the
successful meshing of two highly
advanced air traffic control systems.

I also want to thank George
Howard for inviting me here today. At
the risk of sounding like an evangelist
preaching to the converted -- I'd like to
talk to you about an issue I believe is
about to become one of our most
important concerns ... second only to
safety. That issue is the coming
capacity crunch at U.S. airports.

Our FAA forecasts, which have
gained great credibility over the years,
predict that -- within the decade -- air
travel in the United States will increase
60 percent. For every ten passengers
who fly today, we will have to find
space for six more.

And within the next two
decades, we predict that our U.S. air
traffic control system, our airlines, and
our airports will have to accommodate
one billion passengers a year -- twice
as many as today. Providing for this
surge of new travelers is a challenge
we are going to be hard pressed to
meet.

If we fail to respond while there is still time to act, the long-term vitality of our industry will face a double risk. The first risk is continuing economic damage from ever greater delays at clogged airports. The second threat is a distorted pattern of growth, as the industry is forced to adapt -- not just to the demands of a competitive market -- but to the physical limitations of inadequate airports.

We are already feeling the pressure at our busiest airports, and we have every reason to fear that the problem can only worsen.

Let me portray a very plausible version of the future ... if present trends are allowed to run their course.

Picture this. You're on your way to catch a flight 25 years from now.

You battle your way through local traffic and eventually reach the airport.

The terminal building -- built in the 1970's -- is much too small for the volume of passengers it handles. It gets an occasional facelift. But they gave up trying to expand it years ago. Today it's jammed with travellers. You look for your flight on the monitor and see that it has been delayed. As the morning wears on, the backlog of planes waiting to take off from the airport's two parallel runways gets longer.

You wait. Finally, the call comes to board.

Aircraft in the year 2020 will be quieter and more cost efficient, safer -- perhaps a little larger -- but about the same as those in service in 1994.

The big change is in the cockpit. There, by means of high speed data links, a steady stream of information flows between the ATC computer and flight management system.

These powerful computers assign flight routes, issue departure instructions and clearances ... and relay weather updates and safety alerts ... all in "real-time."

Once airborne, the pilot and crew use the Global Positioning System for navigation. GPS can pinpoint an aircraft's position within centimeters -- anywhere in the world.

Cockpit displays, using advanced collision avoidance technology, let the pilot participate with the controller in maintaining the safe separation of aircraft.

The advent of these new technologies has given us near-total flexibility in routing, saving both time and fuel. We may even have developed the technology to allow "free flight". But, more important, they have made it possible to further reduce the already small risk of air travel.

As your plane nears its destination, the ATC computer and the cockpit computer plot the exact point to begin descent and the exact of time of arrival.

Guided by GPS, automation aids bring the plane safely to the ground -- with virtually no intervention from either pilot or controller.

Your flight lands and is directed onto an apron. But then, you sit for 20 minutes, waiting for a gate.

Finally, the plane reaches the jetway. The doors open. You push your way through another crowded airport.

Maybe you can still make that Congressional hearing -- called to investigate the critical issue of airport capacity.

Most of you are probably thinking this scenario is too extreme. We'd like to believe that airport development will keep pace with everything else that is happening in aviation.

Frankly, I worry that it will not.

Just how much this imaginary trip accurately reflects air travel in the year 2020 is going to depend on where we focus our effort during the next twenty-five years.

We need to achieve the same clarity about what to do about our airports that we have about air traffic management.

Several of the advanced tools that I mentioned in our 2020 scenario are already in operation around the country. Others will soon be installed.

I'm confident that the new system we're putting in place will be able to handle, with greater safety, all the increased air traffic predicted by even our most optimistic forecasts.

It's taken longer and cost more than we envisioned. Complex systems usually do. But, in the final analysis, solving ATC problems only requires money, new technology and sound management. All are available.

Airports are different. Proposals which make good sense from the standpoint of economics and technology often come into sharp conflict with other priorities and values.

The controversy surrounding the new Denver airport is but the most recent example. Few elected officials are eager to take on an issue which can ultimately turn against them.

As the situation stands today, legal disputes, environmental regulations and financing problems can stall an airport project for years. Community opposition can stop airport development in its tracks.

But the threat posed by inadequate airport capacity strikes to the heart of our system.

The magnitude of the problem has been clearly understood for at least a decade. In 1990, the Transportation Research Board convened an expert committee to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the issue and to identify the most

credible strategies for expanding airport system capacity.

While the TRB study did not single out any one strategy as offering the most promise, there were two points which were emphasized throughout the report ... two points which were repeatedly underscored. Both are as valid today as they were five years ago.

One point stressed the importance of new ideas for financing the needed expansion. The second point suggested a redefinition of the federal role in national airport system planning and development.

Let's talk about money first.

As Secretary Peña told us yesterday, there is a growing gap between what we need to do and what we have the money to do. We have to find a way to span the shortfall between declining public resources and the rising costs of infrastructure.

Many of you know, first-hand, that adding a single runway today can cost as much as we once paid to build an entire airport.

The new runway at Dallas-Fort Worth cost \$415 million dollars. That's about \$35 million more than it cost to build Idlewild -- a forceful reminder of the combined impact of inflation and constantly rising costs.

Lou Miller had to spend \$120 million to build the new runway at Salt Lake City.

Philadelphia -- \$215 million.

Still, that's less than half the \$500 million it will cost for the new runway at Seattle. But then, Seattle has to first move a mountain.

Moving mountains is a familiar metaphor for performing nearly impossible tasks. And that's the true magnitude of the task we face today whenever we try to build new airports or plan a major expansion.

It takes a mountain of money. And we've just about mined out all our old federal resources.

This year, Congress appropriated the President's request of \$1.7 billion but has signalled it will appropriate somewhat less next year. We expect the new appropriation will be about \$1.5 billion.

Maybe we can avoid further shrinkage, but I don't think we should be expecting to receive more. Not if we are serious about reducing federal spending and cutting the deficit.

Throughout government, we have to learn to do more with less. We have to learn new ways to use the resources available to us.

Up till now, the Airport Improvement Program has been a plain vanilla venture, one which followed a very traditional pay-as-you-go approach to construction.

In the 1994 authorization bill, Congress mandated the Department of

Transportation to look at innovative approaches to financing airport development.

Under the leadership of Cynthia Rich, this study is now well underway.

It's clear, even at this stage, that there are several options for leveraging the funds we have to help create even greater returns.

We may be able, for example, to make it easier for airport authorities to pledge land as collateral for loans. This is not usually done now because, under current law and regulations, the recipients of federal funds are not permitted to encumber their property.

We're taking a close look at all the pros and cons of loosening this restriction, at least under certain circumstances.

There is also a strong argument for encouraging airport authorities to do landbanking -- buying up suitable property now for the eventual building of new runways and even new airports.

An airport's landbank is itself a valuable asset which can be converted into a new source of revenue. But there are impediments which have to be eased before the private sector can be confident that its investment will not be put at risk by some preemptive change in federal policy.

We've also come to realize that we're not tapping the full potential of the passenger facility charge.

While PFCs provides a steady flow of revenue, airports have been unable to obtain loans secured solely by PFCs -- principally because the financial community is aware that the FAA can terminate collection of the charges if we discover that the funds are being misused.

We're hoping to give lenders and the credit rating agencies sufficient assurance that we will order the end of PFCs only as a last resort.

Not all airport authorities find it difficult to obtain financing from private lenders. At our largest airports, most of the development -- 90 percent or more -- is now, and will continue to be, privately financed.

But for those which do encounter obstacles, should we look for ways to offer various credit enhancements -- perhaps through federal loan guarantees or the purchasing of credit insurance, if steps such as these will be a more effective way of encouraging investment?

Should we set up a revolving loan fund, seeded with money from the aviation trust fund? That's still another option we're investigating.

These are the kinds of questions that Cynthia will examine. We don't yet know which of these many possibilities will survive close scrutiny and take the form of specific recommendations to be submitted for Congressional consideration.

Let me be clear. There is no inclination to establish another broad entitlement program for airports. The aim is to provide selective assistance to those airports where lack of capacity has a system-wide impact.

It is obvious that many of the problems of airport capacity are problems associated with a mature system.

We're nearly at the end of the great airport building phase of our history. New airport openings in this country will become increasingly rare events -- which means that the emphasis must turn to expanding capacity at already existing high volume airports.

Much of our innovative technology is designed to do just this.

New approach procedures, precision runway monitors, and final monitor aids can keep a runway open under weather conditions which once might have forced its closing.

GPS, digital datalink, and advanced automation can safely speed up traffic flows on the ground and in the airspace. I recently brought in George Donohue, a top-level official from Rand Corporation, to see that these programs stay on track. We will not tolerate the kind of delays and cost over-runs that have plagued the advanced automation system.

There's no question that the FAA can still do a lot to improve the capacity of our existing airports. And our Office of System Capacity is conducting a thorough review of the possible actions we might take.

We are far from reaching such a desperate state of over-saturation that nothing remains to be done.

But none of the most promising approaches are solutions which airports, acting autonomously, can pursue effectively on their own.

We are now in an era which requires a high level of national coordination. And such extensive coordination necessarily involves the FAA and the federal government.

Our old role as more or less passive conduits between Congress and the local airports is out-dated. But our new role is yet to be defined.

This is the second point which was emphasized again and again in the TRB report: the federal government must become more active in shaping and carrying out a coherent national policy.

I believe that the time has come to re-examine the entire spectrum of responsibilities involved in the management of our national airport system.

It is time to move beyond the stage of theoretical problem analysis and take on the job of developing a politically achievable program of action.

George Howard and ACI leadership have been urging us for some time now to elevate the level at which capacity issues are handled at the Agency.

I believe you will be glad to know that I have established a high-level group to tackle the daunting array of political and policy complexities which must be resolved if a viable strategy is to emerge.

The group is headed by two of the FAA's top executives -- Cynthia Rich and Executive Director Monte Belger. They and their staffs will bring us to the point where a clear strategy can be decided upon.

I hope that many of you here today will join in this effort and work to make it a broadly collaborative consultation.

Secretary Peña and I are prepared to maintain a steady federal focus on this issue. We're prepared to keep up the pressure until a comprehensive, coherent plan of action is negotiated. But we must be able to depend on the backing of all of you in the industry.

Unless we find a way to add capacity, our airports may become the weak link in our total system ... limiting the gains we hope to achieve from advances in aircraft design and air traffic control technology.

Growth is a certainty. And unless we move quickly, an unsettling future for the entire aviation industry is just as certain. I am not being an alarmist when I say that, in this instance, time is not on our side.

Thank you.

FAA News



Washington, D.C.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Friday, September 30, 1994

Contact: Pat Cariseo

Tel.: (202) 267-8521

FAA PROPOSES AIRCRAFT NOISE REDUCTION FOR 19,000 NEW JERSEY RESIDENTS, SEEKS PUBLIC COMMENT

Keeping its promise to work more closely with citizens and elected officials, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) today said it wants to hear from the public on a new proposal to cut aircraft noise for many New Jersey residents who have been objecting to increased noise since the agency realigned east coast aircraft routes in 1987.

"After analyzing an extremely complicated issue, we believe we have come up with a proposal that would reduce noise for many of the state's residents who were affected by changes the FAA made in 1987," said Barry Valentine, FAA assistant administrator for policy, planning and international aviation.

"Before making any final decisions, we want to give the public the opportunity to review this new noise mitigation proposal. We are also releasing FAA's analysis of an over-the-ocean routing proposal submitted by a New Jersey citizens group," Valentine said.

The noise mitigation proposal, the analysis of an over-the-ocean routing proposal and specific noise levels for every New Jersey census block are all new information contained in a "supplemental" draft environmental impact statement on the Expanded East Coast Plan (EECP), which the FAA issued today.

Called the "Solberg Mitigation Proposal," it is named for the Solberg navigational aid near Readington. The proposal would make several changes to current routing procedures to reduce noise for 18,755 Union County residents -- approximately 40 percent of the 45,600 people who experienced higher noise levels when the EECP was implemented -- without a comparable increase in noise for other residents. There would be no noise effects for residents living outside of New Jersey. Continuing most of the current EECP routes and procedures would benefit 1.46 million New Jersey residents who would experience higher noise levels if the EECP were rolled back.

- more -

The EECF, implemented in 1987, was a comprehensive revision of the air route structure and air traffic procedures in 19 states and the District of Columbia to increase system efficiency and reduce aircraft delays at New York metropolitan airports. More than 6,000 aircraft a day use the metropolitan airspace. Its three major airports, Newark, Kennedy and LaGuardia, are located within two minutes flying time of each other.

During the next 60 days, the public has an opportunity to comment on all the information in the supplemental including the Solberg mitigation proposal and FAA's analysis of the New Jersey Coalition Against Aircraft Noise (NJCAAN) over-the-ocean routing proposal. The coalition proposed establishing a new departure flight path for Newark Airport traffic that would take aircraft out over the ocean 24 hours a day and then turn them north and south for continued routing.

After the comment period closes, the FAA will review all comments and prepare a final environmental impact statement (EIS) which is expected to be issued in early 1995. Once the final EIS is issued, the FAA will determine an appropriate action and prepare a "record of decision" and a report to Congress. After the FAA issues the record of decision, the agency will continue to work with affected communities to develop mitigation strategies for areas that are not within the scope of the EIS. This may involve review of airspace management in the entire New York metropolitan area.

Solberg Mitigation Proposal

The Solberg mitigation would modify several air traffic routes to decrease noise levels for residents in areas of the New Jersey communities of Scotch Plains, Westfield, Fanwood and Berkley Heights -- some of the areas most affected by increased aircraft noise when the EECF was implemented in 1987. The proposal is similar to a plan offered by the Scotch Plains-Fanwood Citizens Against Aircraft Noise -- commonly called the Hardie maneuver -- and would reduce noise by making the following changes:

- o Westbound routes that currently take aircraft over Plainfield, Scotch Plains and Berkley Heights would be moved farther south to coincide with other westbound routes along the border between Union and Middlesex counties.

- o Routes currently over Summit, Madison and Morristown, which then head west toward Long Valley, would be moved more to the north through Union and Essex counties, then cross Morris County near Boonton and Dover -- areas currently exposed to noise from departures from LaGuardia and arrivals into Kennedy.

- o Newark westbound departures currently routed over three Pennsylvania geographical fixes known as "Parke," "Biggy" and "Lanna," would proceed to a new departure gate located over the Solberg navigational aid (near Readington, N.J.), then southbound.

- o Newark westbound departures currently routed by the geographical fix known as "Eliot" would initially proceed northwest and turn west over Morris County.

- o To allow for new departure routing over Solberg, LaGuardia Airport arrivals would be moved about 10 miles south of Solberg on a course from Allentown, Pa. to Raritan Bay.

The FAA says the Solberg mitigation would decrease noise by at least DNL (day-night level) 5 decibels for 18,755 people. No one would be subjected to a noise increase of DNL 5 decibels or more.

NJCAAN Ocean Routing Proposal

Although an alternative similar to the NJCAAN proposal was dismissed as not operationally feasible in the draft EIS issued last year, the FAA has analyzed the NJCAAN proposal in detail because of the extraordinary public interest in it and the use of federal funds to prepare the NJCAAN comments. Now, the FAA is asking for public comment on its analysis of the proposal.

The NJCAAN proposal would move the majority of Newark traffic over Raritan Bay, across the Sandy Hook National Recreation Area, and over the Atlantic Ocean southward along the New Jersey coast. These route changes would effectively result in all Newark departures avoiding flying over the western half of Essex, Union and Middlesex counties and all counties to the west.

Because of the dense population west of Newark Airport, the FAA estimates that 685,000 people would experience at least a DNL 5 decibel reduction in aircraft noise.

Another 460,000 people however, would experience an increase of DNL 5 decibels or more in areas across the middle of Ocean and Burlington counties and into the northern sections of Camden and Gloucester counties, south of Philadelphia. The highest increases in noise would occur along the shoreline of Ocean County.

An additional area in northern New Jersey comprising much of Passaic and the northeast corner of Sussex counties would also experience an increase.

Operational modeling revealed that the proposal has substantial safety problems and appears not to be operationally feasible because of numerous air traffic conflicts throughout the metropolitan area.

In addition to accepting written comments, the FAA will soon announce the dates and times of public hearings in Cranford, Tinton Falls and Bernardsville, N.J. and a public meeting in Staten Island, N.Y. The agency will also use statewide public television on Wednesday, Nov. 9 from 10 to 10:30 p.m. to explain the Solberg and NJCAAN proposals.

Public comments will be accepted through Nov. 30. Comments on the supplemental draft EIS may be hand-delivered or mailed to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Docket No. 27649, 800 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20591.

###

FAA News

Washington, D.C.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Friday, September 30, 1994

Contact: Fraser Jones
(202) 267-8521

Advanced Automation Update

Following an analysis by independent experts of advanced air traffic display software, the Federal Aviation Administration will seek a proposal on the costs and schedule of completing the en route controller work station program from Loral Corp. If the agency can negotiate and agree upon a fair and fixed price and schedule, then the FAA will move forward with Loral. Otherwise, the agency will proceed with other strategies. It is premature to commit as to what direction the agency will take or what contractor will complete the job.

"We have completed an evaluation, and the underlying architecture is sound, but the documentation and implementation leave a lot to be desired," said Dr. George L. Donohue, the Rand Corp. executive recently hired by the FAA to serve as executive director for acquisitions. "We will continue to work with Loral while it documents the overall architecture and computer code. In addition, we are monitoring process improvements that Loral has said it is introducing into its new Federal Systems Division."

This decision is predicated on the findings by Lincoln Labs and Carnegie Mellon Software Engineering Institute in the 90-day study that the existing software, although flawed in several respects, can perform adequately with sufficient effort and attention.

The 90-day study was part of the agency's overhaul of its advanced automation program. Citing contractor problems and major cost-overruns, FAA Administrator David R. Hinson canceled two major portions of the multi-billion program in early June. These and other portions of the automation program will be redefined and procured competitively.