DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | NEWS

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY
BENJAMIN F. L. DARDEN, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF AVIATION POLICY AND PLANS
AT THE SPRING MEETING OF THE WOMAN'S
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AVIATION
18 MAY 1971

Good afternoon. I am certainly pleased that you selected short-haul air transportation as the main topic of today's discussion. Inherent in its selection was an awareness that there is a clear need for a system which is truly responsive to the needs of the short-haul air traveler as well as an awareness that rational Policies are required to guide and support its timely implementation.

Over 50 percent of all passenger enplanements today have destinations of less than 500 miles. Yet, with this growing demand for short-haul service, the traveler going less than 500 miles is being provided increasingly less satisfactory service by the carriers and, due to ground and terminal access delays, is faced with a total door-to-door trip time on the order of that found forty years ago with the DC-3.

It is in the question of terminal access congestion that we are forced to immediately address the transportation priorities of the individual community and the conflict of these priorities

with the particular needs of the air traveler. While airport access delays have become a deficiency in the entire intercity transportation system, access to airports remains but one element of the urban transportation problem. In such a context, few metropolitan governments place airport access at the top of their transportation priority list. On the other hand, the aviation community, while recognizing the need for relief to the airport access question, has traditionally maintained a position that appropriate relief must be initiated by the individual community. It has, therefore, refused to assume the responsibility for local transportation of passengers to and from air terminals. Regretably we see no indication that this situation will change in the near future, and access times to conventional airports will become even longer during the next decade.

Aviation's greatest advantages over the other modes of transportation are the characteristics of speed, comfort and flexibility. The characteristic which is becoming of ever increasing importance is that of flexibility. We have witnessed the gradual decay of the railroads in the passenger market, partially because of their inability to remain flexible. As cities expanded, the passenger was faced with longer and longer travel times and delays in reaching the railroad terminal. Aviation is faced with a somewhat similar problem today. The urban sprawl of recent years has resulted in the individual travelers residing at even greater distances from the central city. In addition, airports are now being forced to locate at distances far removed from the communities they are intended to serve Witness the fact that New York's fourth jetport will be some 65 miles from the city. What is really demanded of aviation today is greater flexibility. We have speed. We have comfort. But these benefits will be ineffective if we are unable to deliver the passenger within close proximity to his intended destination without suffering the delays and frustration of both air and ground congestion.

We believe the most practical and economical option available to us in meeting this demand is the institution of a V/STOL short-haul air transportation system capable of operating over short stage lengths, while utilizing small STOLports located in or near urban centers. The ultimate goal of such a system would be to expand aviation services while, at the same time, delivering the passenger as close as possible to his destination. Such a service would have obvious benefits to the CTOL traveler. By reducing the mix of short-haul and long-haul travelers, both air and ground congestion at CTOL airports would be reduced. The question is no longer whether we need such a system, or whether

it is technologically feasible. The question facing us today is how do we go about instituting it.

Our problems with the Florida Everglades Airport, the SST program, the expansion of John F. Kennedy Airport into Jamaica Bay, and right here in the Maryland Suburbs at Bowie Airport, serve notice that times are indeed changing. I believe that the FAA and the aviation community must respond to these changes. We must change our outlook regarding system planning and development. For if our efforts are to be successful, we must be outward seeking rather than inward looking.

The problems which we have encountered in the recent past are merely harbingers of what we will encounter in the future. They are problems which are not unique to aviation. Far from it. The development of our urban communities and highway systems have been faced with similar problems for years. The future expansion and improvement of the aviation system, particularly where highly developed urban areas are concerned, must inevitably result in a head on confrontation between the planners and the communities. It will be a confrontation of competing goals. Those regional in nature on the one hand, and those local in nature on the other. These goals essentially stem from the diverse values held by the region and communities, not all of which are compatible.

The entire question of social and community values is much broader than transportation alone. The value question has a rather wide impact upon all aspects of community development; only one element of which is transportation. Other organizations, such as the Bureau of Public Roads, have long recognized the need for a greater understanding of the subject. The Bureau, as well as several state highway departments, has, over the past years, become increasingly involved in research and planning activities relating to the proper place and role of transportation within the total urban environment.

Private and governmental bodies are becoming more interested in and concerned with the relationship of the community's basic needs with the needs of transportation. This was readily evident in the highway planning conference held in Williamsburg during 1965 and in Warrenton during 1969. One important outgrowth of the conferences was the so-called "Williamsburg Resolves." An example of the context in which the conferees believed transportation should be placed by the planner is provided by Resolve Number Three, which reads:

> "The planning and development to move people and goods in urban areas must be directed toward raising

urban standards and enhancing the aggregate of community values, both quantitative and subjective; it should be recognized that transportation values such as safety, comfort, convenience and economy are a part of, and are to be given proper weight in the total set of community values."

This resolve emphasizes the point that transportation is both a service and a community value and, as a value, is subject to comparison and trade-off against other values. The planner, therefore, becomes entwined not only in identifying the specific values of a community, but in the priority ranking of these values as well.

I previously mentioned the conference conducted at Warrenton during 1969. This conference specifically related to the confrontation between transportation and community values. For those of you who had the opportunity to participate in our National Planning Review Conference you may recall that Jack Shaffer presented a paper which summarized the results of this conference and translated these results into aviation terms.

One of the many workshops conducted at Warrenton was devoted to value identification, measurement, and trade-offs of values, and the legal and social constraints relating to the development of transportation facilities. While the workshop was oriented to highway planning, I believe most of their findings are applicable to aviation as well.

To cite but a few examples of the values they identified:

Under the category of transportation-related or transportation-associated values they included:

1. Accessibility (Is it possible to get from A to B).

2. Travel time (How long will it take).

3. Reliability (What is the probability of completing a trip as expected).

4. Convenience

5. Comfort, Safety and many more.

Values were also identified which were associated with the general characteristics of the environment in the community. These included:

1) protection of property investments

2) preservation of social stability in the community

3) preservation or enhancement of community cohesion

4) avoidance of commotion and preservation of personal privacy

5) institutional preservation

6) absence of noise

7) maintenance of the feeling of personal and group security

The participants in the workshop generally believed that while these values might be capable of measurement or quantification in some manner; significant and complex difficulties were to be expected in the resolution of value trade-offs and value conflicts.

Yet, it is in this ranking and trade-off of values that we require the greatest knowledge and dexterity to be applied in our future systems planning. Much effort on the part of others has already been expended toward this end. No clear tool has as yet been developed with which to rack up the entire spectrum of community values against a backdrop of some greater goal. What has been found is that while many values may be both identifiable and quantifiable still others are clouded through the emotions of an issue. History has shown us that those values that seemed to be capable of expression only in emotional terms were also the values which become decisive in final decisions.

Future aviation planning must consider the obvious questions to be presented by those who will be effected by aviation facilities or actions, especially the non-users. These questions are "What will it do for me?", and more importantly, "what will it do to me?" If all we can provide are vague motherhood statements relating to broad national or regional goals, the response we receive will most likely be very clear and very negative. On the other hand, if we can answer these questions in a very positive manner, if we can clearly relate specific aviation goals to what aviation can do for the community, and I emphasize for the community, if we have already determined the adverse impacts to be expected from the particular action and have minimized them, and if we encourage community participation to the fullest possible extent during the planning process, we will have done our homework and will be in a position to make better headway. The questions relating to what aviation will do for or to a community are most critical. Any rational policy for future aviation systems planning must require that they not only be considered, but be adequately answered as well. As President Nixon stated in designating this week as National Transportation Week, "Our national mobility will demand the continued conquest of time and space, yet our national conscience will not accept irreparable costs to our land, our environment,

or the social fabric of our communities."

Inherent in this statement are the indications of the changes which have taken place in our national and community priorities. It lays before us the issues which we face in future system developments.

Thank you.