

Y4
.In 8/4

1019

91-93
In 8/4
4/16

91-93

LIMITATIONS ON AIRPORT EXPANSION

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Storage

B 25 1971

5854

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 2668

A BILL TO PROVIDE THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY SHALL NOT UNDERTAKE
CERTAIN PROJECTS TO IMPROVE OR EXPAND FEDERAL
AIRPORTS WITHOUT SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION FOR
SUCH PROJECTS

MARCH 4, 1969

Serial No. 91-93

Printed for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1971

55-673

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION



COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

HARLEY O. STAGGERS, West Virginia, *Chairman*

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland
TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Massachusetts
JOHN JARMAN, Oklahoma
JOHN E. MOSS, California
JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan
PAUL G. ROGERS, Florida
LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, California
J. J. PICKLE, Texas
FRED B. ROONEY, Pennsylvania
JOHN M. MURPHY, New York
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, Virginia
DANIEL J. RONAN, Illinois
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
RICHARD L. OTTINGER, New York
RAY BLANTON, Tennessee
W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY, JR., Georgia
PETER N. KYROS, Maine
BOB ECKHARDT, Texas
ROBERT O. TIERNAN, Rhode Island
RICHARDSON PREYER, North Carolina

WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, Illinois
SAMUEL L. DEVINE, Ohio
ANCHER NELSEN, Minnesota
HASTINGS KEITH, Massachusetts
GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
JAMES T. BROYHILL, North Carolina
JAMES HARVEY, Michigan
ALBERT W. WATSON, South Carolina
TIM LEE CARTER, Kentucky
G. ROBERT WATKINS, Pennsylvania
DONALD G. BROTZMAN, Colorado
CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio
DAN KUYKENDALL, Tennessee
JOE SKUBITZ, Kansas
FLETCHER THOMPSON, Georgia
JAMES F. HASTINGS, New York

W. E. WILLIAMSON, *Clerk*

KENNETH J. PAINTER, *Assistant Clerk*

Professional Staff

ANDREW STEVENSON
JAMES M. MENDER, Jr.

WILLIAM J. DIXON
ROBERT F. GUTHRIE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland, *Chairman*

JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan
J. J. PICKLE, Texas
DANIEL J. RONAN, Illinois
BROCK ADAMS, Washington

SAMUEL L. DEVINE, Ohio
GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
ALBERT W. WATSON, South Carolina
DAN KUYKENDALL, Tennessee

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of H.R. 2668.....	2
Report of—	
Bureau of the Budget.....	3
Commerce Department.....	3
Statement of—	
Bofing, Harry F., Chief, Fiscal Management Branch, Bureau of National Capital Airports, Federal Aviation Administration.....	4
Rakowski, Edward J., Chief, Engineering Staff, Bureau of National Capital Airports, Federal Aviation Administration.....	4
Saunders, Arven H., Director, Bureau of National Capital Airports, Federal Aviation Administration.....	4
Additional material submitted for the record by—	
Air Line Pilots Association, Charles H. Ruby, president, letter dated March 3, 1969, to Chairman Friedel.....	25
Federal Aviation Administration, Bureau of National Capital Airports:	
Approach light system (ALS) Washington National Airport.....	14
Cost of installing a "moose-proof" fence at McGrath, Alaska, airport.....	11
Noise levels of various size aircraft.....	18
Friedel, Hon. Samuel N., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland:	
Speech on the floor of the House, September 26, 1968, entitled "The FAA Schemes Again".....	2
Statement on H.R. 2668.....	3

1910

1911

1912

1913

1914

1915

1916

1917

1918

1919

1920

1921

1922

1923

1924

LIMITATIONS ON AIRPORT EXPANSION

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1969

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to notice, in room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Samuel N. Friedel (chairman) presiding.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The subcommittee will please be in order.

Today's hearing is on H.R. 2668, a bill which I introduced to provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall not undertake any project to improve or expand Federal airports without specific authorization, if the cost of such project will exceed \$50,000.

I introduced similar legislation in the beginning of the 90th Congress (H.R. 2798), January 18, 1967). Then last year under date of September 1, 1968, the Federal Aviation Administration released a "Master Plan Report—Washington National Airport." This report cost some \$300,000. I described the outlay of \$300,000 taxpayer dollars for this purpose as outrageous on the floor of the House on September 26, 1968.

Without objection, I will include my floor statement of that date in this hearing record at the end of my opening remarks.

Over the years I have been actively engaged in the airport needs for not only the Baltimore area but for the Baltimore/Washington, D.C. area. In many and ever increasing instances these needs are overlapping. I take a great deal of good natured joshing just about every time I say "Friendship International." I don't mind this—I rather enjoy it as long as all of us concerned with aviation are aware that Friendship and Dulles have unused capacity with minimal aircraft noise problems while Washington National is saturated with air service and its aircraft operations bring constant complaints about noise.

It would seem to me that the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration would do well to think in terms of minimizing the surface transportation problems—and I don't believe that they are as large as some would have you think—to and from Dulles and Friendship rather than concentrating on revamping or rebuilding Washington National at a cost of several hundred million dollars.

(Mr. Friedel's statement on the floor of the House, January 26, 1968, referred to, follows:)

[From the Congressional Record—House, Sept. 26, 1968]

THE FAA SCHEMES AGAIN

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a "Master Plan Report—Washington National Airport." I understand that this has been under preparation since 1965 pursuant to a contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and Vincent G. Kling & Associates. I am advised that the contract cost the taxpayers of this country \$300,000. This is outrageous.

Early in the 90th Congress I introduced H.R. 2798, which would prohibit the Federal Aviation Administration from improving or expanding any airport owned and operated by the Federal Government if the cost of improvement or expansion would exceed \$50,000. Anything over that would have to have specific authorization by Congress. This Kling report underscores the need for such legislation, for in the report there are four schemes proposed with total costs as follows:

Scheme F-1.....	\$192, 440, 479
Scheme F-2.....	193, 622, 525
Scheme F-3.....	136, 988, 139
Scheme F-4.....	163, 024, 588

Some scheming.

Across the Nation there are many places where airport improvements are urgently needed. It is a crying shame that the one place which does not need to be expanded should be chosen for dumping \$300,000 down the drain.

Incidentally, for some reason, the report is encased in a book which measures 18 inches by 13½ inches. This is a little awkward for Congressmen to carry around in their side pocket, so I do not have it with me. I am not sure my file cabinets are large enough to accommodate it and it costs so much I just hate to throw it away. If any of you want to see it, I will keep it in the office at least for awhile. I have the feeling the Mr. Thomas, the Acting Administrator, will be glad to give away all of his copies if you want to get one from him.

A number of us have been telling the FAA formally and informally for years that the overuse of Washington National is ridiculous in the face of the underuse of Dulles which has over \$200 million invested in it, and the underuse of Friendship International, so conveniently located between Baltimore and Washington.

I do not know what more we must do to get this message across but I am perfectly willing to keep at it until it gets across.

I think that Congress is entitled to an immediate and complete explanation as to just how the FAA decided to spend \$300,000 for this purpose. I question their right to do this. If they have such discretionary right, it should be removed.

I would have thought that their judgment would have led them away from such an adventure. I regret that it did not. I will exert my efforts to have them up just as soon as possible to determine what additional restrictions we should put on their authorizations. Among these I would hope would be the one set forth in H.R. 2798.

(The text of H.R. 2668, and reports thereon, follow:)

[H.R. 2668, 91st Cong., first sess., introduced by Mr. Friedel on January 9, 1969]

A BILL To provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall not undertake certain projects to improve or expand Federal airports without specific authorization for such projects

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall not undertake any project to improve or expand any airport owned and operated by the Federal Government and under his control, if the total cost of such project will exceed \$50,000, unless such project has been specifically authorized by an Act of Congress enacted after the date of enactment of this Act. This Act shall not apply with respect to any project for which funds for construction have been appropriated before the date of enactment of this Act.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1969.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 2668, "To provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall not undertake certain projects to improve or expand Federal airports without specific authorization for such projects."

The bill would prohibit the Administrator from undertaking any project, which would exceed \$50,000, to improve or modernize any Federal airport unless the project is specifically authorized by an Act of Congress.

The Department of Transportation opposes this bill on the grounds that a requirement for specific authorization for such projects might inhibit prompt response on projects essential to safe and efficient operation of the airports, and that the appropriation process provides for Congressional review and approval of Federal Aviation Agency expenditures at federally owned and operated airports.

The Bureau of the Budget concurs in the views of the Department of Transportation and accordingly recommends against enactment of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1969.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of this Department concerning H.R. 2668, a bill to provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall not undertake certain projects to improve or expand Federal airports without specific authorization for such projects.

We have reviewed the provisions of H.R. 2668, and we defer to the views of the Department of Transportation which has jurisdiction over the Federal Aviation Agency as to the desirability of its enactment.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of our report to the Congress from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK SIMPICH,
General Counsel.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I have an additional statement that I would like to include in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

On January 9, 1969, I introduced H.R. 2668, a bill to provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall not undertake certain projects to improve or expand Federal airports without specific authorization for such projects. The bill would prohibit the FAA Administrator from undertaking any project, costing more than \$50,000, to improve or expand a Federally-owned and operated airport unless that project is specifically authorized by an Act of Congress passed after the date of enactment of the proposed bill.

Past experience has shown that the Federal Aviation Agency has repeatedly by-passed the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in utter disregard of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and requested funds for certain projects from the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. This is clearly wrong, for Rule XI specifies the Powers and Duties of Committees:

"All proposed legislation and other matters relating to the subject listed under the standing Committees named below shall be referred to such Committees respectively;" and paragraph two of that Rule clearly states:

"Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

- (a) Interstate and Foreign Commerce generally.
- (b) Civil Aeronautics."

Thus, all matters dealing with Civil Aeronautics must be brought before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The point has been made that this bill is not practical because of the possibility that emergencies may arise requiring the FAA to spend more than \$50,000 for a particular project. Such possible objection is not valid because the FAA does have a contingent fund or general fund from which it can draw; it can even re-program its resources for special needs as they may arise. Additionally, experience has shown that such emergencies are relatively few in number.

Attempting to deprive this Committee of its assigned jurisdiction over civil aeronautics matters can result in a wanton waste of taxpayers money.

The Federal Aviation Administration is guilty of needlessly wasting \$300,000 of the taxpayer's money. That is the sum spent on a contract between that agency and Vincent G. Kling & Associates for plans to enlarge and further expand the facilities of Washington National Airport which has for some time been dangerously overcrowded. In an unwieldy and oversize report, 4 schemes are proposed costing (F-1) \$192,440,479; (F-2) \$193,622,525; (F-3) \$136,988,139; and (F-4) \$163,024,588 respectively.

A more outrageous waste of money cannot be imagined, not only for the sums spent in preparation of such an unneeded study, but also the proposals to further pay not less than \$136 million and up to more than \$192 million to enlarge a presently overcrowded air facility and thereby further increase hazards and noise as well as air pollution over the Nation's Capital.

With the use of jet aircraft, the voice of protest rose up and down the Potomac Valley from Alexandria to McLean. It is conceded by everyone that the present number of flights in and out of Washington National Airport are far too many and with the transition from propeller planes to prop-jets and pure jets, danger and noise to the surrounding population are greatly increased—to further expand and enlarge that airport's facilities just does not make any sense.

It should be noted that this costly study of National Airport was not a part of any formal program of the F.A.A. except the most general statements made to the two Appropriations Committees. And, here again, our Committee was not consulted, neither was it advised of such action by that Agency.

Any plans to "study, expand or construct" additions to Washington National and Dulles International Airport should first be approved by this Committee and no funds should be provided by the Appropriations Committee without such specific authorization. Dulles Airport is not being used at any where near its full capacity and neither is Friendship International Airport; but the F.A.A. requested funds from the Appropriations Committee last year to expand Dulles Airport. I have already urged the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee not to approve funds for such projects in the future.

I submit that unless we amend the Federal Aviation Act as provided in this bill, the F.A.A. is practically in the position of supervising itself. It is, therefore, strongly urged and recommended that in the public interest, in the interest of safety in the air and on the ground, and economy in Government, that this Committee take favorable action on H.R. 2668.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I look forward with interest to the testimony of the Federal Aviation Administration at this time and welcome as our first witness Mr. Arven Saunders, Director of the Bureau of National Capital Airports, Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. Saunders.

STATEMENT OF ARVEN H. SAUNDERS, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORTS, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, ACCOMPANIED BY HARRY F. BOLPING, CHIEF, FISCAL MANAGEMENT BRANCH OF THE BUREAU, AND EDWARD J. RAKOWSKI, CHIEF, ENGINEERING STAFF OF THE BUREAU

Mr. SAUNDERS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, my name is Arven H. Saunders. I am Director of the Bureau of National Capital Airports of the Federal Aviation Administration.

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss H.R. 2668, a bill to provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall not undertake certain projects to improve or expand Federal airports without specific authorization for such projects. This bill would prohibit the FAA Administrator from undertaking any project, costing more than \$50,000, to improve or expand a federally owned and operated airport unless that project is specifically authorized by an act of Congress passed after the date of enactment of the proposed bill. We oppose this bill.

The bill would apply to several federally owned and operated airports under FAA control. In addition to Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport, these include the airport at Atlantic City, N.J., where the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center is located, and the airports at Annette Island, Alaska, at six other locations in Alaska, and at Wake Island. In carrying out his responsibilities to operate, maintain and protect these airports, the Administrator must undertake projects to improve or expand them. These projects are essential to the safe and efficient operation of the airports. In many instances, they also represent an investment which will yield significant economic benefits. Normally, we obtain congressional approval to undertake such projects through the appropriation process. Occasionally, we cannot anticipate the needs of our dynamic and fast-growing aviation business, and the public we serve, far enough in advance to seek congressional approval.

When our funds are received from Congress, we may find that the priorities which existed when we requested the funds almost 2 years earlier no longer prevail. To provide adequate public service, we must reprogram funds to meet more urgent needs that are within the intent and purpose of our appropriation. We try to keep such occasions to a minimum. But, we need only look at the rapid evolution in aircraft in recent years to appreciate that these occasions will arise in the aviation industry, and that we must respond quickly.

More often, we are faced with unforeseeable and unplanned conditions. Often these may be emergencies that involve public safety and that must be corrected immediately. Not too long ago, we grooved a runway at Washington National Airport to eliminate a serious hydroplaning problem. There are many other examples: An element of the aged physical and mechanical plant may fail. An aircraft or ground service vehicle may unexpectedly damage a fuel system, or some other essential facility. A sharp increase in cargo shipped may demonstrate the inadequacy of cargo handling facilities. The closing of a general aviation airport may generate increased demands for facilities to take care of the flying public. Increased airplane passenger capacity may make necessary expanded or improved baggage handling facilities. We may detect a previously unknown safety hazard that demands a quick response.

As many as 45 to 48 months may elapse between the conception of an airport improvement and its final completion for some types of projects. No business connected with aviation should take this long to respond to customer demands. To my knowledge no other major airport in the country faces such delays, and they limit our ability to carry out the congressional mandate to operate our airports on a businesslike basis.

Enactment of this bill would increase the existing limitations on our ability to operate the two National Capital airports, and our other airports, on a businesslike and safe basis. When we find it necessary to restructure our projects or to reprogram funds of any magnitude, we customarily advise the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of our need and the projects deferred or canceled. This bill would require us to seek an act of Congress authorizing that action, each time we need to reprogram funds. While seeking this authorization, public service might deteriorate and necessary safety measures might be delayed. When Congress was not in session, our needs might become critical.

We do not believe that it is in the public interest to encumber the administration of federally operated airports with the requirement proposed in this bill. The National Capital airports are expected to be operated on a commercial basis. We feel that the public, and the airlines, the concessionaires, and the tenants who serve the public, foot the bill for our facilities. We believe that they have a right to expect, and should receive, a reasonable response to their needs for the improvement or expansion of our facilities.

We believe that the appropriation process, including the passage of an Appropriation Act, provides full and adequate means for congressional review and approval of FAA expenditures at the federally owned and operated airports.

That concludes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to try to answer any questions that the committee may have.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Saunders, there may be emergencies involving funds, and I can understand that this may come up and there could be an amendment to the bill to take care of emergencies. I notice you say here as many as 45 or 48 months may elapse between conception of an airport improvement and the actual improvement at the airport. What is your method now; do you go through committee each year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. You do not plan 48 months in advance or 2 or 3 months in advance. You go each year to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir. But, Mr. Chairman, the leadtime is longer than that. We recently prepared a construction cycle chart and presented it to the airlines and to others we deal with at the airports. We meant to emphasize the need for good planning, and for good facts as to what the future schedules and the future needs will be. Planning does involve this kind of timelag.

For example, at the present time we are in the standard Federal budget cycle. We have just finished the 5-year plan. That is part of the Federal cycle. We will have the fiscal year 1971 budget review this summer, and through the fall with Bureau of the Budget. Finally next January, the President will submit the fiscal year 1971 budget proposal to Congress.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, but this bill would not interfere with your going ahead before the Bureau of the Budget. My bill would not interfere with that whatsoever.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir. I understand that, Mr. Chairman. But nonetheless, the planning that is involved in our requests takes this long, and it is not always possible for us to anticipate urgent needs.

Mr. FRIEDEL. This bill would not interfere with that whatsoever.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No. I understand that, sir. But neither would it change the length of time required to complete the Federal budget process. It is a long process, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. You made another statement here. "When Congress is not in session our needs might become critical." What do you do now when Congress is not in session?

Mr. SAUNDERS. If funds are available, Mr. Chairman, we do reprogram on an emergency basis.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I thought you said you notify the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. We do. We have followed that practice in the past.

Mr. FRIEDEL. They are not in session.

Mr. SAUNDERS. When that is true, the Chairman is usually available. I cannot recall any specific instance, but an attempt would be made to pass the information on to him as to the nature of the emergency or the need for expedited action.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Saunders, this bill would not interfere in any way, shape or form other than to put a limit on the amount you can spend for unauthorized projects. In 1965 you started a study of the National Airport. Was that in your program before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That was not in the budget, but it had been cleared in a number of ways with the various committees.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that it has always been our practice to seek the counsel of Congress on our problems and our proposed solutions. We stand on that and wish to continue this. We have tried to do this in the past.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Here is a report of the contract in 1965, reporting back in 1968, and this report cost over \$300,000.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Did you ask the Appropriations Committee for \$300,000 to make a study of Washington National Airport?

Mr. SAUNDERS. On March 2, 1965, Mr. Halaby, then the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, appeared before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the House Committee on Appropriations. On May 14, 1965, Mr. Halaby appeared before a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. At that time, Mr. Halaby outlined the need for studies at National Airport, and he said this. If I may briefly, I will quote from his statements before both committees.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Before what committee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the House Committee on Appropriations, and a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in 1965, Mr. Chairman. At that time he said:

I would call your attention to a current effort wherein we are using the best assistance available to us from the FAA, the Bureau of the Budget, and private professionals to advise us on the best approach to modernization of the excellently situated, heavily used, but 25-year-old Washington National Airport. It is obvious that major capital expenditures will be necessary within the next few years to modernize this air terminal. Before proposing a full-scale modernization program involving large capital investments we are making a careful preliminary review of all economic, air traffic, and safety factors and are considering approaches to the physical layout and airport-operating concept. We must take full account of

the fact that within a very few years almost all air carrier operations will be conducted by jet aircraft, and that there will be an increasing use of jet aircraft by general aviation. I am simply informing you—

Mr. Halaby went on—

that we are seriously studying these matters and will within the next several months be developing firm proposals for modernization of this airport.

Mr. Chairman, the record continues. On March 22, 1966, the Administrator and various officials of FAA appeared before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the House Appropriations Committee. During this hearing we pointed out that economic feasibility studies relating to modernizing Washington Airport had been completed, and that a development of design alternatives leading to the acceptance of a concept of modernization was the next step. We advised the committee of our plan to reprogram funds for this purpose.

On April 13, 1966, the Administrator wrote Chairman Evins setting forth additional details of our plan. A contract was later awarded to Vincent Kling & Associates on May 5, 1966. Since then, Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this pending study at all appropriations hearings. In 1968, for example, the Committee on Appropriations noted that, for some time, a study had been underway on modernization of Washington National Airport. They stated that we should push harder to complete the necessary studies so that action on modernization of the airport could be completed.

In September 1968, we received the report from Kling. We promptly made copies available to you and to other Members of the Congress. We released it to the press and to the public on September 29, 1968.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize as best I can that it has always been our intent to seek the counsel of Congress, to inform you of our problems, and to outline our proposed solutions.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The \$300,000 was not mentioned in that report.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir; in the letter to—

Mr. FRIEDEL. In the statement you just mentioned, it was not.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The letter to Chairman Evins, that I mentioned dated April 13, 1966, specifically mentioned approximately \$300,000. I would be glad to read the letter to you, Mr. Chairman, if you wish.

Mr. FRIEDEL. And they approved that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. They had the information, and apparently approved it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Where did you get the \$300,000?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The funds were made available from two previously authorized projects. The first project was for repaving the runways and taxiways, for which appropriations were made in fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964. As it happened, an extremely favorable paving contract provided us with savings of \$200,000 from the budgeted amounts.

The second project from which funds were available involved the construction of a sewage pretreatment plant and modernization of sewage and water lines, for which funds were appropriated in fiscal years 1961 and 1962. A savings of \$100,000 was available from the funds appropriated for that project, based on the budget estimates at that time, and this, Mr. Chairman, was stated in the letter to Chairman Evins that I mentioned dated April 13, 1966.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Well, I do not want to take all the time here.

Mr. Adams, any questions?

Mr. ADAMS. No, Mr. Chairman, I have no questions at this time.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Devine?

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I am most confused here. We have legislation on the subject matter, and the only witness called is one in opposition to it. Are there any proponents of this legislation?

Mr. FRIEDEL. My purpose in the bill is to require authorization from this committee before they go to the Appropriations Committee. They bypassed the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee completely, and go before the Appropriations Committee and get their funds. What I want them to do is to come before our committee for the authorization.

Mr. DEVINE. Apparently 4 years ago they went to the Independent Offices Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Independent Offices. This is a jurisdictional matter.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Right, at least for airports and runways. but the point is that they had \$300,000 and they did not ask for it. They saved \$200,000 on paving. Instead of going back into the Treasury, they just used it for this study, \$300,000 for plans to spend \$200 million just to improve Washington National. It is overcrowded now.

Mr. DEVINE. You are not suggesting any misappropriation?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, no.

Mr. DEVINE. Apparently the money was appropriated by a duly approved committee of the Congress.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is true. I am not questioning that at all.

Mr. DEVINE. I was just seeking proponents of the legislation. I wondered what the purpose of the hearing was. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Pickle, do you have any questions?

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank you. I have not yet had a chance to read the statement of Mr. Saunders, but I welcome you before the committee. I note that you appear in opposition to the bill. I will read this testimony and would like to reserve the right to ask any questions, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder if I might deviate from the bill before us for just a moment, Mr. Saunders. I wanted to ask you the status of the possibility of helicopter service between the airfield and downtown Washington, Dulles, and Friendship. Can you bring us up to date on the status of these applications?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir, Mr. Pickle. As I understand it, the Civil Aeronautics Board has authorized a consortium of airlines, to begin helicopter service here in Washington serving the three area airports—Friendship, Dulles, and National—and the airlines are prepared to provide this service.

Up until now, they have been unable to locate suitable helipad or heliport services or facilities in the District. At the moment, the project is stymied by that obstacle. I am told that they are exploring several possibilities, and making plans for two or three locations. They are also exploring possible rezoning of a building, where a rooftop helipad is available in the District. I think it is fair to say that the airlines are pursuing this as vigorously as they can, and they are attempting to resolve the heliport problem.

Mr. PICKLE. It is a question of site selection, one that will be left to the airlines or is it something that has to be coordinated with the FAA or the District Committee? Who will make that decision about a proper site?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The area office of the FAA—I mention the area office of the FAA to distinguish it from the Bureau of National Capital Airports which I represent—will look into the heliport site, will coordinate with the airlines and with other interested parties, and will approve the site from the point of view of airworthiness and air traffic compatibility. The airlines will not make the decision alone. They will propose a site, and will work with the FAA area office, I am sure.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Saunders, I thank you for that information because I am keenly interested in that service being provided, and I want to be sure that we don't interfere speeding that project along.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, sir.

Mr. PICKLE. May I ask you one brief question about the bill before us now. The measure that has been proposed would be that any item that costs over \$50,000 would have to have approval of the committee, and you are opposing that proposition. Do you propose any specific sum that would be reasonable, that would give us a limitation? Does your testimony cover that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, sir. We feel, Mr. Pickle, that the appropriation process, which is already in place and has been in effect for many years, is adequate with the passage of an appropriation act. That process as it now stands does provide full and adequate means for Congress to oversee.

Mr. PICKLE. You would not recommend any sum of minimum or maximum; would you?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, sir. We would prefer to have the appropriation process remain as it is.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Would you be opposed to getting the authorization of this committee before you go to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Would you be opposed to getting the authorization from this committee before you go to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that I would be able to comment on that properly, because I think it would involve, as Mr. Devine mentioned, the jurisdiction between committees, on which I would not be competent to speak. We would want to do what was asked of us. We would come to appear as requested, of course, and we would present information as requested.

Mr. PICKLE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Kuykendall?

Mr. KUYKENDALL. What does a 100-foot section of Dulles runway cost, or 1 foot of Dulles runway cost?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Very roughly, Mr. Kuykendall, I think that the construction cost of the two long runways at Dulles, which are 11,500 feet in length, was about \$3 million each, excluding taxiways.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Have you got your arithmetic cap working?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Roughly calculating that would be \$300 per foot, if the decimal point is in the right place, if we are right on that.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. All right, so an accumulation of water that suddenly accumulates under a runway could create the sudden neces-

sity of tearing out 150 feet, that would be \$45,000 right there; wouldn't it?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Which would have to be suddenly fixed?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This is right.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I think a lot of people do not realize just how expensive and how high this figure would be. I had a rather interesting experience. Do you run the airport in McGrath, Alaska?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am not sure whether that is one of the six that I mentioned.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I understand they are worrying about building a moose-proof fence around the airport at McGrath, Alaska, because a moose knocked off the nose wheel of a 727 and did \$250,000 worth of damage. I wonder what a moose-proof fence would cost around there. This really happened. I was just up there last year. Do you remember it?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. You do not know what it would cost?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I would gladly submit that for the record if you would like to have it, because the facts would be available on the cost of a fence per foot.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. In fact I happen to know they are looking for such a thing because they are having problems.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

(The following information was received for the record:)

COST OF INSTALLING A "MOOSE-PROOF" FENCE AT MCGRATH, ALASKA, AIRPORT

We estimate that the cost of installing a "moose-proof" fence around the McGrath, Alaska, Airport would be between \$40,000 and \$100,000. Specifically, we estimate that an 8 foot, 4 or 5 strand, electrified barbed wire fence would cost about \$40,000; an 8 foot, electrified woven wire fence would cost about \$48,000; and a 6 foot chain link fence would cost about \$100,000. Under normal conditions, we believe any one of these types of fence would exclude moose.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. There is a great deal of consternation and exploration taking place around the Congress, and I think the whole aviation industry knows about the building of an airport and airways construction trust fund. Would you propose in such an overall plan somewhat similar to the trust fund plan of the highway trust fund? Would you like to keep the actual operation of some airports as opposed to the supervision which is normally the function of the FAA? Would you like to see this removed to another agency that would maybe put you in a position of not being both fish and fowl in this business of actually operating an airport? Aren't you in a position here of somewhat supervising yourself?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir; I guess that is true. FAA does include—

Mr. KUYKENDALL. You are your own boss here in this thing as far as the agency is concerned.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir, the Bureau of National Capital Airports, of which I am Director, reports directly to the FAA Administrator. So it is all one organization. On the first part of your question, I just would not be in a position to answer on the trust fund or the airways question at all.

On the second part, I would say simply this: That I assume that the new Administrator will want to review the operation and organization

of the Bureau of National Capital Airports. I assume that he will want to present his findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation. But beyond that, I simply cannot comment.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Would you say that usually the complaints, the petitions, the legislation or whatever it is that is aimed at your operation probably would not be about 90 percent aimed at National?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. When you speak of National, emotion gets pretty high around here from time to time.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir, I think that is probably a reasonable proposition. And, I guess it is somewhat related to the fact that 10 million passengers a year use Washington National Airport, and the Dulles level is something less than 2 million a year at the present time.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Is there a great danger here in some of the attempts to get at National, that they will throw the baby out with the bath water by getting Dulles along with it, attacking the overall operation instead of just National?

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is true that both airports are under the same management, that is, the Bureau of National Capital Airports? So any regulation, any law, any bill that would apply to one would very likely affect both.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. In other words, any limitation on expenditures primarily aimed at curtailing activities at National would almost invariably tend to hurt Dulles too, would it not?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir, because Dulles is also a federally owned airport, and the same regulation, the same restriction would apply to it as well.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. So in other words, the attack on the disease might be to attack the cure also. I am not calling National a disease.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Right.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. But there are a lot of people around here who think it is.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir, and as I pointed out in my opening statement, the bill or the law would of course affect Wake Island, Annette Island, Alaska, and six other Alaska airports, and the Atlantic City NAFEC facility. All those are federally-owned and operated airports.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I know you would join with me in observing that the people who know more about and contribute more to this problem than anybody are right here in this building and the two next door, because most of us Congressmen like to travel out of National Airport. What Mr. Pickle mentioned was ready land access to Dulles and the Friedel Memorial Airport up in Baltimore. Seriously, high speed ground transportation it seems to me is the only possible answer to National, and I think all the fencing that different people try to do on National until that comes I do not see another answer. I know you agree and I think Mr. Pickle has nailed it right on the head as to what we had better aim at as far as the solution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Right.

Mr. Watson, do you have any question?

Mr. WATSON. Mr Chairman, I apologize for not being here to hear the earlier testimony. I am sure questions that I have in mind have already been answered, but if I might just ask one or two.

You state that emergencies come up that immediately require attention, and you give some examples. You state on page 2 concerning

the projecting of your needs for even a 2-year period, that the changing of the art is so dramatic and rapid that you are unable to project these needs, even for a 2-year period?

Mr. SAUNDERS. We do our very best, Mr. Watson, and we plan the 4 or 5 years ahead as part of the 5 year plan, for example.

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And we try to set the priorities on the basis of facts available to us at the time. I think we do reasonably well in that, with lots of help from lots of people. But it is not always possible to predict accurately what the priorities will be 2 years hence, as I pointed out. We are making the case for the exception, rather than for the majority of cases I think.

Mr. WATSON. Well, I can see that. You go ahead and enumerate several examples of unforeseeable, unplanned conditions.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. One of them was the hydroplaning problem. That certainly could have been anticipated. It has been in existence for years. Was this something just arising overnight of an emergency nature?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, sir. It was determined after research that the grooving of runways would be an effective way of eliminating hydroplaning. The state of the art had advanced to the point that grooving was accepted as a way of improving braking. So we felt it was incumbent on us to proceed with grooving as quickly as we could, once the scientists had said that grooving is a worthwhile project that does work.

Mr. WATSON. But it is really not something of an emergency nature. That is something that has been developing all along, and finally you decided to do it. Now you say you can have aircraft or ground vehicles to have unexpected damage to a fuel system. Would that exceed \$50,000?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir, it might.

Mr. WATSON. It is quite expensive?

Mr. SAUNDERS. It might. Mr. Watson, may I cite another example that perhaps would make the point. Because of the shifting mud in the Potomac River, the alignment of our 3,000 foot long approach light system at the south end of the airport, which is a very important component of the instrument landing system, was shifted out of line. The approach light system consists, as you probably know, of thirty some odd stations 100 feet apart with high intensity lights and sequence flashers installed on the stations. These stations are independent of each other, as far as structure goes, but they are connected by the electrical cables and the control mechanisms.

The strain on this straight 3,000-foot line approach light system was so great because of the shift of mud in the Potomac area that we were close to having the electrical cables severed. In addition to that, the whole system was out of line. It went a little bit on the weaving side (demonstrating). Because the approach light system is a very important part of the instrument landing system on which the present minimums of "200 and a half" depend, we felt there was an emergency. And we proceeded with the repair (the relocating and stabilizing of the approach light stations) at, as I recall, a cost of \$93,000.

Now, I do not honestly think that we could have anticipated that a year or two or three or four years ahead in planning the budget cycle.

Mr. WATSON. You mean when this was installed, that there was no consideration given by the engineers as to the shifting of the bottom of the Potomac? I am familiar with what you are talking about, but it would appear to me elementary, and I am no engineer at all, that consideration would be given to that very thing.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The approach light system was engineered properly we believe. It had served for many years, and it was not a new installation. I would think that the approach light system might even go back 8 or 10 years. I will tell you exactly for the record, if you wish, without any difficulty.

(The following information was received for the record:)

APPROACH LIGHT SYSTEM (ALS) WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

The approach light system (ALS) at Washington National Airport was originally installed in 1942. Until 1956, the ALS was a centerline light system supported on individual piles in the Potomac River. Technicians maintained the ALS by rowing between each pile. In 1956, we installed the existing pier to accommodate a more modern ALS, including bar lights. In 1958, we added a sequence flasher to the ALS.

In 1967, an unanticipated mud wave misaligned the pier. The addition of guys and several steel piles promptly stabilized the pier, but this proved to be insufficient. In 1968, we entered into a contract to replace existing timbers which had warped or broken, and to strengthen about 1000 feet of the pier with steel piles driven about 50 to 70 feet to the point of refusal. The approach light system is now functioning perfectly.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I want to keep the picture straight in my mind. You appear before the Appropriations Committee each year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Did you know that you wanted to straighten out the lights when you went to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. As I recall, no, sir. It happened between the hearings, but I am not exactly sure of the time.

Mr. FRIEDEL. It did not come up overnight. You knew that it was out of line and you wanted to straighten it up.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The actual shift did come rather suddenly, Mr. Chairman. I think it is correct to say that it probably did not happen overnight, but it did happen rather suddenly over a period of days, as I recall.

Mr. PICKLE. One more question.

Mr. WATSON. Just one or two further questions, or rather seeking a little edification here, a little enlightenment. You cite as a further example of apparently unexpected problems, the closing of general aviation airport may generate increased demands for facilities to take care of the flying public.

General airports are not closed without considerable discussion, even prolonged over a period of years. I know in my district if you even think about closing an airport, you have got a problem on your hands and you wrestle with it for years. But you do know of instances when they have suddenly been closed?

Mr. SAUNDERS. There have been instances where they would be closed for a period of time, and extra traffic would come into the

picture. I think what we are thinking about there, and it is in the future, is that the Washington-Virginia Airport at Baileys Cross-Roads is expected to be closed, and has been expected to be closed for some years. But, it is now expected to be closed in the early part of 1970. There are some 115 aircraft based at that Baileys Cross-Roads Airport at the present time.

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir; but you are making plans now for that. You cite this as an emergency.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. That is not an emergency thing. You have got years to make preparations for that. As you say, you normally present these requests to the Congress, and I know you do, but you would not say that that would amount to an emergency, would you?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, not an emergency in a dire sense. But there is this to be said: The ownership of this particular airport changed in the last year or two upon the death of the long-time owner. For awhile, it appeared that, as a result of settling the estate, the airport might be sold and disposed of on a very short-term basis. That is what we referred to. Apparently now, according to our best information, the estate or the heirs have decided to continue the airport until the early part of 1970.

Mr. WATSON. You cite, finally, increased airplane passenger capacity may make necessary expanded or improved baggage handling facilities.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. That is nothing of an emergency nature. You know the necessity right now to make plans for increased baggage, the handling of it, and also the improvement and expediting of the handling of it. You can plan for that in advance, can't you?

Mr. SAUNDERS. We can do our best, Mr. Watson. The example I guess that would best illustrate this is the increase in passenger loading that came even with planning and with advance notice. When a number of airlines began to use the stretch DC-8 jets. These involve about 196 passengers, instead of 120, 130, 150 at a time. This brought additional loads on our baggage claims facilities at Dulles, for example.

Mr. WATSON. I know you are doing the best you can. We were just trying to look at some of these things. Most of them did not appear to me to be of an emergency nature, but were something that you could well anticipate in advance.

One final thing I am concerned about. I believe at the end of this year you are going to have the 747's with the 400 passenger capacity and so forth. What arrangements are being made to get those passengers, from Dulles into town quickly. We bring them here at supersonic speeds. Now what are we going to do after they are landed?

Mr. SAUNDERS. There are several things to mention, in that connection, Mr. Watson. First, effective January 1 of this year, we entered into a new ground transportation contract after competitive bids, with Greyhound. We hope to improve the ground transportation service not only to the District, but also to some 35 hotels in the District and to a number of suburban areas, with lower rates and faster, more frequent service.

In addition to that, we are hopeful that the link remaining on Interstate 66 from its present termination at Interstate 495 will be

extended. Eventually our access road will be extended to connect to I-66, so that Dulles will have a three-way link from Dulles to the District. That is the present plan for expediting travel to and from Dulles.

More long-range, and we worked to a great extent to bring this about, we were happy that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority includes rapid transit to Dulles in its long-range plan. Now this will be perhaps in the eighties. It will be some years ahead. But they are planning and we are planning for the time when even the special-purpose road that Dulles has will not be adequate to handle the passengers to and from the airport.

I guess the point that Mr. Pickle raised on the helicopter service is the cap. This service could be provided rather quickly, and it would serve a large number of people with very fast transportation between the District and the airport.

Mr. WATSON. To what extent have you explored that possibility, the helicopter?

Mr. SAUNDERS. We have pushed it as best we could over the years, and now—

Mr. WATSON. You said pushed it, and I am not trying to get technical, but we have so many people that come before us and say, "We are studying this," and "We are exploring this," and "We are pushing this." What do we mean by "pushing"?

Mr. PICKLE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir; I will be happy to.

Mr. PICKLE. If I could address myself to that question in advance of whatever reply Mr. Saunders might make. Some 2 years ago the chairman of this subcommittee, Mr. Friedel, and I took an active interest along with other members of the committee in promoting a demonstration project of helicopter service here at the Capitol, to both Dulles and Friendship, and it was proven from that demonstration that you could go in approximately 11 minutes to Dulles or Friendship, from immediately east of the Cannon House Office Building.

In other words, to get that demonstration going, we had to approach FAA. Mr. Saunders was the gentleman to whom we were referred, and the cooperation we got from him and the FAA was excellent. We could not have had the demonstration project if it had not been for the interest that they showed in this particular demonstration project.

In turn they contacted the District Committee and made further contact with the Speaker and the leadership and the building commission. All contacts I have had with them in trying to push this FAA service have all been on the plus side, and I, for one, wish to express my appreciation, and to say to my knowledge they have pushed it and they have helped tremendously.

Mr. WATSON. That is fine, and I am glad to hear it. Are we approaching the possibility, I mean the reality of this thing, or are we still pushing? That is what I want to know.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATSON. Have you made any requests for helicopters? Have we tried to contract this out to any private airlines or anything?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATSON. Do we have it?

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Will you yield for a question?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Is your problem getting a commercial carrier to do this job?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, sir. As Mr. Pickle brought out, the Civil Aeronautics Board has ruled in this case, and has handed down a decision favorable to Washington Airlines, a consortium of the scheduled airlines in this area. They are prepared and have set aside financing. They are prepared to begin a helicopter service to and from the three airports of the area. The problem is the heliport or helipad. As Mr. Pickle brought out, that is the stumbling block with which the airlines are now struggling. They have been forced to write back to the Civil Aeronautics Board and say that they are not able to begin the scheduled helicopter service. We are pursuing it vigorously and will let you know as soon as we can resolve this problem.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Is the District Committee involved in this?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No sir; not directly, I do not believe.

Mr. ADAMS. The answer to the gentleman's question is no, unless there is some specific authorization required for a particular piece of property, because ordinarily it is just a matter of zoning and arrangement made with the landowner, whoever he might be, for the port. No part of this has come before the District Committee as a specific project to my knowledge this year.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Saunders, you will agree that it is possible to get from Dulles and Friendship to Washington D.C. within an hour.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Do I agree? Yes, sir, I think that is reasonable.

Mr. FRIEDEL. How does this compare with major airports like Kennedy, Chicago, and Los Angeles?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think favorably. I have often said that I think that Dulles and Friendship as well have acquired a sort of distorted image of remoteness in the minds of many people, whereas they are really accessible airports.

There are many airports in this country that are only 10, 12, or 15 miles out instead of the greater distance involved to Dulles and Friendship. But the travel time involved to those airports is greater than the travel time to Dulles and Friendship.

Mr. FRIEDEL. You know with the 747's and these other jets, you are still going to have a noise factor. The airports will have to be further away from the densely-populated areas. What has been done about rapid ground transportation to both Dulles and Friendship?

Mr. SAUNDERS. A great deal of study has gone into it, Mr. Chairman. As I indicated, the master plan does show a rapid transit link probably along the access road median to Dulles, in the future.

Similar studies on Friendship have been made, I understand.

Mr. FRIEDEL. At Friendship right now as I understand it there is a right-of-way right to the airport on the old railroad track. That could be used almost immediately. This should be started as a project, and a monorail or something planned to Dulles. I think a study should be made along those lines rather than expanding Washington National.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to dwell unduly on a word. But, we have emphasized to Mr. Kling, and to others in talking about his study, that we are interested in modernizing Washington National Airport, not in expanding it. And there is a difference. In the instructions to Mr. Kling, we have clearly pointed out that we did not want to expand the field capacity of the airport. We wanted to

have all the present restrictions at National remain—the 40 schedules an hour, the 650-mile perimeter, the two and three-engine jets only, et cetera. We stressed that we are interested in improvement and modernization of the people handling side of Washington National Airport, and not the airplane or field side.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Would the chairman yield for a question?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Are there any plans or even any plans to plan the possibility of a 747 ever landing at National?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, sir, absolutely not. The present restriction is very clear. We have made it eminently clear to the airlines in writing on a number of occasions that the jets permitted at Washington National are the smaller variety of jets, the two- and three-engine jets. These include, for example, the Boeing 727, 100 series, but not the Boeing 727, 200 series, or stretch version.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Another quick question. Is it not true that exactly the same noise restrictions on engines that apply to the smallest of jet aircraft engines are applying to the engines on the 747?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The FAA has published a "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking," on noise certification, in accordance with congressional action at the last session, I believe. It is in the proposal stage at the present time, as best I remember it. But again, this is not in the area where I would normally be able to answer.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. The Boeing people tell me, and I was in the 747 last November, that their quietness of engine meets all the restrictions and all the regulations that have come out from this committee as the chairman well knows. I did want to make this point to alleviate some fears that even at Dulles and Friendship the 747 will be as quiet as any other plane.

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is comparing the 747, to what other planes?

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I am comparing it to the 727. Would you check that out, sir?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir. I will be glad to attempt to get the answer to that question. Your question is the—

Mr. KUYKENDALL. How would the noise restrictions on the 747 compare to, for instance, the 727 or the DC-8, the Convair, any of the noise levels. I believe the noise level restrictions, are they not, sir, do not have anything to do with the airplanes. They are there.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think that is right.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. In other words, an aircraft engine can just make so much noise, isn't that true?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think that is the plan in the "Notice of Proposed Rule Making," but again, I am not really prepared to answer that in detail. We will submit the information for you.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I understand that the Anglo-French Concorde yesterday made a noise that you could hear for 20 miles.

(The following information was received for the record:)

NOISE LEVELS OF VARIOUS SIZE AIRCRAFT

On January 3, 1969, the FAA issued Notice No. 69-1 (34 F.R. 453; January 3, 1969), proposing noise standards to implement Public Law 90-411. No final regulations have been issued. Based on estimates using the noise standards proposed in Notice No. 69-1, at the proposed approach certification reference point, the Boeing 747 would be approximately 5 Effective Perceived Noise Level (EPNL) units quieter than the Boeing 727, and approximately 12 EPNL units quieter

than the Douglas DC-8-55. At the proposed sideline certification reference point, the Boeing 747 would be approximately 3 EPNL units quieter than the Boeing 727, and approximately 7 EPNL units quieter than the Douglas DC-8-55. At the proposed takeoff certification reference point, the Boeing 747 would be approximately 6 EPNL units noisier than the Boeing 727, and approximately 9 EPNL units quieter than the Douglas DC-8-55.

When we compare the noise exposure at a specific airport for aircraft that have different maximum certificated takeoff weights, we should consider several factors. First, the aircraft will produce different relative noise levels. Second, using a larger aircraft having greater passenger or cargo capacity may result in fewer landings and takeoffs at the airport, and fewer noise exposures. Third, the range of the aircraft affects its actual operating (as opposed to its maximum certificated) takeoff weight, so that when an operation is for the same distance and the aircraft used is operating at its maximum range, it might takeoff at its maximum weight, while a longer-range aircraft might not. In turn, the longer-range aircraft might produce noise at less than its maximum noise level. Thus, if the Boeing 747 were used for operations up to 2800 nautical miles (the approximate maximum range of the Boeing 727), then the Boeing 747 would be slightly quieter than the Boeing 727 at the proposed takeoff certification reference point.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I have one other question. Washington National is one of the five high density airports which may have to have limitations on the aircraft operations. Do you intend to hold down or cut back on the arrivals and departures at Washington National?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir. We plan to continue present restrictions, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to give you these figures if I may.

On the basis of fiscal year 1967 figures, Washington National Airport ranked sixth in the country, no longer fourth, in air carrier operations. In 1968, it dropped to seventh ranking in the country. At the same time Friendship Airport increased its standing from 24th to 22d. In the monthly and yearly figures—

Mr. FRIEDEL. What did you say Dulles was?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Dulles is now 44th. The previous year it had been 50th in ranking on the basis of air carrier operations alone.

You will be interested in these figures, Mr. Chairman. On the basis of our year-end traffic figures for the calendar year 1968, Washington National Airport showed a decrease for the year in air carrier operations of 1.5 percent. Passengers at Washington National Airport during the calendar year 1968 increased only 6 percent, far less than the increase at either Friendship or Dulles.

For January of this year, the only month that I have available in 1969 to date, total operations at Washington National by the scheduled airlines declined 6.9 percent, so the restrictions—

Mr. FRIEDEL. What was the basis for the decline?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Because of the restrictions, Mr. Chairman. I have outlined the number of flights per hour and the other restrictions. In the same period, I might add, Mr. Chairman, Friendship Airport has shown great growth. According to our information, again calendar year 1968, while passengers at National increased only 6.2 percent, passengers at Friendship International Airport increased 17.8 percent.

Mr. FRIEDEL. How about Dulles?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Dulles increased at a lesser rate, about 15 percent, as I recall.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. While I would agree with you, Mr. Saunders, on your percentages, an increase of 6 percent on the volume at National is much much greater than an increase of even 10 or 20 percent of the volume at Dulles and Friendship. You would agree with that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATSON. Although the percentage is not quite so impressive, when you have got one airport already overloaded and there are so many passengers, a smaller increase exerts a lot more pressure than a greater increase in other areas. Would that not be a correct statement?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The point I would emphasize still is the rate of growth at National appears to be half, or less, than the other two airports over a period of time, the last year and a half or so.

Mr. WATSON. Yes, 6 percent at National——

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is still substantial.

Mr. WATSON. It is still far greater than a 17 percent growth increase at Dulles?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Right.

Mr. WATSON. That is the point we are trying to make.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Is it not true, in line with this, that you as the FAA in running these airports, your regulations control airplanes, not the number of passengers. You control the number of airplanes and the number of wheels and engines and wings, but not the number of people, so the number of airplanes that come in, I believe you said you showed a slight decrease, that is your area. That is your bailiwick, right?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Passengers, you have no control over at all.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is right.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Watson, one further point is that as the airlines convert more and more to all jet equipment (and we now have seven airlines at Washington National all jet), the percentage of jets will increase at National, Dulles, and Friendship, all over the country.

For example, 3 years ago, the percentage of jets at National was 16.2 percent. Now, the percentage of jets is about 72.5 percent. This trend will continue because of the great efficiency, economy, and attractiveness of jet aircraft.

Mr. FRIEDEL. On that thought, Mr. Saunders, Lockheed and others are planning air buses that will hold anywhere from 250 to 300 passengers. Will this type of plane be allowed to land at Washington National?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, sir, not according to the present policy. They would come within the two and three-engine restriction. But we have added to the restriction banning four-engine jets, the additional proviso that the smaller jets (which opened up jet service at National) would be the only ones permitted.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I am asking particularly about the 250 and 300-passenger jets.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The present policy——

Mr. FRIEDEL. As to those jets?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The present policy would prevent them.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The present policy. I am hoping they live up to that.

Mr. WATSON. Will the able chairman yield at that point? Mr. Saunders, as a safety matter, this new jet does not require as much runway, although it has as great capacity as the present jet as I understand it, is that not correct?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATSON. And if we want to eliminate the congestion at Washington National, it would appear to me that we would be at least looking at the possibility of bringing in a plane which has a greater load capacity but operating on shorter runways. In other words, we can reduce the number of flights. That is where the problem that we have now is. We have got 100 planes around in the air, as these control tower people tell us.

Does that not make sense?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, sir, I would not see it quite that way, Mr. Watson. The problem in the air involves no issue of safety. It does involve delays, of course, but it does not involve any issue of safety.

The part that we worry about is the congestion on the ground, and the capacity of the parking lot, of the roadways and of the baggage and passenger handling facilities.

Mr. WATSON. And Mr. Saunders, if you have a larger load capacity, you reduce the congestion on the ground?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No.

Mr. WATSON. Would that not follow?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, sir, because the ability of Washington National Airport now to handle 10 million passengers is based on an even flow, at the present rate of deplaning passengers. To have a larger number of deplaning passengers at various times would tend to stop the flow, and to congest the whole operation. This would slow things down.

With the present mix and, I might add, with some \$13 million worth of improvements which the airlines have put in at their own expense at National, you are able to keep the flow of passengers going without interruption generally, except for very high passenger days. But we feel this would not be so if larger aircraft were involved and you had the people going in and out in larger bunches.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Pickle?

Mr. PICKLE. May I ask a question at this point? How many other witnesses do we have this morning?

Mr. FRIEDEL. None.

Mr. PICKLE. Well then, Mr. Chairman, may I proceed for additional questions of Mr. Saunders?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. PICKLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to appear to be out of order by referring back to the bill, Mr. Chairman, but if I may I would like to ask Mr. Saunders for some general information. As I understand it, when the FAA wants to spend funds on a particular project that is primarily of an emergency nature, one, if you can, you put it in the appropriation bill for that year, and you list it as line items of work to be done at X places.

Second, you cannot anticipate always on an annual appropriation basis what is going to be needed, particularly of an emergency nature. You have a contingency fund or a general fund from which you can either reprogram or reshuffle your funds and use it for these emergencies that you have reference to here.

Now if that is generally the procedure you use, I assume that at no point do you come before this committee to ask for authorization for the expenditure of those funds but rather to the Appropriations Committee to say "We need to do this."

If that is correct, at any point do you notify this committee of the expenditures that are made and for what purpose, other than the general review, congressional review procedure that we have?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Pickle, as far as I can remember, I do not think we have been asked to appear before this committee on this topic before, no, sir.

Mr. PICKLE. My question then would follow, how would the FAA feel about a procedure that would at least be informational or notification to this committee of expenditures of a certain amount for certain items, other than waiting for the end of the year and sometimes even 2 years when you review what you actually have accomplished, or how the money was spent?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Pickle, consistent with the appropriation process, and with the jurisdiction of committees, and complying with whatever the wish of Congress is, we will be glad to appear to discuss our plans when the time is appropriate and when it is possible for us to do so.

Mr. PICKLE. I think that would be in order some time when appropriation matters are being reviewed, but the point I want to get to, would you think it would be agreeable to the FAA that this committee be notified through the Appropriations Committee or directly by you of the expenditures of funds for purposes that would be classified as of an emergency nature?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Pickle, since this involves not only a budget question—and our Director of Budget is not here—but also the policy of a new administrator, I would ask to defer on that question now, and perhaps submit the answer to you later. I do not feel I can answer the question at the present time.

(The information requested was not available to the committee at the time of printing.)

Mr. PICKLE. Thank you.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Do you want to yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Watson.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman yields.

Mr. Saunders, I appreciate the tremendous job and responsibility that you have, and I am in hearty accord, but there are two or three things that I would like to get clear in my mind. How many of these in excess of \$50,000 emergency projections, in quotes, have arisen over or would you say would arise during the calendar year or the fiscal year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think they would be relatively few in number, Mr. Watson.

Mr. WATSON. We are not talking about many at all. What has been our experience in the past, say over the past 5 years? How many of these projects have you had that you did not specifically anticipate?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Approximately 11 for National, and perhaps five for Dulles.

Mr. WATSON. Or the past 5 years?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Over the past 4 or 5 years.

Mr. WATSON. Now so that the record might be clear on this point, let us reduce the percentages we are talking about and increases in traffic to numbers. As I recall, you state that Dulles is handling about 2 million per year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, that is right.

Mr. WATSON. And Washington—that is passengers?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Passengers.

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. In and out.

Mr. WATSON. In and out?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATSON. And Washington National is handling about 10 million per year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. And you said there has been an increase of about 6 percent in Washington National?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. My math, and I never was too good at it, would show that that would mean an increase of 600,000 at Washington National?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. And your 17 percent increase at Dulles would only be an increase of 340,000, so still you have approximately double the increase at Washington National which is already highly congested. Is that not a fair statement, or would my math not be correct?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The math sounds correct to me, Mr. Watson. That would be right.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Will you yield?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Did we not develop that FAA has no control over passengers. The actual number of commercial aircraft transactions in and out went down, is that correct?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is right.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. What you control went down?

Mr. WATSON. If the gentleman—

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I think we ought to get it on the record here and make it very clear that this gentleman has nothing to do with the number of passengers that come in and out of the airport.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman from South Carolina did not mean even to imply that Mr. Saunders had anything to do with passengers. I think he missed the point. The point I was trying to make is that Mr. Saunders tried to impress upon us, or at least he impressed upon me, the fact that the problem is handling the passenger. That is the point I was trying to make, and yet we have almost double the increase in passengers in Washington National, which is already in desperate need of some new passenger facilities there. I think we will all agree, and that is the point I was trying to make. I am not suggesting for a moment that you get into the field, but I believe we had better be addressing ourselves to that particular problem. We cannot just come up and say, well, the increase is 17 percent at Dulles and only 6 percent at Washington National, because in passengers the percentages belie the true facts as to the aggravation of the problem that is existing. That is the point that I am trying to make, and I hope we will be addressing ourselves to that problem.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not—I know we are going to let the witness go—I wonder if we could not at least ask the gentleman to try to work with us in differentiating what you call a true emergency. As much as I fly in and out of Washington National, I do not think you should even wait 5 minutes to fix up that row of lights out there, whether you have our permission or not. I want you to fix that row of lights because I fly in on them, and I want to make that understood, with or without our permission.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. But I think you should anticipate the influx of increasing baggage and this type of thing. I think that certainly would be anticipated. I cannot call that an emergency. So it would seem to me that in justice to this committee, Mr. Chairman, that we could ask the gentleman to separate between true emergencies and types of things. I think a damaged runway or that type of thing is a true emergency.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Let me make a little statement. I am not wedded to \$50,000 on anything. What I want to do, the purpose of my bill is this—to have the FAA come before this committee and get the authorization without bypassing us. Now I really think that rapid ground transportation to Dulles and Friendship would have been a better study than to spend \$300,000 to be advised we should spend \$200 million more to modernize Washington National. We have a big, big airport out there at Dulles, and they can handle the 747 or anything imaginable right there. What I want the FAA to do is to come before our committee and get the authorization, and then go to the Appropriations Committee and if they say it is OK, they will give it to them. They might want to cut it further. This is the purpose of the bill, and I think the committee ought to be notified and briefed on and asked for what they would really need for the coming year. This is nothing new. But this committee should know what the funds are that are needed for next year and the year after, come before the committee and let us know.

Are there any other questions?

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Devine.

Mr. DEVINE. Just as a comment, I can understand the chairman's position, and I would agree that the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should have jurisdiction or at least have knowledge of what is anticipated by the Federal Aviation Administration. I am not sure, however, that this bill is the vehicle to accomplish this. It would seem to me that we should call in the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and make clear what this committee expects. I do not think legislation is necessary.

Mr. FRIEDEL. If it is not necessary it is OK with me but I think we ought to be informed and know what they want to do, what they are asking for each year.

Mr. DEVINE. I think it can be done without this being the vehicle by which it is done.

Mr. FRIEDEL. As I said, I am not wedded to this particular bill.

Are there any other questions?

Thank you, Mr. Saunders.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The meeting now stands adjourned.
(The following letter was received for the record:)

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1969.

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, Committee on Inter-
state and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to the notice given by the Committee dated February 26, 1969, that public hearings will be held on March 4, 1969, on H.R. 2668, a bill "to provide that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall not undertake certain projects to improve or expand Federal airports without specific authorization for such projects." The notice permits little time for study of the bill and preparation of comments; however, we would request that the following comments on the proposed legislation be made a part of the record of the public hearing and that your Subcommittee consider the comments in its deliberations on H.R. 2668.

The Air Line Pilots Association is strongly opposed to H.R. 2668 and urges that the bill not be favorably reported.

If enacted into law, H.R. 2668 would require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to have specific authorization by an Act of Congress before he could undertake any project costing \$50,000 or more to improve or expand any airport owned and operated by the Federal Government and under his control. This would prevent the Administrator from reprogramming appropriation activities at these airports in response to unexpected or emergency conditions requiring immediate construction or maintenance for safe aircraft operations, if the activity cost \$50,000 or more and improved the airport. For example, if a flood or other natural disaster, or a fire should render unusable a runway or any airport facility required for safe operations at the airport, it would be necessary for corrective action to be specifically authorized by an Act of Congress. Also, if a new device such as a fog dispersal system is perfected that would improve the safety and efficiency of operations at these airports, Congress would have to authorize the installation of such an improvement by a specific Act if the improvement cost more than \$50,000.

We believe the purpose and need for the legislation is not clear. However, it is evident that the proposed legislation would result in greater delays than we have witnessed in the past with regard to the installation of equipment and construction of facilities necessary to safe airline operations at Federal airports under the Administrator's control. Moreover, we are firmly convinced that projects such as runway grooving, the installation of an additional ILS, the construction of a building necessary to provide adequate aircraft maintenance, etc., improve the safety of aircraft operation at airports and should be completed without the delays that would be required by a system whereby the Administrator can only undertake projects that have not only been programmed by him, but must have been specifically authorized and funded by the Congress. Unnecessary delay of these projects would compromise the safe and efficient air transportation of passengers and crews who fly in and out of the airports.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. RUBY, *President.*

(Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.)

(Further hearings were tentatively set for later in the session but because of other legislative demands time did not permit.)



