altitudes, and the slower, piston airplanes operate more efficiently at the lower altitudes. We do have a great deal of natural segregation there.

Generally within the United States, over 80 percent of the traffic is under 12,000 feet, and travels distances less than 250 miles. Most of the jets operate between 25,000 to 40,000 feet, and turbines generally at 12,000 to 30,000.

Of course, this runs out, because they all must use the lower airspace. They all must come down to an airport and leave an airport. We get the mixing in the lower airspace.

Another type of segregation is by airport. Less than 10 percent of the traffic at JFK, for example, is general aviation, and most of that 10 percent is air carrier oriented; that is, it is air taxi, bringing passengers to and from the airlines, or corporate aircraft bringing them to and from the airlines. Of course, this changes character as the community size decreases.

For example, at Asheville, 64 percent of the traffic is general aviation, and when you get to a place like Rockford, Ill., 95 percent of it would be general aviation.

This natural segregation isn't absolute nor does it operate when the weather is good, because all the aircraft operate in the lower airspace. Our present policy is to combine the rules of the road with the necessary ground control as appropriate. As a matter of fact, despite the lack of radar in a great many locations served by airlines, about 90 percent of the passengers are served at locations where we do have airport radar available.

There are many reasons that are advanced for seeking some segregation between general aviation and the air carrier operations. These, I think, can be divided between economic reasons and safety reasons. Among the economic reasons that I would cite is that we get complaints that light aircraft should not use the runways and delay airline aircraft filled with passengers. Here, if control is adequate, and it is our attempt to see that it is, the question is one of delay and economics rather than one of safety.

Another economic reason advanced frequently is that these are very expensive runways, long ones for jets, and they perhaps should not be used by small aircraft because they do not need all this runway capacity. But, again, this is economic rather than safety.

When one looks at the safety aspects, I think one would not look at the character of use as to whether it is general aviation, military, or air carrier. One would look to the capability of the aircraft.

For example, a 4-engine Jetstar flown by two ATR pilots would operate at substantially the same speed, use the same runway, and so forth, as a 727. From a safety viewpoint, you simply could not distinguish one from the other. If one also considers that our forecast in the next 10 years is that we foresee about 8,000 turbine aircraft in the general aviation fleet and about 3,500 turbine aircraft in the air carrier fleet, it looks to us like the business fleet will be larger in terms of the number of jet aircraft than will the airlines.

So I think one would look toward equipment, capability, or something other than the character of use.

There are, of course, many solutions to the problem. One solution would be, perhaps, that we would provide more airports which would