

County airports. An adequate airport of such type can be built today for the price equivalent of *one* mile of four-lane expressway for each runway required. Most such secondary airports would be more than adequate with two runways.

4. Establish a program whereby non-essential pleasure flying and student training, usually done in the vicinity of airports, be conducted away from the traffic areas of major airports. The secondary airport program suggested above could do much to bring this about.

5. Relocate all military air operations from busy metropolitan areas. There are plenty of military airports that are now inactive to provide bases for military operations.

6. Recently FAA announced intentions of controlling VFR flights above 18,000 feet. This is fine, except the problem is between the ground and 10,000 feet. A check of the records will reveal that the collisions or near misses have all been at low altitudes. To fly above 10,000 feet requires oxygen equipped or pressurized aircraft which represents a very small percentage of registered aircraft. Let's get to the "scene of the crime."

7. Of great importance is the need to quit looking at the problem as one being associated with the commercial airlines. The commercial airlines represent only about 2% of the registered aircraft in the country. Also, it is the most sophisticated aircraft, operated by highly qualified pilots, under strict procedures. Yet, they become involved in midair collisions because of the system under which they must operate. The other 98% of the aircraft and pilots have the same right to air safety as do the airlines. We do not make special rules or enact special vehicle codes or build special highways for buses, and we should not attempt to give preferential treatment to airlines. We must improve air safety for *all* aircraft, and only then will the solution to the problem be forthcoming.

My apology for another long epistle, but I hope it will serve to stimulate someone to get the F.A.A. to *do something* other than take a defensive position. Actually, the F.A.A. is a fine organization of capable people, faced with an overwhelming problem. They need *help* not *hell*. They will learn that many people will help when they come out of their shell and quit behaving as though the problems and solutions were their exclusive prerogatives.

It is my understanding that Congressional hearings are planned to explore this all-important matter. If so I respectfully suggest that the above seven points be covered in the hearings. Perhaps in that way their merits can be determined.

My appreciation of your patience and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. MALLICK,
Vice President, Properties.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Aug. 19, 1967]

AIR SAFETY PROCEDURES NEGLECTED

The public is justified in questioning federal procedures to insure air safety when there have been five major plane accidents so far this year and a number of smaller ones. The latest was the crash of two single-engined craft as they simultaneously approached the same runway in New Hampshire recently.

There are 547 airports in this country served by airlines: 285 have no control towers and 434 lack radar which would provide a means of keeping planes a safe distance. There wasn't any radar at Asheville, N.C., where 82 persons were killed recently.

According to James Ridgeway in the August 5 New Republic, the Federal Aviation Administration, part of the Department of Transportation, is at the root of the problem. The FAA is understaffed and isn't given the money to implement technological advances. Its chief, an ex-Air Force general, William F. McKee, scarcely makes the best of what the FAA has, Ridgeway says.

He cites, for instance, the number of safety requirements that don't apply to air taxis (chartered planes for hire); no requirements for co-pilots, radar, emergency evacuation, or weighing of baggage. McKee has said the government must not place too heavy an economic burden on small operations lest they fail.

When the FAA's budget request was cut this year from \$75 million to \$65 million, the argument in Congress was that since the money was being poorly spent and the amount inadequate to meet the airport crisis, it might as well be trimmed.