

additional benefits to noise abatement. This would include the acquisition of land or land interests needed to resolve any residual noise problem remaining after all possible aircraft technological improvements were made. Such a fund should be created out of one or more of the following sources: taxes on aircraft and fuel, cargo, or an additional ticket tax. The Administration of such an Airport Trust Fund should be in the Federal Aviation Administration, and distribution of such funds would be on the present area/population, discretionary basis of the Federal Airport Act.

We hope this brief review of the aircraft noise problem will assist you in understanding its scope, the sincere interest of the AOCI Membership in helping to resolve the problem, and the need for prompt Federal participation to stimulate and ensure necessary action.

We appreciate this opportunity of presenting our views to you. If we may be of further assistance or if you have specific questions we may assist with, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

E. THOS. BURNARD,
Executive Vice President.

[Attachment A]

1. Changes in runway/taxiway layout

The most often used method of noise abatement through runway/taxiway layout changes is an extension of a runway. This has been done at a number of places where the terrain and the costs have made it feasible. By the use of such extensions, the aircraft can start their take-off farther from the noise-sensitive areas and thus attain greater altitude immediately upwind of the airport. Under some circumstances we have used displaced thresholds for landing and thus alleviated approach noise.

Other actions taken by airport operators have included the construction of new runways essentially to accommodate increased traffic but planned as to alignment with airport neighbors in mind. We have abandoned runways, we have abandoned plans to build certain runways, and we have alternate runway layouts.

Within limits, these measures have produced useful results. They are costly measures, however, and only a part of these costs are financed by the Federal Aid to Airports programs.

2. Designated areas for engine maintenance runups

A very common practice among airport operators is the designation of specific areas on the airport where engine maintenance runups may take place. These generally take the form of shielded or remote areas for runups which may vary for day or night operations. The latter usually requires the use of noise suppressors.

3. Preferential runways

Another common practice of airport operators is participation with the Federal Aviation Agency and the airlines in the development of a preferential runway system. Implementation is usually through an Operation's Letter by the FAA which designates the runways by order of preference under certain wind conditions. Exceptions are always made when in the judgment of the pilot the use of the preferred runway will jeopardize safety, or when in the opinion of the Tower Supervisor, a hazard could be created.

Related to the general subject of preferential runways are agreements worked out among the airports, the FAA and the airlines regarding preferred flight paths over industrial or noninhabited areas after take-off or prior to approach to land.

Visual markers, such as beacons, have also developed, and additional visual guidance to the runways is provided to help keep the pilots on appropriate courses and approach paths.

All of these measures rely, to a high degree, on the human factor—the pilots and the controllers. And being human, the effectiveness of these measures is only as good as the willingness and ability of those involved to follow them.

4. Maximum noise limits

In the United States, only in the New York areas has a maximum noise limit on present aircraft at a given point off the airport been established and enforced by an airport operator. Among the reasons for this anomaly are the high degree of