

I would be less than candid if I did not say to you that I see no short-term instantaneous areas of substantial improvement; on the contrary, at most locations aircraft noise nuisance will become somewhat worse before it starts to improve.

Could you expand on that?

Mr. BRUNELLE. Yes. I think it is in my opinion a fair statement. We are approaching noise abatement in three areas now in our opinion. Land, of course, compatible land use adjacent to the airport we think is long-term and perhaps the one that will give us the most relief. We then go to design technological changes and we have stated that in the operational changes we cannot give any more relief operationally.

So that, we are looking at the other two for relief, and we know that compatible land use is a long, long thing, and it will take years and years to reach fruition. We see no technological advances or substantial ones before the seventies.

Mr. SPRINGER. What do you see in the seventies?

Mr. BRUNELLE. Somewhat quieter engines in the neighborhood of six to seven PNdB's noise rating. Six or seven. This will be due to a higher bypass ratio engine, nacelle designs that will help somewhat, but this is well downstream.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, you can remember back when we had hearings several years ago in which we told FAA on any future airports that community construction had to be taken into consideration. You are familiar with that?

Mr. BRUNELLE. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. They are following that now. The only trouble is that you have had big airports already there, before we made that statement. I mean that there will be no more airports, and I checked on this, in areas built up; but that doesn't do us any good with reference to O'Hare which was already here or to Kennedy which was already here.

I am somewhat more concerned about the supersonic which you will be operating probably in 10 years at least. We had a feature which I understand is built into Boeing's contract on noise. But we don't have anything on sonic boom.

This committee completely misunderstood General McKee, I think, because I didn't at all separate noise from sonic boom in my questioning of him at the time with reference to whether or not in the contract was a built-in clause that noise had to be taken into consideration.

Now, I understand over at Transportation that the contract doesn't do anything about sonic boom at all. I wish I had known that because I didn't in my life dream that you were going to separate sonic boom from aircraft noise and that sonic boom was not a part of noise.

This has disturbed me a great deal to know that we are proceeding here with an airplane which is going to have all this wrapped up in it and nothing in what the committee I am sure understood to a man included all noise, not just the question of aircraft landing and takeoff noise, but all noise. Here we are at this point. I can assure you that nothing like this will ever happen again, but we are at this point in history now where I am wondering what the future supersonic is going to be under these circumstances.

I believe that is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.