

thrust setting we will make at first thrust reduction, and we haven't arrived at that one yet.

I don't know whether I have answered your question or not. I think I have skated around it.

Mr. ADAMS. You just indicated in your statement and with the questioning of Mr. Devine that you had apparently an evolving situation and that you weren't satisfied with what was happening out of Washington National, and I wanted to know how you were flying out of Washington National today and how you are suggesting that you should be able to fly.

Mr. BRUNELLE. The procedure today is closer to what we would like. If we used a rather broad interpretation, we could perhaps almost fit it into the existing language that they now have, but this has been a fairly recent change.

Mr. ADAMS. Are you talking about jet or piston or both?

Mr. BRUNELLE. Well, the piston we have very little trouble with. I mean it's a noisy airplane, but there is just so much that you can do with that. It is a matter of getting if off. I don't think we have the complaints, certainly not from the approach on piston that we would from jet.

Mr. ADAMS. I am sorry Mr. Springer left because I was going to indicate that I didn't agree with his statement that we didn't know about sonic boom as opposed to noise. As I remember, we spent the better part of a morning trying to define the two, and as I understand it, and you can correct me if I am wrong, we have no technological ability to change the effect of sonic boom at the present time as opposed to suppression of engine noises or noise at airports, isn't that correct?

Mr. BRUNELLE. I think that is a correct statement; yes.

Mr. ADAMS. I understand that the reason why it wasn't put into the contract was that nobody wanted to contract on a presently impossible situation at least at a development stage.

Now I would like also to ask you one final thing. You indicated there were three ways of trying to approach noise abatement: (1) the compatible land use, (2) design and technological changes, and (3) operational changes.

What is your feeling as to the practicality of not just compatible land use but the establishment of corridors, approach and landing corridors, to the major airports? With the increase in power and the type of equipment we have now is this feasible?

I just would mention that in my opinion the problem in the past has been the requirement of taking off into the wind which changes from time to time so a number of variable runways are required for taking off. Therefore the building of corridors practically meant that you had to have a compatible land use in a circle around an airport.

I am asking you, with the changes in power and so on, is it feasible to have limited corridors that we might possibly be able to purchase around the major airports?

Mr. BRUNELLE. Well, I think we are utilizing corridors at National using the Potomac River. I think this would be an example. It hasn't proved too effective at National.

If the corridor perhaps were wider, it might, but I think there you are getting into more land acquisition than you would normally ex-