

pect to have around an airport. We feel that using, getting the property adjacent to the airport and then perhaps with the technological advances that might come with the higher descent rates, it might perhaps be a better long-range answer to the problem, but at the present time, I think perhaps we will have to resort to corridors.

Mr. ADAMS. You see what our problem is, in a breakthrough, to try to determine. If, for example, the Congress is to provide matching funds to the local communities for the obtaining of land and that is the proposal that is presently being discussed to buy land for noise abatement as opposed to buffer zones for safety. These corridors could be used for such things as noise abatement and so on.

I think we all will agree that most of the major airports were built or at least many of them were built at a time when there was not a buildup around them.

I know, for example, when JFK was built it was way outside of the populated area. The same, I know, is true of the airports in the district that I represent. People have moved in around them. I don't have a great deal of sympathy for people who have participated in this type of movement, and now complain of the noise.

We have now had the first set of cases on condemnation in effect or the payment required by local airports for annoyance caused by flights over land and the courts have held that if you moved into it, your rights were less than, of course, if it moved in on you.

Therefore, there is an area where we can do a considerable amount of purchasing at the present time at a price that will be less now than it will be 15 or 20 years in the future. That is what I am asking you.

Is this a direction that we should be considering moving? For example, 50 percent matching funds on a corridor 3 miles out from the end of certain established runways would then qualify for Federal funds. I am not advocating it. I am asking you.

Mr. BRUNELLE. I think that would be an excellent move for long term alleviation of the noise problem.

Mr. ADAMS. Gentlemen, do you have any further questions?

Mr. DEVINE. I had just one.

I am aware, of course, of the regulations adopted by FAA on, say, Washington National. Now, does either approach control or departure control tell you what to do when you are coming in or taking off as far as elevation and glide path and angle of descent and angle of climb-out or is this pretty much up to you as the captain of the ship?

Mr. BRUNELLE. Well, they do advise us on initial contact when we get our clearance, ATC clearance, that we are to proceed via noise abatement procedures and as to the mechanics of the procedure, it is then up to us to abide by it.

Mr. DEVINE. Within the limitations—

Mr. BRUNELLE (continuing). Of the airplane and perhaps the turbulence or something that might require a little more airspeed than the procedure might call for. We are given this latitude.

Mr. DEVINE. You could determine whether to drag it in, dump it in, or flair out?

Mr. BRUNELLE. No, I didn't mean to go quite that far. We have latitude within reason. We can't, for instance, come down the Potomac River Valley at 300 feet from the Chain Bridge. Certainly the FAA