

effect on the public and you are from the small jet people and, therefore, can perhaps break some of these out for us.

Isn't there a difference in noise effect between what we refer to as the noise around the airport, the immediate landing and taking off which can be handled by land use techniques, and the noise that causes the greatest amount of trouble in a city area which is the approach of the aircraft or this thing you referred to as going into the daisy chain of the aircraft under "a lot of power at a low altitude for long segments over the city."

Doesn't that have to be controlled not by land use techniques, but by air traffic control techniques?

Mr. WOODS. Yes, sir. I think everything you say is very true in my opinion. I think sometimes it is hard to say that we accomplish this phase of the program via flight procedure and that phase of the program via land use and draw a hard line between them.

Mr. ADAMS. What I wanted to know is this: I happen to favor the land use technique for the end of the runways and for a limited area there, but you can't with land use concepts attack the problem of over city traffic that is basically the problem for example at Washington National where you have jets flying over the city at low altitudes with flaps down, gear down often and under almost full thrust before making their approach.

That has to be handled by a traffic control technique; is that correct?

Mr. WOODS. Yes, sir. This would be traffic control technique; to a small degree we think flight procedures; and also to a very large degree H.R. 3400 and the benefits that it would bring to us.

Mr. ADAMS. If we pass H.R. 3400, what is going to happen if the FAA decides that, in order to avoid a daisy chain operation at the places where we have the most trouble such as LaGuardia, O'Hara, Los Angeles International, and Washington National, that we not land any jets that don't have compatible equipment at those close-in airports and jam the commercial jets which produces a daisy chain operation.

Mr. FRIEDEL. You mentioned LaGuardia. Did you mean Kennedy Airport?

Mr. ADAMS. Well, Kennedy, yes, but a little different problem. I am using LaGuardia as an example because I have been informed that it is 80 percent general aviation at the present time.

I want to know whether or not it is going to be possible as these jam up to allow all equipment in. I think your equipment will probably fit. What I am talking about is the sort of thing that has been done in Paris at Le Bourget where you require compatible electronic equipment and two pilots in order to land at these airports.

Mr. WOODS. Sir; it is a very complicated question.

Mr. ADAMS. It is very difficult for you, I know.

Mr. WOODS. Could I take a couple of pieces of it and would you be good enough to give me again the points that I missed?

Mr. ADAMS. All right.

Mr. WOODS. Yes, sir. We think that there is certainly some merit to the idea of compatible equipment particularly in the very densely congested airport. We feel and have stated in our airport policy that we think this is reasonable and that this is rational.

We don't envision it as having too much significance in connection