

major hubs and a majority of them have serious noise problems. Without these major hub airports, there is no national air transport system. In fact, the problem of aircraft noise has reached such proportions that the Fifth Air Navigation Conference of the International Civil Aviation Organization meeting in Montreal in December 1967, attended by 61 nations and 5 international organizations, adopted as part of its Recommendation 7/5:

"That

(i) substantially quieter aircraft be made available and introduced into service as soon as possible;

(ii) for the above purpose a system of aircraft noise certification (as suggested at the "International Conference on the Reduction of Noise and Disturbance Caused by Civil Aircraft", London 1966) (the London Noise Conference) is urgently needed."

While purporting to support the idea of the regulation and control of aircraft noise through a Federal program of aircraft certification, the Air Transport Association has decided not to support the legislation (H.R. 3400 and S707) which would establish such a program. It suggests instead legislation that empowers and directs the Federal Aeronautics Administration only, in Mr. Stephen's words: "to prescribe and amend reasonable standards for the measurement of aircraft noise and sonic boom..."

Certainly we need better standards for the measurement of aircraft noise, but we need as well to have the Administrator empowered to set maximum limits for the noise aircraft can make in populated areas. Such powers are provided in H.R. 3400 and S707.

And finally, Mr. Stephen would have the certification for noise apply only to aircraft not now in the fleet, in production or on the drawing boards. Since the principal aircraft projected for fleet service through 1990 are all in one category or the other, Federal noise legislation would have no practical effect for nearly 25 years. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe either the people around our airports or, indeed, the aviation industry itself, can wait that long.

I trust that these comments are useful to the Committee in its deliberations on H.R. 3400. The Port Authority commends it to the Congress as, I am sure, do the millions of people from coast to coast, who live within "hearing" distance of our American airports.

Sincerely,

AUSTIN J. TOBIN, *Executive Director.*

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF AIRPORT EXECUTIVES, INC.,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1967.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are greatly encouraged by the leadership you have demonstrated by the scheduling of hearings on H.R. 3400.

Our members, the professionals who manage the nation's airports, have been on the front line of the aircraft noise battle for years. They are the ones who have borne the brunt of the neighborhood complaints and who have been expected to provide quick solutions to the problem. Many of them have made diligent efforts to protect airport approaches, prevent residential encroachment, promote aircraft noise abatement procedures, and provide additional facilities to remove the noise from sensitive areas.

They realize that these efforts have in most cases accomplished, at best, temporary relief; also that the noise problem rather than improving is worsening due to increased flight frequencies and aircraft weights. They are convinced that the basic solution lies in the aircraft itself; that until quieter aircraft are produced and operated, only limited progress will be made. This is why they consider Federal legislation, authorizing the FAA to establish noise emission criteria as part of the aircraft certification program, is the basic answer to the noise dilemma.

Present aircraft noise is affecting airport capacities. Airports, because of aircraft noise, are now considered as undesirable neighbors with consequent community resistance to airport expansion or new sites. Communities that have conscientiously planned to provide noise buffer zones have been frustrated as