

our taking the time to again monitor the control frequencies used by the FAA in handling the O'Hare traffic. We did a considerable amount of this prior to the testimony we gave before the committee several years ago. We find that while they are somewhat more considerate of people on the ground by holding to higher altitudes and allowing slightly higher aircraft speeds, their primary responsibility of handling traffic consumes their full time. We feel this is as it should be. This is their job and they are doing it well.

To ask them to compromise the job they are doing to consider evaluation of present practices from a noise abatement point of view is really asking them to serve two conflicting purposes. At the time we testified before the committee, we were told to pass ordinances at the local level to control noise. The principal of whether a city has the right to legislate to control pollution by noise or noxious gases to protect the health and welfare of its citizens had not been tested in the courts at the time we were before the committee. It was the opinion of the members of the committee that cities did have that right. It was the opinion of the FAA that Congress had taken that right away from the cities and vested it in the FAA. Based on this difference of opinion the cities of Park Ridge, Ill., and Hempstead, N.Y., passed ordinances to control noise level. Park Ridge has held the enforcement of their ordinance up pending the outcome of the Hempstead case. Hempstead lost their case. So apparently in the eyes of at least one court, Congress did take away the right of citizens to control trespasses against their health and welfare. It is our opinion that Congress should consider this matter in light of the more recent thinking on matters concerning people's rights. It is a dangerous precedent to take away the rights of people to protect themselves by local legislation, and vest this power in an appointed agency with no direct responsibility to the people.

There is a further responsibility that the Congress should consider in this matter. The cities of Park Ridge and Hempstead spent considerable time and money in establishing a reasonable compromise between what people could stand and what aircraft could accomplish in the matter of actual Db noise levels. These noise levels were actually too high for people on the ground to live with comfortably. They were established based on the noise levels of first generation jet aircraft. Present aircraft could operate reasonably at even lower levels than those established. We feel that Congress should establish the rights of cities to control both noise and partially burned hydrocarbon pollutants with limits established at reasonable and attainable levels.

Very truly yours,

JAMES D. COLE, *President.*

Hon. FRED B. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

BETHLEHEM, PA., January 16, 1968.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: A few nights ago, about 3:30 a.m., my wife and I awoke to what sounded like an explosion. We checked our children's room immediately to see if all was in order there. I then checked out the rest of our home, with special emphasis on the furnace and gas hot water. Everything appeared in order and so we tried to go to sleep, still not knowing the cause of the "explosion". Only the next day did we learn that many others had been similarly awakened and that the cause was not within our home. It was the result of the shock wave set up by a supersonic overflight (apparently by a military plane).

I feel that this incident is an example of what may be a common occurrence for us if the supersonic transport (SST) is built and allowed to fly over our area. I find the idea of such a future very disturbing. I realize most of our past advances in civilization, including transportation, have had to come at some expense to the population, or at least some portion of the population. While it undoubtedly may be argued that the population will get used to sonic booms and that this is a worthwhile price to pay for the SST, I certainly feel differently at this time and will continue to do so until convincing evidence of the elimination of the sonic boom is presented. I cannot imagine that the saving of a little flight time and the possible slight reduction in cost of transporting goods is at all commensurate with the psychological, physiological, and material damage to the