

each new aircraft type is bigger and noisier. No intelligent future planning for compatible land use can go forth until a limit on aircraft noise is established and enforced.

Considerable differences will, no doubt, develop on what the specific noise level maxima should be. We urge that enactment of H.R. 3400 not be delayed because of this. We feel confident that if the FAA is given the necessary authority, it subsequently, in concert with industry, can arrive at acceptable levels.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views on this important bill

Very truly yours,

F. R. HOYT, *Executive Director.*

BURLINGTON AIRPORT COMMISSION,
South Burlington, Vt., April 12, 1967.

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

DEAR MR. STAGGERS: The Burlington Airport Commission, as a party to the resolution of the Airport Operators Council International relating to aircraft noise, wishes to advise that they are in complete agreement with the position taken by AOCI and hopes that you will see your way clear to support expeditious achievement of the objectives of the resolution.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. MACKAY, *Clerk.*

RESOLUTION No. 3, ADOPTED AT THE MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE AIRPORT
OPERATORS' COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL, OCTOBER 14, 1966

Whereas, the Airport Operators Council International is deeply concerned about, and recognizes that the Federal certification and resulting use of jet aircraft in interstate commerce has created a serious national aircraft noise problem, and

Whereas, a solution to this problem has become most *urgent* with the expansion of airline service with existing and new jet aircraft and the development of potentially noisier aircraft of the future, including supersonic transports, and

Whereas, the aircraft noise problem cannot be solved at the local governmental level and properly is a subject of national concern by virtue of the Federal statutes defining airspace to be within the public domain and subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government in behalf of all citizens of the United States, and

Whereas, a number of AOCI Members have adopted resolutions calling upon the Federal Government through Congress and the President of the United States to initiate steps towards the solution, and

Whereas, the President of the United States, in his message on Transportation delivered to the United States Congress on March 2, 1966, took cognizance of the aircraft noise problem and the urgent need for its solution in the public interest, and ordered the White House Office of Science and Technology to direct all interested Federal agencies in an action program to solve this problem—including the recommendation of all necessary legislative and administrative actions, and

Whereas, the problem of aircraft noise has been recognized by the Congress, and numerous bills proposing solutions have been introduced: Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Members of the Airport Operators Council International, in meeting assembled, That

1. Aircraft noise is a national problem affecting the national air transportation system and interstate commerce of the United States which must be resolved at the national level;

2. It is imperative that the Congress and the Federal Government of the United States accept responsibility for the control and consequences of aircraft noise because of the Congressional declaration that the airspace is in the public domain, and enact legislation to (a) establish criteria for levels of aircraft noise acceptable to persons on the ground, (b) assure that civil transport aircraft shall meet such standards as a condition to certification for airworthiness, (c) authorize establishment of such rules and regulations applicable to aircraft

operations as may be necessary to conform to such criteria and (d) financially assist municipalities and other public bodies operating airports in obtaining adequate property interests for the acquisition and expansion of public airports necessary for resolving the national aircraft noise problem;

3. With an effective solution of the problem of aircraft noise within reach, AOCI pledges its assistance and support to the achievement of these objectives; and

4. AOCI expresses its appreciation to the President of the United States for actions he already has taken to attack the problem, and urges and enlists his support and that of the United States Congress in the expeditious achievement of these objectives.

BOROUGH OF WOOD-RIDGE,
Bergen County, N.J., December 4, 1967.

Representative HARLEY STAGGERS,
Chairman of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STAGGERS: You will find here a true copy of a resolution passed by the Mayor and Council at the last regular meeting.

We respectfully request that you give its contents your generous consideration.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT I. STOESSER, *Borough Clerk.*

RESOLUTION No. 126

Whereas, an Ad Hoc Committee known as the South Bergen Mayors' Committee on Aircraft Problems has been formed by the Mayors of the Boroughs of Carlstadt, Wallington, Ruthford, Hasbrouck Heights, East Rutherford and Wood-Ridge, and

Whereas, the Mayors of Lyndhurst, Lodi, Moonachie and North Arlington have expressed an interest and a desire to participate in the activities of the said Committee, and

Whereas, the said Committee at a meeting held Friday, October 20, 1967 in the Carlstadt Borough Hall reviewed the numerous complaints received by various officials from South Bergen residents protesting low-flying jet aircraft, and

Whereas, a review of these complaints revealed that numerous jet aircraft have flown over South Bergen Communities in clear weather at altitudes the complaints considered "low" and "dangerous", and

Whereas, several Mayors in attendance at the said meeting reported seeing such aircraft personally, and

Whereas, a review of the traffic patterns indicate that said aircraft probably were making an approach to landing on Runway 22 at Newark Airport, and

Whereas, in both clear and inclement weather, complaints have been made concerning the excessive and disturbing noises caused by jet aircraft reported to be on an approximate course for Runway 22 at Newark Airport; Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Wood-Ridge, That they do herewith protest against the intrusion into the air space immediately above the Borough of Wood-Ridge by jet aircraft flying at altitudes so low as to cause residents to be put in fear and apprehension and suffer from the intensive noises created by such aircraft, and it is further

Resolved by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Wood-Ridge to join with the other communities of Lyndhurst, Lodi, Moonachie, North Arlington, Carlstadt, Wallington, Rutherford, Hasbrouck Heights and East Rutherford in requesting the Federal Aviation Administration, the New York Port Authority, as operators of the Newark Air Terminal, and the Aviation Development Council, to take immediate action to cause such low-flying aircraft to cease and desist from this practice and to require all aircraft to maintain at or above 2000 feet until they reach the instrument landing system outer marker in their approach to Runway 22 at Newark Airport, and to take such further corrective action with regard to the landing pattern of aircraft landing on Runway 22 at Newark Airport, removing insofar as practicable, these aircraft from the air space immediately above the communities involved and moving said aircraft to the east over the Hackensack River Valley; and it is further

Resolved by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Wood-Ridge, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Office of the Secretary of Transportation and request that the jet aircraft noise panel formed therein place the problem of Newark Airport, its approaches, over South Bergen Communities upon its priority list for investigation and action to alleviate the problem of low-flying aircraft over these Communities and the attendant danger and noise created by them; and it is further

Resolved by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Wood-Ridge, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to Congressman Henry Helstoski, Senators Clifford P. Case and Harrison Williams and Representative Harley Staggers, Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and urging the passage of House of Representatives Bill No. 3400 giving the Federal Aviation Administration power to include in aircraft certification procedures jet-engine noise limitations and specifications.

Approved:

FRANCIS X. RIEGER, Mayor.

Attest:

ROBERT I. STOESSER, Borough Clerk.

AIRPORT OPERATORS COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1968.

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRIEDEL: We are submitting the enclosed comments on the draft of noise abatement legislation proposed by the Air Transport Association and later introduced by you as H.R. 14146, to supplement our testimony of November 21. As was stated at the hearing, we had no prior knowledge of the ATA draft bill and were unable to comment on its merits at that time. We appreciate the opportunity to submit our comments for the record.

The ATA's proposal is completely unacceptable to the Members of the Airport Operators Council International. In essence, it would destroy the possibility of effective government control over aircraft noise.

The premise of the ATA proposal is that it would empower the Administrator of the FAA to set standards only for the measurement of aircraft noise and sonic booms. It completely circumvents the intention of the Administration and eliminates the possibility of federal control over aircraft noise during the manufacture and operation of aircraft. Additional details are attached.

In our opinion, to achieve effective federal control over noise at its source, it is necessary for the Department of Transportation/Federal Aviation Administration to have authority to:

- a. Establish aircraft noise measurement standards
- b. Establish criteria for determining acceptable levels of aircraft noise
- c. Develop, apply and enforce standards of acceptable noise levels to present and future aircraft through type certificates, airworthiness certificates and operating certificates.

The ATA bill will not do these things. The Administration bill will. We therefore again urge prompt passage of H.R. 3400.

Sincerely,

E. THOS. BURNARD,
Executive Vice President.

AOCI COMMENTS ON H.R. 14146

Section a of the ATA bill limits the Administrator's authority as follows:

1. Provides standards only "for the measurement of aircraft noise and sonic boom"
2. These measurement standards would be provided only if the Administrator finds such action "necessary and appropriate to encourage progress in aircraft noise abatement"
3. Aircraft type certificates would be required to meet only noise "measurement" standards.

The noise measurement standards proposed by ATA are comparable to posing that a yardstick be developed to measure feet and inches. There is nothing

in their proposal authorizing or requiring the federal government to develop criteria for acceptable levels of noise; or for the application of such criteria to present or future aircraft.

Section "b"

This section dealing with modification or revocation of type certificates is equally ineffective, because in *Section a* the only thing required in the type certificate is compliance with *measurement* standards.

Section "c"

This section completely removes from the authority of the federal government any power to modify *airworthiness* certificates.

Since under the ATA proposal the *type* certificate (which is issued to the manufacturer) had no meaningful requirements in it with respect to noise, the ATA would then preclude government control over the *airworthiness* certificate which the airline must have to prove that the aircraft has met all the safety and noise standards.

Completely absent from the ATA proposal is any requirement that the aircraft be operated in compliance with any standards of acceptable noise levels.

In conclusion, it is the position of the Airport Operators Council International that an aircraft noise bill must be enacted which will authorize the Secretary of the Department of Transportation to:

1. Prescribe and amend standards for the measurement of aircraft noise, and abatement of aircraft noise,
2. Prescribe standards, rules and regulations to provide for the control and abatement of aircraft noise,
3. Apply such standards, rules and regulations to the issuance of *all* aircraft type certificates, *airworthiness* certificates and airline operating certificates, and
4. Amend, modify, suspend or revoke aircraft type certificates, *airworthiness* certificates and operating certificates in order to insure the control and abatement of aircraft noise.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AVIATION OFFICIALS,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1967.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAGGERS: The National Association of State Aviation Officials commends you for scheduling hearings on H.R. 3400 and related bills pertaining to aircraft noise abatement.

Enclosed for your information are several copies of a resolution adopted unanimously by NASAO members during the Association's annual meeting on September 28, 1967. The resolution urges enactment of legislation such as H.R. 3400, which would authorize, and direct the Secretary of Transportation to regulate aircraft certification and operation for noise abatement as well as safety purposes.

During the hearings your Committee is urged to give consideration to the following:

(a) The aircraft, particularly the jet engine, creates the noise and the problem, and therefore should be the prime target in any noise abatement program or regulatory action.

(b) Aircraft noise creates a very serious problem even in communities where there is presently no airport. This occurs when citizens who do not want to be subjected to aircraft noise vote down, or by court or other action, prevent the development of a much needed new airport, or the improvement of one already in existence. This is particularly true in the case of airports to accommodate the general aviation type aircraft, in both small communities and metropolitan areas.

(c) Apparently no practical unit of noise measurement has been developed or adopted which will permit accurate comparison of noise created by civil and military jet powered aircraft—small general aviation piston aircraft—and various types of surface noise. This is essential in order that citizens can be intelligently advised regarding the relative noise levels of various forms of transportation vehicles.

NASAO respectfully recommends favorable consideration and an early report

of H.R. 3400, or similar legislation, by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and enactment by the Congress.

We would appreciate the enclosed resolution being incorporated in the record of the hearings.

Respectfully,

A. B. McMULLEN,
Executive Vice President.

AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT, RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AVIATION OFFICIALS, SEPTEMBER 28, 1967

Whereas, The National Association of State Aviation Officials and its member State Aeronautics Departments and Commissions have a vital interest in the prompt resolution of the aircraft noise problem;

Whereas, The Association's members have determined that the noise created by the operation of some types of aircraft is becoming an ever more serious problem, and of proportions beyond the total solution of local and state governmental units, which causes it to be properly one of national concern;

Whereas, In recognition of the need for aircraft noise abatement, the President of the United States, during March, 1966, directed responsible Federal Departments and agencies to—

“study the development of noise standards and the compatible uses of land near airports;

consult with local communities and industry; and
recommend legislative or administrative actions needed to move ahead in this area”; and

Whereas, An orderly approach to the problem now requires a prompt and thorough evaluation of the effect of aircraft noise on persons and property, an analysis of the means by which aircraft noise annoyance can be reduced to acceptable levels, and the formulation and adoption of a comprehensive integrated program to expeditiously solve the problem in the interest of everyone concerned;

Now, therefore, the National Association of State Aviation Officials,

(1) Urges prompt enactment of S. 707 and H.R. 3400, as legislative vehicles needed to designate responsibility for, and to provide the Department of Transportation specific authority to regulate the certification and operation of aircraft on the basis of noise as well as safety standards;

(2) Recommends to all Federal governmental agencies concerned the immediate establishment, and official adoption of a realistic measurement standard for aircraft noise in perceived noise decibels or other accepted and practical unit of measure;

(3) For the protection of property, and the health and comfort of persons on the earth's surface, urges the Secretary of Transportation to establish noise and sonic boom levels beyond which no aircraft shall operate; and

(4) Further urges the Secretary of Transportation, after soliciting, receiving, and evaluating the views and recommendations of other Federal agencies, State, county, and municipal officials, and industry organizations, to adopt such standards, rules and regulations as will assure compliance with the maximum prescribed and authorized noise and sonic boom levels; and

(5) Directs the Association's Executive Vice President to furnish copies of this resolution to Members of Congress, the President's Science and Technology Advisor, the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Administration and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Secretary of Transportation, and to inquire periodically as to any affirmative action or lack thereof on this matter so as to keep the members of this Association informed concerning the reactions of the recipients of this resolution.

COLE DYNAMICS CORPS,
Elgin, Ill., January 8, 1968.

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. REID: We feel the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should consider establishing the responsibility for aircraft noise monitoring in some agency other than FAA. Our delay in writing you has been in part due to

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 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 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

general population. This saving, in fact, may well be illusory, just as the saving we have gained from massive truck, bus, and automobile transportation is now beginning to be eroded by the vast sums we must spend now and in the future to combat the effects on our health due to air pollution and to control future contributions to this pollution.

There is another aspect of this overflight which I find disturbing. That is the apparent disregard of the military for the civilian population. It may be argued, and rightfully so in some cases, that these annoyances are a small price to pay for the proper defense of our country. On the other hand, there appears to be little consideration of whether or not these acts are in actuality necessary for the defense.

This same lack of concern on the part of aviation, particularly military, comes up occasionally in another more distressing form, for it involves the actual loss of civilian lives. I am referring to the abandonment of disabled aircraft by the pilot and crew. These abandoned aircraft occasionally make headlines, as when they crash into homes or schools. It seems to me that the general population should have the right to expect the pilot of a plane in trouble to make every possible effort to avoid crashing in populated areas, *even if it means riding the plane to earth and sacrificing his own life.* The people of this country give pilots the right to fly over their homes and lands and this is at some cost to their own comfort and convenience, as anyone who lives near an airport may testify. The people thus certainly have the right right to demand the utmost regard for their rights on the part of those who are granted this privilege.

There are three major points I have tried to make in this letter. First, I find the prospect of supersonic transport overflights distressing and I fear the consequences to the general population. I furthermore question the overall desirability of such a program at the present state of the art of controlling sonic booms. Allocation of this money to other programs, such as a program to reduce poverty, to revitalize our cities and towns, and to reduce air and water pollution, might make more sense.

Second, I feel the military ought to be made more directly responsible for their actions against the general population. There should be procedures whereby the military may be called upon to justify their actions. They should be accountable, in the case of this supersonic overflight, to a civilian and should have to justify perpetrating this annoyance on the basis of defense need. From the newspaper accounts, the military presently do not have to justify their actions at all, although a civilian performing the same act is accountable.

Thirdly, I feel it is only right that one of the responsibilities of those gaining the privilege of flying is to protect the population as fully as possible. I feel the law should set severe penalties for those who do not carry out these responsibilities. I further feel that these responsibilities are as rightfully assigned to military pilots as to civilian pilots, and the law should so read.

I would be very much interested in learning your feelings on these matters and in learning what is being considered by Congress pertaining to these questions.

Very truly yours,

SHELDEN H. RADIN.

COMMUNITY PLANS, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 8, 1968.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am taking this opportunity, on behalf of Community Plans, Inc., Westchester-Playa del Rey, to express to you our concerns about aircraft-generated noise and to comment on pending federal noise legislation.

The problem of aircraft-generated noise is reaching critical proportions at Los Angeles International Airport as it is in most areas throughout the country where major airports are located. Passage of federal legislation is a vital first step toward the resolution of this very serious problem.

Your bill H.R. 13919 incorporates items we feel are important in dealing with the overall problem of aircraft noise abatement. We support your efforts to obtain appropriate legislation in this session of congress.

I am enclosing information about Community Plans, Inc., our noise resolution, the Los Angeles City Council's resolution supporting federal legislation, and an editorial from a recent issue of the Los Angeles Times.

Again, we wish to express our support for noise legislation and we would appreciate any suggestions you might have on ways we might further support this effort.

Thank you.

CARL E. NIELSEN, *President.*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED JANUARY 25, 1968, BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMUNITY PLANS, INC., LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Federal noise legislation introduced in the 90th Congress but not yet enacted gives recognition to the serious impact aircraft-generated noise has upon millions of persons who live in close proximity to airports. The area surrounding Los Angeles International Airport, like other areas throughout the country, is adversely affected by aircraft-generated noise and the projected volume increases in air transportation will further intensify this problem.

Community Plans, Inc., Westchester-Playa del Rey recognizes the need for federal legislation to control aircraft-generated noise. By resolution of the Board of Directors on 25 January 1968, Community Plans, Inc., recommends that the following items be included in federal noise control legislation:

Department of Transportation have overall responsibility for administration of noise programs.

Standards for measurement of aircraft noise be established.

Standards for the correlation of aircraft noise with human discomfort be established.

Standards for aircraft noise be used in aircraft certification.

Provide funds to develop methods and devices for noise abatement, both procedural and mechanical.

Provide funds to develop quieter aircraft.

Provide funds for soundproofing public structures that are adversely affected by aircraft noise.

Provide funds for the acquisition of land surrounding an airport where noise levels exceed established standards.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES RESOLUTION ADOPTED FEBRUARY 19, 1968

Whereas, the problem of airport noise is evident at the Los Angeles International Airport and every major airport throughout the United States; and

Whereas, the development and adoption of rules and standards to regulate noise abatement are still pending; and

Whereas, the impact of aircraft-generated noise upon the residents near our airports is increasing in both volume and area and will be intensified by projected aircraft volume; and

Whereas, thirty-five bills prescribing remedial action have been assigned to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and

Whereas, H.R. 3400 and S. 707 authorizes federal rules and standards to regulate aircraft noise abatement; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council urge the Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to schedule this subject for early hearing; and be it further

Resolved, That the City Council urge the adoption of H.R. 3400, S. 707 or similar legislation that will provide an early solution to this problem and that the City Clerk with the assistance of the Chief Legislative Analyst provide David L. Wallerstein, the City's Legislative Representative in Washington, with sufficient copies of this action for distribution to appropriate persons.

Presented by:

Seconded by:

L. E. TIMBERLAKE,
Councilman, 6th District.

JOHN FERRARO,
Councilman, 4th District.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 12, 1968]

FEDERAL JET NOISE CONTROL NEEDED

The only things louder than the roar of jet aircraft are the screams of property owners and airport operators calling for quieter engines and noise controls. So far their pleas have fallen on deaf ears.

The Airport Operators Council Intl., which represents an estimated 86% of the domestic airline business, has broken a nine-year association with the industrywide National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council. They charge that airlines and aircraft manufacturers are not effectively seeking solutions to the problem, which, operators insist, requires immediate federal standards and controls.

We agree it is now time for such action.

Congress recognizes the national nature of the problem and is considering the creation of maximum noise levels to be federally enforced. Research by the government and private aircraft manufacturers is also under way to develop quieter engines.

In the meantime harassed homeowners, such as those around the Los Angeles International Airport, are waging anti-noise campaigns and filing lawsuits against airports and officials who do not have the power to effectively act to control noise.

The problem is not a local one. This area of "noise pollution" ranks with the air and water pollution problems now plaguing metropolitan areas across the country.

It is conceded that there will always be aircraft noise. The challenge is to reduce it to a livable level.

There are several ways to approach the problem. These include noise suppression devices on today's engines, quieter new engines, revised flying operations and restricted land use and condemnation. Cost, safety and engineering problems are involved in all of them.

In the next 10 years more than 1,000 new aircraft, including jumbo jets, will be needed to meet the mounting passenger and air cargo demands. That adds up to a lot of noise.

Standards to control the noise are needed now. To be effective they must be nationwide, realistic and give the airlines and manufacturers sufficient time to meet the new rules. Research must also be stepped up on the quieter new engines.

As technology improves, regulations may be modified and stricter standards adopted. But the first step must be taken now to curtail the environmental pollution that now plagues our airports—and the crowded communities around them.

(Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned.)



1. The first part of the document is a letter from the President of the United States to the Congress, dated January 3, 1862. It is a very long letter, and it contains a great deal of information about the state of the country at that time. The President talks about the war with Mexico, and about the situation in the South. He also talks about the economy, and about the need for more money. The letter is written in a very formal style, and it is very long. It is a very important document, and it is a very good example of the President's style of writing.

2. The second part of the document is a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Congress, dated January 3, 1862. It is a very long letter, and it contains a great deal of information about the state of the country at that time. The Secretary talks about the war with Mexico, and about the situation in the South. He also talks about the economy, and about the need for more money. The letter is written in a very formal style, and it is very long. It is a very important document, and it is a very good example of the Secretary's style of writing.

3. The third part of the document is a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the Congress, dated January 3, 1862. It is a very long letter, and it contains a great deal of information about the state of the country at that time. The Secretary talks about the war with Mexico, and about the situation in the South. He also talks about the economy, and about the need for more money. The letter is written in a very formal style, and it is very long. It is a very important document, and it is a very good example of the Secretary's style of writing.

4. The fourth part of the document is a letter from the Secretary of the War to the Congress, dated January 3, 1862. It is a very long letter, and it contains a great deal of information about the state of the country at that time. The Secretary talks about the war with Mexico, and about the situation in the South. He also talks about the economy, and about the need for more money. The letter is written in a very formal style, and it is very long. It is a very important document, and it is a very good example of the Secretary's style of writing.

5. The fifth part of the document is a letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress, dated January 3, 1862. It is a very long letter, and it contains a great deal of information about the state of the country at that time. The Secretary talks about the war with Mexico, and about the situation in the South. He also talks about the economy, and about the need for more money. The letter is written in a very formal style, and it is very long. It is a very important document, and it is a very good example of the Secretary's style of writing.



