

(3) International aviation work involving obtaining, granting, or exchanging of operating authority with foreign countries generally through bilateral agreements, and the handling of day-to-day operating problems with foreign governments and airline officials;

(4) The issuance of foreign carrier permits; and

(5) The necessary studies, forecasts and analyses not related to processing a specific case or application.

The estimated and actual outputs in terms of workload items are:

Workload item	Items completed or processed			
	1967 actual	1968 estimate	1969 estimate	Increase
1. Regular route authorizations.....	299	409	510	101
2. Cargo and charter licensing.....	1,273	1,170	1,197	27
3. Examiners decisions issued.....	77	78	85	7
4. Negotiations/consultations.....	15	18	19	1
5. Informal intergovernment discussions.....	7	7	7	-----

The officials responsible for the operations of the program:

John H. Crooker, Jr., Chairman.

Charles F. Kiefer, Executive Director.

Alphonse M. Andrews, Director, Bureau of Operating Rights.

Mr. ANDREWS. I will try to be brief and indicate what I believe to be the thrust of the Board's present program.

As the Chairman mentioned earlier, one of the basic objectives that we spend a considerable amount of time on right now is strengthening the subsidized route carriers. We attempt to give them access to the larger markets. We try to lift restrictions on their operating rights at the moment. The thought behind it all is to attempt to reduce subsidy for these carriers.

There have been some mergers in this field, both in the Alaska area and in the local service area, which have a favorable impact on subsidy.

A second program that I think is fairly distinctive is the improvement of route licenses where markets have grown and there is now the possibility of a single-plane service, for example, in a market where previously there had been only connecting service or there is opportunity for competitive service where previously the market had involved only a monopoly carrier. We have several cases like that. The Gulf States-Midwest points case, the Pacific Northwest-Southwest case and the Southern tier case are examples.

A third kind of objective which the Board has in mind is getting more effective use of the ground facilities now available. I think we are concerned there primarily with the congestion that exists in major airports such as New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago. Some of our route proceedings are designed to permit traffic flows which avoid such places as these. We have possibly a half dozen important cases designed to get the most out of the limited ground facilities which now exist.

Internationally, the Board's program is designed to take a look at broad geographical areas that have not been reviewed for some period of time where possibly now with technological advances in aircraft we can provide flights to interior points—overflying gateways. We believe the traffic has grown and the prospects are good for additional competitive services. We are in the process of looking at the South American situation, the Caribbean area, and, of course, the Trans-Pacific area.