

2

STATEMENT OF JOHN H. SHAFFER, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE AVIATION SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE REGARDING THE AIRPORT AND AIRWAY DEVELOPMENT ACT ON 25 APRIL 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to speak about a program which is of utmost importance to the aviation industry and the Department of Transportation.

The Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, in its short life, has already infused the aviation community with a new life and vitality and its continuing effective operation is of paramount importance.

Because of the program's obvious attractive features, the FAA has experienced a vigorous response from airport sponsors and various planning agencies all across the country. Looking ahead to the end of Fiscal Year 1972 we project that we will obligate the full \$280 million allotted for this year under the Airport Development Aid Program. In Fiscal Year 1971, we succeeded in obligating all but four cents of the Airport Development Aid Program funds set at \$170 million. During the first 18 months of the program we funded new runways at 57 airports; runway extensions at 70 airports; runway reconstruction and strengthening at 164 airports; funded land acquisition at 179 airports; and have undertaken the development of 36 new airports.

Increased capacity at airports was also realized by providing for new construction and expansion of existing taxiway system and aircraft parking aprons. Over the life of the program new taxiways have been installed at 179 airports; taxiway extension at 64 airports; new parking aprons at 97 airports; and apron extensions at 84 airports.

Despite the obvious success we have had under the Airport Development Aid Program it would be unfair and unrealistic to say that we have not noted some difficulty on the part of airport sponsors in raising their share of the funding of the program. However, as I have stated, we are able at the present time to obligate funds at a sufficient rate so we do not now see any need for a change in the federal participation level. In fact, we will have a substantial carryover of applications for funding for Fiscal Year 1973 in the neighborhood of \$200 million. Until there is further study on the issue of increased federal participation, we do not feel that there is a need for any change in the federal share as provided in S. 2397.

One suggestion that has been made to alleviate the financial problems encountered by the sponsors is that consideration be given to making Federal funds available for the construction of terminal buildings at airports. Under the Federal Airport Act, which preceded ADAP, terminal construction was financed entirely at the local level and not by the Federal Government. We opposed the use of Federal funds for terminal construction during the hearings on the Airport and Airway Development Act for a number of reasons. One of our objectives under ADAP was to provide for a system which would operate to the

maximum extent feasible on a self-supporting basis. Terminals are income-producing facilities and, therefore, are often capable of paying their own way. In addition to this, we were most concerned with the urgent problems of safety and capacity as they related to aircraft operations on the airfield, and sought to avoid a diversion of funds needed for those purposes. We are not ready to back off the position we took on this matter two years ago. The Department is undertaking a new transportation study which will consider terminal needs in all modes of transportation. We believe that we should focus upon the whole trip made by the traveler, door to door, and not just upon the principle segment of the trip. This has great importance as far as aviation is concerned because, while airplanes provide us splendid service from airport to airport, we have serious problems in connection with the efficient movement of the passenger and his baggage through the air terminal and from the airport to his ultimate destination.

We should be thinking in terms of how we can process travelers for the most effective manner. For example, it may not be desirable to process a passenger and his baggage at the actual port of embarkation. A centralized location may be more convenient and efficient. Perhaps an air terminal should be more than a jumping off place for a trip by air. Perhaps we should consider more fully the need for locating terminals at new downtown or suburban locations where the traveler can make his connections between modes more quickly and conveniently. In addition to having an impact on our thinking respecting terminals, I believe the results of our study may provide new insights into

public policy regarding adequate access roads, parking facilities, and public transportation at terminals coordinated with local transportation systems. I should mention here too that our study will extend beyond the terminal question to the need for better door to door or terminal to door transportation. Pending the completion of this study we believe the existing policy on air terminal funding should remain unchanged.

On the planning side of the program we presently have authorized funds for 20 state system planning efforts and have another 11 applications under consideration. These state systems are of the utmost importance for providing an intelligent framework for both the individual airport master plan and the National Airport System Plan which is required by the Act. Despite this response to our planning program, we have experienced some inertia in the implementation and in the participation of several states in the planning side of the program. At this time we attribute some of this problem to a lack of appropriate state planning agencies dealing with aviation. Further, airport system planning in many areas has not received top priority in the allocation of existing state and local funds.

In connection with the planning side of the Airport and Airway Development Act, FAA is again holding its Annual Aviation System Planning Review Conference on May 1, thru May 3, 1972 in Washington, D. C.

and we are confident that this year's conference will continue to provide valuable input into the total aviation system planning process. Today, before this Committee and as a matter of public record, I want to give my personal invitation to every person who cares about the complex issues facing aviation system development to attend the 1972 National Aviation System Planning Review Conference. We want to hear your ideas. We urge you to bring them to us. We both will benefit measurably from that exchange.

From an environmental standpoint, we find that the Airport and Airway Development Act is lending itself in an immeasurable manner to the improvement of our environment. The planning section of the Act allows the investigation and designation of suitable alternative generalized locations for major new airports to be undertaken at dates early enough that all interests can be considered. System grants to study the overall concepts of airport development for a specific geographical area, we believe, will result in agreements on new locations for airports that will be acceptable to all parties. Included under the planning grant program are the funding of environmental analysis, public information systems, and public hearings. These planning grants assist in producing long-range master plans that the aviation community and the general public can live with. The program allows early public participation in resolving environmental and other problems, which previously had not been the case. Without this participation at the earliest stages of development, extreme delays are encountered in initiating needed airport development projects.

Environmental considerations have likewise lead to added processing time. Where a significant impact on the environment is found, processing time of up to a year may be encountered. Because of these added time factors, which we find are usually associated with the large airports, both existing and new, our funding of large airport construction has been seriously inhibited. Conversely, the small hubs and general aviation airports are moving ahead at a more rapid pace.

Another area within the ADAP Program which has come to be of great importance in light of the recent wave of hijacking and bombings is the funding of security equipment. As you are aware, the FAA, at the direction of the President, has recently instituted, on an emergency basis, regulations requiring the tightening of security measures at the 531 air carrier airports. Under these regulations, we anticipate requiring increased lighting and fencing to be installed on an expedited basis. These items are presently eligible under the ADAP program. However, we are experiencing some difficulty, and I might add, may need some assistance, in facilitating the airport operators in financing these items. As you know, the ADAP Program requires a grant agreement to be entered before any obligation of funds is made or any funds are paid to the sponsors.

Because the application must be approved and a grant agreement entered prior to the disbursement of monies, we are unable to reimburse the sponsors immediately. Due to the obvious pressing need for security fencing and lighting we want to tell the sponsors to go ahead and install the equipment required to comply with Part 107 of our regulations, and that we will then reimburse them retroactively for

those expenses which would otherwise be eligible for 50% Federal funding under the ADAP Program. If the Committee feels that there is a need for legislation on this matter, we will certainly pursue that course immediately. But this course, too, will require some months. This procedure to fund security projects retroactively would only apply to those begun after 18 March 1972, the date of the new regulation.

The hijacking incidents we have been experiencing over the past few months have also pointed up the need for greater security in air passenger operations. We regard the screening of boarding passengers as the most effective protection against hijacking and have found the use of magnetometers by airlines to be a key element of that screening. Accordingly, the emergency amendment to FAA regulations on airline security, effective 6 April 1972, requires among other things pre-boarding screening by scheduled air carriers. Magnetometers are currently a necessary part of the process at airports enplaning almost all air travelers. It has been proposed that the Government help finance the acquisition of this equipment by the airlines. We do not agree with that proposal. Our view is that the pre-boarding screening of passengers is a function appropriately carried out by the airlines in conjunction with their processing passengers through the ticketing and boarding phases of a flight and that the acquisition of the equipment used in this process should be financed by the airlines. It is estimated that approximately 1,250 magnetometers would insure coverage at all 531 air carrier airports in the U. S. We do not believe that the approximate \$3 million needed to purchase these magnetometers will be overly burdensome for the airlines. The air carriers have already purchased approximately 545 magnetometers for their own use.

As we have worked with the ADAP Program over the last year and one-half, we have come across items we consider technical amendments which we commend to the Committee for their consideration.

Perhaps one of the most pressing of these items is the confusion over the elimination of the United States in the definition of a public agency and its impact on "joint-use" airports. Under the Airport and Airway Development Act, as is presently constituted, those military airports which are used jointly by the civilian aviation community might be precluded by a strict and unrealistic interpretation of the Act. We feel that the intent of the Airport and Airway Development Act has been confused by the present wording of §16(c)(1) and because of this we would support S. 3302, a bill to clarify the wording of this subsection. This amendment, we feel would allow the Federal Government to give both planning and development grants to the civil sponsors of our many joint-use airports without question and provide a great benefit to the aviation community. This amendment, as outlined in S. 3302, would not, however, make U. S. Government agencies themselves eligible for ADAP grants.

I wish to thank you for letting me appear here today and I am more than willing to answer any questions you may have.