

File Copy

Digitized by the  
New Jersey State Library

VOL. IV

PUBLIC HEARING

before

SENATE AND ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES ON TRANSPORTATION  
AND PUBLIC UTILITIES

on

Senate Bill No. 377 and Assembly Bill No. 433  
[Jetport Authority]

Held:  
April 8, 1969  
Assembly Chamber  
State House  
Trenton, New Jersey

Members of Committee present:

Senator Richard R. Stout [Chairman, Senate Committee]  
Assemblyman Harry Randall [Chairman, Assembly Committee]  
Senator Garrett W. Hagedorn  
Senator Hugh A. Kelly  
Assemblyman Kenneth T. Wilson  
Assemblyman Joseph Azzolina  
Assemblyman Everett B. Vreeland  
Assemblyman Richard A. Olsen

\* \* \* \*



I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
William E. Schluter Assemblyman, Mercer County	1
William J. Flanagan Executive Director New Jersey Turnpike Authority	8
Ralph Seligman Citizens Committee Against the Jetport in Central New Jersey	24
Richard D. Goodenough Executive Director Upper Raritan Watershed Association	44
Jack McCormick President-Elect New Jersey Academy of Science	53
Walter Swain, Chairman Board of Trustees Somerset County College	60
William M. Kwalick Executive Director Middlesex-Somerset-Mercer Regional Study Council	62
Charles E. DeAngelis Senior Vice President Walter Kidde Constructors	67
Willard Berner Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization	85
Donald W. Geyer Professional Planner Newark, New Jersey	1 A
Mauro A. Checchio New Jersey Federation of Planning Officials	15 A
Tristram Johnson Princeton, New Jersey	20 A
Steven M. Cicala Cape May County	33 A



SENATOR RICHARD R. STOUT: We will call this fourth and final, we hope, hearing to order on the question of a proposed jetport authority for New Jersey, on the bills presently in the Assembly and the Senate.

I would first like to present the members of the Committee. On my far left is Assemblyman Azzolina of Monmouth County; Assemblyman Kenneth Wilson of Essex County; on my far right, Assemblyman Olsen of Middlesex County; Assemblyman Vreeland of Morris County; and the Chairman of the Assembly Transportation and Public Utilities Committee, on my right, Assemblyman Randall of Bergen County.

We have some witnesses who have been with us on previous occasions and I'm going to extend to them priorities this morning. The first one is Assemblyman William Schluter of Mercer County who was here the first day and we asked him to come back at a later date.

Assemblyman William Schluter of Mercer County.

W I L L I A M     E.     S C H L U T E R: Thank you, Senator Stout. Gentlemen of the Committee, I appreciate being able to appear before you a second time. Before I give you my prepared remarks, I would like to report that the Mayor of one of the municipalities in my particular district, called me last night and said that he favored a location for a jetport somewhere between McGuire and Toms River, and I told him that I would let the Committee know about his particular inclination. He is Mayor Turp of Hightstown.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, it is my

From the reports which I have read, many persons appearing before your Committee are engaging in what can be called "Jetport Roulette." By this, I mean they are giving you many reasons why a jetport should not be located in their area but in "someone else's backyard." It is my belief that they favor implementation of a jetport authority not because they believe it is good for New Jersey but because this might be a method to remove the jetport from their own vicinity.

There are five major points which have to be answered before I can be convinced that New Jersey must have a jetport.

First, there have been reports that 80 percent of the airport traffic at the three major New York airports is local traffic in the sense that the flights involved are less than 200 miles. There have been suggestions that many of these flights should be restricted to feeder airports rather than use up the valuable airspace, landing, and take-off capabilities of the major airports.

Second, with the advent of large super-jets, it has been predicted that there will be less aircraft needed to transport the same number of people. As a result, we would expect less airport congestion.

Third, much has been said about the ineffective scheduling of commercial aircraft served by the New York airports. The traffic at peak hours, as well as aircraft that are only partially filled, has added greatly to this crisis.

Fourth, with all the emphasis on highways and

jetports, very little has been said about the need for rapid-speed ground transportation. We must have breakthroughs in ground mass transportation merely to serve the major airport facilities. These breakthroughs, in themselves, should provide enough improvements in general transportation to alleviate some of the need for more airport facilities.

Fifth, the economics of a fourth major jetport have not demonstrated that this will be a paying proposition within a reasonable length of time. Obviously, it would be up to the jetport authority to make the proper determination on the matter of economics and feasibility. Yet, it is often the case that an authority will start to develop a facility on the basis of hope and speculation. If the anticipated economic benefits do not materialize, future legislatures will be compelled to make up the deficiencies.

There are many other considerations of a subjective nature which would make a jetport objectionable. Among these are pollution, noise, hazards, and the resultant increased road traffic. (Applause)

It has been said in some quarters that New Jersey will get a jetport whether we like it or not. This theory is based on the fact that Federal Aviation officials will insist on such a facility because of the problems of air congestion. Obviously, such a viewpoint would have a lot of bearing on the Committee's ultimate determination. However, I have yet to be convinced of this line of reasoning, and I hope that it is not being used to scare us into a premature decision.

Another theory urging quick approval of a jetport

authority is based on the fact that 1969 is a gubernatorial election year. Since prospective Governors will be making irrevocable commitments on jetport locations, this premise argues that New Jersey should act at once before the State is completely hamstrung on its various options. Yet this reasoning does not justify premature implementation of a jetport if the basic need for such a facility has not been proved.

Gentlemen, I submit that your decision on the establishment of a jetport authority will have a major effect on the destiny of New Jersey. Approval of any of these bills will mean that there is no turning back. We will have a jetport.

Do we want to pass on a legacy of super development and overwhelming density to future generations? In short, do we really want to be the "Turnstile" State? Or do we want to provide for the orderly growth of a well-balanced State with due concern for residential and environmental considerations? (Applause)

For the above reasons, gentlemen, I respectfully urge you not to approve at this time the various bills which would establish a jetport authority.

(Applause)

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you, Assemblyman Schluter.

After that applause, I think you're the Legislator of the week.

Now we have two more members of the Committee here, Senator Hugh Kelly of Camden County, on my far right; and on

my far left, Senator Garrett Hagedorn of Bergen County.

Do any members of the Committee have any questions?

Assemblyman Wilson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Assemblyman Schluter, therefore, from your release and your presentation to the Committee, you are saying that there is no need for a jetport in the metropolitan area at this time? an additional jetport?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHLUTER: Assemblyman, I say that I am not convinced of the need with the evidence that I've seen.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: All right.

SENATOR STOUT: New Jersey is a small state and it's narrow and it has a long river line; if a jetport were established just across the river in Pennsylvania would that change your thinking at all?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHLUTER: Obviously, I could not and I don't think the Committee here could control the destiny of what happens outside of the State. You would have a ripple effect, you can be sure of that, from the establishment of a jetport across the river in some other state. This is a question that is very difficult to answer and I certainly would not be able to answer it.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Can you document the comment on your number one clarification, things you want to clarify, can you document that 80 percent of air traffic is local traffic?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHLUTER: I can probably get it out of my files, Assemblyman, but I have seen this written and I've heard it said that 80 percent local traffic being air travel

which covers a distance of less than 200 miles - this does not mean that it carries a small number of passengers but just is short in distance.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: But you feel it's authoritative.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHLUTER: Yes, I have read that. I don't have the documentation at hand.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Thank you.

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you very much, Assemblyman.

The Co-Chairman of this Committee and Chairman of the Assembly Committee has a remark he would like to make concerning this morning's audience here.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Mr. Chairman, just on behalf of this Committee, I wanted to welcome all of the children who took time out to come down and see us work. I gather from their participation that they are also helping their parents to bring forth their point of view.

Welcome to the halls. We hope that you will stay and learn something from the hearing.

SENATOR STOUT: Another witness who has been here on several occasions is here again this morning and has asked to be heard. That is the Executive Director of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, William J. Flanagan.

W I L L I A M J. F L A N A G A N: Senator Stout and members of the Committee, I am William J. Flanagan, Executive Director of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority.

Having followed these hearings closely, it appears that this Committee of the Legislature is seeking, for the purpose of advising the full Legislature, answers to these questions:

1. What size facility is required?
2. Where shall it be located?
3. How will it be financed?
4. Which agency shall design, construct and operate the Jetport?
5. Why is the New Jersey Turnpike Authority interested in building a Jetport?

Questions one and two address themselves to a subject that has been generally overlooked by many of those who have appeared here - the subject of feasibility.

If New Jersey is to have a jetport built without cost to the taxpayers of the state through the sale of revenue bonds, then certain elements must be combined. They are, first, the potential revenue producing aspects of the facility and second the clearly established need for the facility. These two components will combine to determine the size of the facility - and perhaps even the location.

Now, with regard to location - and I am aware the ball has been up and down the field without anyone coming close to scoring - there are these points the Turnpike Authority would consider before we would recommend a jetport location:

It must be determined whether the location offers, and will continue to offer, convenient economical ground access for the

goods and people who move by air, as well as for the people who work or visit the airport. Among the subsidiary points which must be considered in this category are:

- the distance between the airport and local air traffic generating centers.
- the availability of good access highways.
- the availability of public transportation.
- the availability of rail or water transportation.
- the comparative advantages of competitive or potentially competitive locations.

In commenting upon those points I ask you to bear in mind that this jetport, even if it received an "all systems go" approval on this date, will not be ready for air traffic for from five to seven years. That means that the highway network in New Jersey will have been substantially completed so that a jetport will be accessible from almost anywhere in the state. In addition, access roads to be supplied by the Turnpike Authority will not be a problem.

It is also well to remember that the current sophisticated trends in high speed rail transportation will have had the advantage of from five to seven years of additional development by the time the jetport is ready.

Returning to the subject of location, an important consideration is the characteristics of the jetport site.

Here the problem is to determine whether the site lends itself to economical development, whether it will permit safe and reliable operation and whether it is adequate for expansion of facilities. Among the subsidiary points to be considered here are:

The length to which runways are needed and the maximum length to which they could be extended.

Obstructions in the aerial approaches to present and prospective runways.

Conflict with the air traffic patterns of nearby airports.

Sub-surface conditions as a factor in construction costs.

Wind and weather experience in relation to the reliability of operations.

Flood danger as a threat to the reliability of operations and safety of investment.

In commenting on this consideration I believe we are all aware that the Federal Aviation Agency must supply the answers and approval. In this regard it must be pointed out that thus far the FAA has been called upon for answers to hypothetical situations. In other words they can more adequately resolve these matters when the Legislature takes affirmative action.

Next to be considered is the space and facility requirements budget.

Here the problem is to determine the adequacy and suitability of the proposed capital investment program both from the standpoint of operational requirements and also from the standpoint of revenue development.

Among the subsidiary points to be considered are these:

- The forecasts of air traffic, flight activity and terminal population.
- The conversion of anticipated air traffic, flight activity and terminal area population into space and facility requirements.
- The relationship between rentable and non-rentable space in buildings based on the space requirement budget.
- The extent to which provision is made for exploitation of all revenue sources in the space and facility requirements budget.

Another of the basic factors to be considered is a rental and leasing policy.

Here the problem is to determine both the level of rates and the suitability of the leasing policies from the standpoint both of revenue development and expense control.

Subsidiary points to be considered are these:

- Basic principles of the rate structure.
- The cost distribution system and its use in establishing the level of rates.
- Length of leases and renewal options.
- Policy on concessions.
- Policy on sub-letting.

These are just four of the many basic factors which affect the stability of jetport revenues. Be assured there are many others which are equally, if not more important.

There have been many suggestions and proposals in this matter - some by members of this committee, some by those who have testified here and some by those who, while they have not appeared here, are genuinely interested nevertheless.

Former Governor Robert B. Meyner, in an interview last weekend, stated that it might be determined after intelligent discussion that New Jersey may not want to have a jetport. I agree with that observation and recognize that indeed there has been testimony of a similar view before this committee.

But, what will happen if at the end of that intelligent discussion it is determined that a jetport is necessary to New Jersey's economy and to its progress?

How much older will this ten year issue have grown?

Will the matter then be of such proportion that politically at least, and perhaps financially too, that a jetport can never be built?

Isn't the most practical course the one which would provide for such intelligent discussion and at the same time immediately undertake the very real work that is necessary to locate and finance a new jetport.

May I respectfully suggest that you establish a reasonable time limit and may I urge that it be done without delay.

Permit me now to return to the five questions I cited earlier. We are now at question Number 3: "How will the jetport be financed."

To be built without cost to the taxpayers it must be financed by the sale of revenue bonds to private investors in the same fashion as the Garden State Parkway, the Turnpike and the various parking authorities and sewerage authorities in this state have been financed. Every member of the committee is completely familiar with the mechanics of long-term financing.

So perhaps the question then should be: "How will the Turnpike Authority finance a jetport?"

Should the Legislature designate the Turnpike Authority as the agency to build the jetport - in other words, should this become a lawful project - the Authority, under its General Revenue Bond Resolution would be entitled to apply to the cost of engineering and site studies a portion of the proceeds of bonds issued for Special Projects, pursuant to Section 203 of that Resolution. The source of that statement is the firm of Hawkins, Delafield and Wood, serving as Bond Counsel to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority.

Financing of the jetport itself would be through the sale of long term revenue bonds encompassing the revenue producing features I referred to in the early portion of this statement.

The new bonds would not be co-mingled with the bonds sold to finance the original Turnpike and the present expansion program nor would the current obligation be impaired in any manner. The Turnpike and the Jetport would be separate investments to the bond-buyer.

Questions four and five: "Which agency shall build the Jetport?" and "Why is the New Jersey Turnpike Authority interested in building and operating the Jetport?"

Let me preface that answer by stating the Turnpike Authority in attempting to interpret the sense of the Legislature believes this body wants the Jetport to be constructed and operated by a New Jersey agency. If that were not the case we would immediately withdraw and agree that our sister facility, the New York Port Authority, operators of the three major metropolitan airports, would be the most competent and most logical agency to undertake this responsibility.

I wish to make it clear that I am here representing the interests of the Turnpike Commissioners only because of their belief that the Legislature intends this project to be built by a New Jersey agency. I would appreciate a sign from the committee if that is an improper assumption.

However, if it is the will of the Legislature that the Jetport be built by a New Jersey agency, permit me to outline the advantages of the Turnpike Authority over those of a new Authority created for that purpose.

1. It would obviate the creation of an additional autonomous authority within the state.
2. It would save the taxpayers the initial \$150,000 or \$200,000 appropriation, as provided for in the bills now before the Legislature, which they believe would be necessary to launch such an authority - and, incidentally, that is a figure which our general consultants estimate as inadequate.

3. Save the time and expense necessary to recruit an experienced and capable staff of engineers, consultants, attorneys, administrators and other personnel necessary for such an undertaking.
4. Our Financial Advisors and members of our bonding syndicate have handled the financing of more than half the major airports in this country.
5. Our General Consultants, the firm of Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff, the largest engineering consultants in the United States, built Logan Airport in Boston, the Miami Airport, Denver Airport, Cincinnati Airport, Fort Worth, Texas Airport, Fort Lauderdale and several others.
6. Our record of performance speaks for itself.

The answer, therefore, to question Number 5 is that we are interested because we believe we can help; that we have an ability not limited to road building that the State of New Jersey should make use of when considering vital projects that can be built without cost to the taxpayer; that we have the confidence of the majority of citizens in our professionalism and that we have earned the respect of the financial community and of individual investors for our successful and well run business, and that we can move this project immediately.

I am not here to say that this Jetport should be located in Solberg or at McGuire or at any other specific location.

Instead, I am here to say that if you entrust this responsibility to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, we will conduct our own site studies and make our own recommendations.

I am not here to say that this state will or will not have a jetport.

Instead, I am here to say that rather than ask this body to endorse or ask investors to support a facility that is not worthy of New Jersey, we will have the courage to tell you and the citizens of the state that a jetport just is not feasible.

Gentlemen, that is the position of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority. (Applause)

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. You have stated your position clearly and I think you have cleared up some points that the Committee was interested in concerning the offer of the Turnpike Authority to be of help in this matter.

Does any member of the Committee have any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN OLSEN: Mr. Flanagan, in your statement you indicate that the initial appropriation necessary to launch the authority of \$150,000 or \$200,000 has been considered as generally inadequate by your general consultants. Has there been any indication as to what would be an adequate initial figure?

MR. FLANAGAN: Assemblyman, we have discussed the cost of the initial studies with our general consultants, whom I have indicated are also general consultants to so many of the major airport facilities in the country. They believe that the engineering costs alone - and I'm not speaking now of the administrative costs which would be necessary to create a new authority, that is the employment of a staff, attorneys, leasing of adequate office facilities, exclusive of that, our general consultants have indicated the initial engineering costs would be somewhere in the neighborhood of between \$250,000 and \$300,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Mr. Flanagan, I have a question.

You stated that you feel that the Turnpike Authority is competent to handle the construction of a jetport, if such is desired. Can you give some examples, throughout the country, where an authority, such as the Turnpike Authority, has gone into the construction of airports as well as roads.

MR. FLANAGAN: Senator, I only have to refer you to the New York Port Authority, which began with the Holland Tunnel and has now blossomed into the operation of tunnels, bridges, airports, bus terminals, truck terminals, and all types of other facilities.

Right now the Texas Turnpike Authority has been asked by the Legislature of that State to study the feasibility of them operating a high-speed ground transportation facility.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Right. So far as then just speaking to the question as to whether a sole state agency has done it, the one down in Texas would be the answer rather

than the Port Authority which is a joint state operation.

MR. FLANAGAN: Yes. If you're comparing directly one to another turnpike authority.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: All right. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Is your agency prepared, if you should be designated to build a jetport, if we decided we need one, - is your agency prepared also to build some kind of a fast rail transportation system or are you just going to stick to roads? I think the highways and turnpikes are pretty jammed now.

MR. FLANAGAN: It would all depend on whether or not the Legislature is asking us. We cannot undertake any facility or even undertake a study of any facility unless it is a lawful project, unless it has been first approved by the Legislature of the State.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: I am asking you, though, if the Legislature approved for your Authority to construct an airport, are you also prepared to build some kind of mass transportation system? Let's assume it's built somewhere around the McGuire area in Central Jersey, or Solberg --

(Boos)

I thought I would get that reaction. Would your Authority be prepared to build some kind of mass transportation system or improve the rail system to get the people from the airport to population centers of New York and North Jersey?

MR. FLANAGAN: Yes, sir, because it would be in our interest to construct such a facility.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: You're not just going to stick

to roads then.

MR. FLANAGAN: I think we've indicated by the testimony here today, sir, that we would be willing to undertake any facility, roads or otherwise, that the Legislature believed can be built without cost to the taxpayers. What we are suggesting is, or indicating is that we believe we have the competency to undertake any type of facility that the Legislature would entrust to us, not merely the building and operation of roadways.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: One more question. How much more debt can the Authority incur? It's just gone into considerable debt to add the additional lanes. Can it incur considerably more debt in order to build a jetport?

MR. FLANAGAN: The authority could because, as I indicated in my testimony, the jetport would be a separate facility; it's bonding and feasibility would stand on its own two feet and, therefore, that would not impair the current debt of the Turnpike in any way. So that each additional facility, standing on its own strength, would then support itself and this would then not place any limit upon the Turnpike's indebtedness.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Mr. Flanagan, what was the bond rating of your last issue of bonds? Did it improve or decrease as far as the rating was concerned?

MR. FLANAGAN: No, the rating, Assemblyman, was current with the rating of the previous bonds.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Of the previous bonds?

MR. FLANAGAN: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Well let me ask you another question. Right now you have three Commissioners that govern the New Jersey Turnpike Authority and it takes two for a quorum. Now this is a three-quarter billion dollar operation. Now, if you were given additional responsibility, such as managing a jetport, do you think that three Commissioners would be sufficient to actually manage such a large operation or should the number of Commissioners be increased inasmuch as the responsibility would be increased?

MR. FLANAGAN: The Commissioners, Assemblyman, act as an approving agency. In other words, the staff of the Turnpike, to put it in simple terms, is much the same as the Legislature. The Legislature in the State does all of the work, formulates the plans and submits them to the Executive Branch for approval. The Commissioners, in this instance, are the Executive Branch; they approve or disapprove. Surely if the indication is that perhaps it may be difficult to get a quorum - if you have just two members absent, you would then do without a meeting. If five members, or seven or nine, would insulate against such a happening, surely then that would be agreeable.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: To me, I think the Commissioners are more like the Legislative branch because, after all, they are appointed to represent the interests of the State of New Jersey. So, therefore, I would think, because they have a larger responsibility, if they ever were given the power to build the new jetport, - therefore, I would think the size

should be increased to have a greater representation throughout the State of New Jersey. This is what I mean.

MR. FLANAGAN: Well, let me say this, Assemblyman. The Turnpike Authority is naturally aware of the bill which is before the Legislature now to increase the size of the Authority from three to five members. The Turnpike Authority and the current Commissioners have offered no opposition to that bill. If it's the will of the Legislature that we can better operate with five commissioners than with three, then we will be most happy to have five appointed by the Legislature.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: All right, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: I have one further question along the line - well, from prior testimony, let me say, I've had some indication that perhaps there is a question as to the financial feasibility of a jetport. But I find implicit in your statement the fact that it is financially feasible to build a jetport and the authority that could best do it would be the Turnpike Authority. Is that a fair statement?

MR. FLANAGAN: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN OLSEN: Just one quick question, Mr. Flanagan. I notice a couple of places in your statement and in a couple of answers you indicate that the jetport facility would be operated separately from the Turnpike facility as we know it now.

MR. FLANAGAN: For bonding purposes, Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN OLSEN: For bonding purposes. Would this preclude in the future some pooling effect, such as the Port

Authority has now, to increase the bonding power, in the future?

MR. FLANAGAN: Assemblyman, I'm not competent to intelligently answer that question. I believe such a question would deserve a long and careful study by our financial advisors as to how the current obligations could be melded or woven into such a thought as you just proposed. I really and in all honesty could not give an intelligent answer at this time.

SENATOR STOUT: Any further questions? If not, thank you very much, Mr. Flanagan. We appreciate your being here this morning and, should we have any further questions after hearing some of the later witnesses today, we will take the liberty of calling upon you for those answers.

MR. FLANAGAN: Thank you, Senator and members of the Committee.

SENATOR STOUT: Representing the Citizens Committee Against the Jetport in Central New Jersey, Ralph Seligman.

Before he begins, I would like to acknowledge the presence of Assemblyman John Ewing of Somerset County and Senator Wayne Dumont of Hunterdon-Somerset-Warren. (Applause) I am also advised that Senator Raymond Bateman is here from Somerset County. (Applause)

Mr. Seligman.

R A L P H S E L I G M A N: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, allow me to express my thanks for being permitted to testify on behalf of the Citizens Committee Against the Jetport in Central New Jersey.

My name is Ralph Seligman. I am the Chairman of the Planning Board of Roosevelt, New Jersey.

Our Mayor has already appeared before you, but we are a citizen group who, in the process of exploring the implications of S-377, have gone beyond our boundaries to enlist the support and counsel of citizens and professionals in neighboring communities.

At this point in these hearings, those of us who have followed them with interest are faced with the need to reconcile opposite conclusions reached by the Blomquist Report and the Aviation Development Council about the issues involved in the establishment of the Fourth International Jetport. To us, there appear to be three main issues.

The first issue is whether it is in the best interests of the region and the nation for this jetport to be located in New Jersey at all. At the very least, we would think that regional cooperation is as vital to the location of this jetport as it is in determining the use of the waters of the Delaware River, which involves joint planning by four states, or the development of commuter railroad and highway facilities for the Metropolitan New York Region, which involves joint planning by three states. We wonder whether the location of a jetport should be decided upon by any single agency in a single state.

The second issue is where the jetport should be located, if it is to be in New Jersey.

The third issue is who should operate the proposed Fourth International Jetport, and what this operation should

entail.

At this point, S-377 addresses itself only to the operation of a jetport, thus bypassing many essential questions.

The Bill, to us, seems limited even further by its dependence for its formulation on the Blomquist Report. This report was described at the March 18 hearings as "an attempt by a well-intentioned citizen group to shift the location of the proposed jetport away from itself."

Incidentally, if it's going to shift it in New Jersey, it means it's going to shift it someplace else in the State.

After the technical and financial analysis of the Blomquist Report by the Aviation Development Council at the March 18 hearing, the report on which S-377 appears to be founded looks at best like a shabby piece of science fiction, and at worst like a prescription for further bankrupting the taxpayers and communities of New Jersey.

Now, if one chose to use the word "conspiracy" as loosely as it was used at the March 18 hearings, one could charge that S-377 represents a conspiracy against the taxpayers and cities of New Jersey by failing to carefully examine the consequences of what it proposes.

Rather than make such reckless and inflammatory charges, however, we prefer to consider such facts as exist from the taxpayer's point of view.

As taxpayers, the testimony that interested us most on March 18 was that of Mr. Wade Smith of Dun and Bradstreet. Certainly, no company in the United States is better equipped to discuss state and municipal finance. Section 8 of S-377 empowers the proposed Airport Authority to issue revenue

bonds. Mr. Smith was very clear about the difficulties of marketing revenue bonds, the proportional increase in the cost of marketing as the rate of difficulty increases, and the need to back such bonds with the full faith and credit of the State, that is to say, the taxpayers.

I note that, in his testimony just before me, Mr. Flanagan also referred to these difficulties.

We had also been made aware earlier of the minimum ten year period between the start of construction and the time that an airport - even in the most desirable site - could become self-sufficient. Six years would be required for construction - Mr. Flanagan said five to seven - followed by a minimum of four years' operation before financial self-sufficiency could be achieved in the best possible location.

Even Mr. Troast has been quoted by the Press as admitting that this ten year period will be necessary.

Earlier testimony also cited the difficulties of ever developing an airport in the wrong location to full capacity, and Dulles Airport in Washington has been cited as an example of an airport with far more advantages than any of the Central Jersey sites proposed by the Blomquist Report. Yet, Dulles Airport is still dependent on tax support.

It would seem, then, that the proposed \$700 million jetport would, if constructed in the wrong place by the wrong agency with the wrong financing, be a perpetual burden on the taxpayers of New Jersey. And this was the position that Assemblyman Schluter referred to in his testimony.

There was mention by some Committee members on

March 18 of forming a Transportation Authority composed of the various turnpike and parkway authorities to finance the proposed jetport. S-377 makes no mention of this. During the conversations regarding this matter, it was pointed out, however, that if Garden State Parkway Authority money, for example were to be tied up by backing a jetport, that money would not be available for Parkway improvements. One cringes at the thought that this road, already desperately overcrowded during every rush hour of the working day and every summer weekend, would be unable to improve its situation because its money had gone elsewhere.

Mr. Flanagan referred to this in terms of a separate agency or dividing the two.

The same consideration of alternative uses of funds was applied to the New Jersey Turnpike.

As for the use of transportation bond money to build the proposed high-speed railroad link for the jetport, it was pointed out that this would prevent badly-needed improvement of New Jersey's commuter railroads. And construction of this high-speed railroad link would cost at least three times as much as costs estimated in the Blomquist Report, according to testimony that was given on the 18th.

The question is, who would pay again, ultimately?

The answer is, the commuting New Jersey taxpayer, by not having his facilities improved as is necessary.

But this is only the beginning. Despite the Port Authority's contention that only 10,000 acres are required for a major jetport, the Blomquist Report, on page VI-17, proposes

a total complex of 192,000 acres - a 22,000 acre jetport and a 170,000 acre support area - all of it tax-exempt. Sections 19 and 20 of S-377 establish the machinery for this.

What we have here, therefore, is a 300 square mile state within a state, expressly created for the purpose of industrial development. Those Central New Jersey newspapers and County Boards of Freeholders who have been pushing for S-377 had better take a second look. What industry in its right mind would, if seeking a location in Central Jersey, not choose the tax-exempt site over the taxable one?

And where would those communities in the region, which even now vote down their rising school budgets, find the additional money to educate the children of the families who move into the region to work in those tax-exempt factories on that tax-exempt land? From the state? (Applause)

The state itself will not receive any money from this separate 300 square mile state - any more than it does from any other authority. Nor would the voters of the state have anything to say about it - any more than they do about the number of lanes on the New Jersey Turnpike or whether it stays open on foggy days.

Three hundred square miles is not a small piece of real estate. It is almost five percent of the total land area of the entire state. Add this five percent to the 25 percent which the acting Director of the Division of Taxation informs us is already tax exempt and you get 30 percent of the total land area of the state.

Three hundred square miles is an area 63% of the size of all of Monmouth County, approximately equal in size to

Somerset County, almost two and one-half times the size of Essex County and more than six times the size of Hudson County.

New Jersey's older communities, who are trying to hold on to their industrial ratables, had also better take a good look at this privileged empire. What will be the effect on Newark, New Brunswick, Trenton, Jersey City and Camden, not to mention the newer areas, like Piscataway Township, when the industries which provide much of their present revenue are tempted away by this tax-exempt haven?

In matters regarding air space, technical feasibility, and the like, we have merely been interested listeners seeking enlightenment. Suffice it to say that the disparities between the Blomquist Report and the aviation industry's leading authorities were so pronounced as to be startling. And these disparities surely damage the credibility of the Blomquist Report.

The point that comes most strongly to mind is the statement by the FAA representative that a maximum of 100,000 operations was possible from a Central New Jersey location, as opposed to the Blomquist Report's assertion on page VI-3, that a Central New Jersey Jetport should be capable of sustaining the same number of operations in 1975 as Kennedy Airport - that's 512,000.

At this point, I must say that our own impression of the Blomquist Report's credibility had been damaged somewhat earlier. In going through the report, we noticed a small error on Page VI-18, and wherever the same item appeared thereafter.

I refer you to the item described as "Common Costs" and suggest that without the benefit of a computer you check the addition. You will find a mere \$50 million error. This small error made us examine the Blomquist Report more carefully, as it dawned upon us that perhaps the report was not infallible.

To help us, we request the assistance of a professional economist in reviewing the report's economic assertions. The following observations, therefore, are taken from an evaluation of the Blomquist Report by Mr. Peter Warren, an economic development consultant whose clients range from General Electric's Missile and Space Division to corporations assisting underdeveloped countries in Africa and South America. I quote -- I may say, Mr. Warren is in the audience today.

"In reading through the 'Summary and Conclusions' of the Blomquist Report, one looks in vain for points which should have appeared.

The report provides no evidence that a major international jetport should be located in New Jersey rather than in some other state.

The report provides no evidence that the jetport can be self-financing.

The report fails to demonstrate technical feasibility.

The report provides no evidence of site approval by the FAA.

The report provides no evidence of consultation with, or approval by, major airlines or railroads, in spite of the fact that a high-speed railroad is an essential part of the plan.

The report gives no evidence of support or review by concerned New Jersey State Agencies such as the Department of Transportation or the Department of Community Affairs Division of State and Regional Planning.

The report offers no evidence that any of the proposed sites in the McGuire Lakehurst complex controlled by the Department of Defense were ever offered for use, or were even truly available. In support of this doubt, the FAA representative stated on March 18 that he expected the operations at McGuire-Lakehurst to continue into the future at their present level.

The report shows no awareness of the three-year study to determine urban air mass transportation systems for the tri-state area of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. This study has been funded jointly by NASA, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the New Jersey Department of Transportation, and is presently being carried out by the Center for Transportation Studies at Rutgers University.

The heart of the entire matter is whether the construction of an international jetport would benefit the economic growth of New Jersey. The Blomquist Report does not really cover this area fully. It contains no mention of the effect of a new jetport in bringing foreign or American tourists to New Jersey. And what is more surprising, there is no analysis of the need of New Jersey industries for air cargo facilities.

Insofar as New Jersey people or New Jersey freight is

concerned, the report does not indicate any benefit from locating a new airport within the state. Instead, the report seeks to rely on two other arguments.

One argument is most appealing to the special interest groups. It is that the new jetport will require labor for its construction and maintenance, thus raising the income of the state. The other argument is that a new jetport will attract new industry to the state because of the facilities offered.

Both assumptions are doubtful.

Based on Mr. Blomquist's figures, the total value of the construction of the jetport and related road systems is approximately \$687 million. Spread over the 16 years, 1970 to 1985, allowed by the report, this comes to almost \$43 million a year in new construction for New Jersey's construction industry.

This sounds like a lot, but it comes to only 4.3% of the value of construction contracts in New Jersey in 1967. It comes to less than 25% of the increase alone between 1966 and 1967. Given the steady inflation of construction costs over the past ten years, this is very little indeed. In fact, it may not even be a net gain.

The proposed Allentown site, according to Mr. Blomquist, lies in the region of greatest industrial and commercial growth projected for New Jersey. This industrial and commercial growth, which is visible to anyone living in the area which will be blighted by the jetport, can be given a dollar value - a dollar value which

may well exceed \$43 million a year, and be tax-producing as well. In such case, the construction industry will be a net loser.

As for jobs, the reasoning is similarly faulty. A gross employment figure is given in the report without allowance for the jobs which will be lost by the destruction of the economy within a wide radius of the jetport. The total labor force in Monmouth County is now some 112,000. It is expected to increase to almost 250,000 within the next decade - without the construction of the jetport. If the jetport is constructed on the site, in the quadrangle designated - Hightstown, Freehold, McGuire-Lakehurst - a large number of the jobs which would have come into existence through normal projected tax-producing growth cannot materialize. In addition, it must be remembered that the operation of a jetport lends itself to computerization and automation, so that it would be possible to program it in such a way that both passengers and baggage would be literally untouched by human hands.

I might mention here that this was the issue in the recent ILA strike on the New Jersey waterfront, the issue of automated cargo handling which is increasing everywhere. And the same is true for the vast warehousing operations which will accompany cargo storage.

If labor opts for the construction of a jetport in this high-growth area of Central New Jersey, it is foregoing assured sources of employment for a hazardous gamble. And, as was the case for construction, if the airport is a financial

failure, either because it cannot resolve air traffic control problems, or because it is inconveniently located for passengers, or because it does not suit the major airlines, or because its inflationary construction and continuing costs have been grossly underestimated, Central New Jersey labor will bear the brunt in lost employment opportunities. And New Jersey taxpayers will bear the burden of financing the jetport." That's the end of the quote. (Applause)

Our objections, therefore, from the point of view of pollution, noise and damage to the ecology have been eloquently stated by many other witnesses, and are, therefore, not included in this testimony.

Gentlemen, I want to make it completely clear, now that I am reaching the end of my remarks, that our objections are not limited to Mr. Blomquist's elaborate document alone.

In our estimation, wrong answers have been produced by a discredited procedure which, by its very nature, was bound to ask the wrong questions.

Today, the federal government increasingly requires that programs which involve the displacement of people must include representatives of all affected parties from the outset, and throughout the entire planning process.

Much as we appreciate our opportunity to speak out at this hearing today, we cannot help feeling short-changed. We, as well as the airlines and other citizens and taxpayer's groups, had a right and a function to contribute from the start to a study which will affect all our lives profoundly.

In fact, gentlemen, we consider ourselves just as

qualified to offer advice to our Governor as a variety of industrial executives with imposing titles whose principal mover provides all our children with excellent band aids.

We urge, therefore, that no action be taken on S-377 and its companion bills, much in the same manner as Assemblyman Schluter, until a truly representative and independent commission has evaluated and reported on the evidence introduced during these hearings.

I thank you. (Applause)

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Seligman, are there any questions by members of the Committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Mr. Seligman, first of all, where is Roosevelt located?

MR. SELIGMAN: It's at the boundary of Monmouth and Mercer Counties, in the western-most portion of Monmouth County.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: What's the population of Roosevelt?

MR. SELIGMAN: The population of Roosevelt is, at our last count, 810.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: 810 people.

MR. SELIGMAN: That's right. However, as I mentioned in my testimony, Assemblyman, we've spoken to people from Cranbury, we've spoken to people from surrounding communities and, as a matter of fact, I've been empowered, for example, by the people in Cranbury, who are concerned, to speak on their behalf.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: No, I just want to clarify your

report. And how close would you have been in, say for example, the Blomquist Report, from, say, the Allentown area, the proposed airport. How far would Roosevelt have been from the Allentown jetport?

MR. SELIGMAN: Let me talk on that for just one minute.

I am really embarrassed that as a New Jersey voter and taxpayer it took that kind of proximity to arouse me to a situation which affects all of New Jersey. And while we began from a purely parochial point of view because we are only a half mile away from one of the runways, the implications of this, for the State as a whole and for the voters as a whole, concerned me far beyond the immediate interests of my own community. (Applause)

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Yes, but I would just like to know, what is the distance?

MR. SELIGMAN: Oh, I said that. I said a half mile from one of the runways on one of the proposed sites, of which there were, as you know, six or seven.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Well, the thing is, Mr. Seligman, I have been down here to four meetings, haven't missed one yet, and I'm from Essex County and there's no jetport going to be built anywhere near Essex County because of the fact of our population, and I take an affront to your last statement, "We urge, therefore, that no action be taken on S-377 and its companion bills until a truly representative and independent commission has evaluated and reported on the evidence introduced during these hearings."

I would just like to know, what do you think we're doing

by coming and sitting week after week and hearing testimony?

(Applause)

MR. SELIGMAN: I think you're doing exactly that, Assemblyman, and I would like to speak on that point.

I am also Consultant to the Model Cities Program in the City of Hoboken, and I'm a Planning Consultant by profession.

Now, one of the things that was discovered during Urban Renewal proceedings, because it caused just this kind of unhappiness, was this, that if one waited until the very end to hear testimony rather than include the people affected at the beginning, this kind of difficulty was bound to arise.

What I'm speaking about, Assemblyman, is not something that would reflect discredit on the Committee; what I'm talking about is the procedure that the Federal Government has seen fit to change by including people from the communities affected from the beginning of the process. Now this is the heart of the Model Cities Legislation which is not the newest of the programs sponsored by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. And it is in this context, Assemblyman, that I speak about this. I am speaking about a planning process that is being revised by the Federal Government because it found it inadequate to solve problems early enough and to collect information early enough. And I am speaking about it in that context.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: All right, Mr. Seligman. Then along the same lines, no matter where we locate the jetport in the State of New Jersey, we're going to have opposition from

the people who are directly affected, are we not?

MR. SELIGMAN: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: So all of the testimony is going to be the same no matter where we have the jetport located unless we're going to put it out in the Atlantic Ocean, as the Mayor in one of the towns in -- (Applause)

That's only a quote of one of the Mayors from Monmouth who spoke at one of the hearings.

MR. SELIGMAN: Maybe I shouldn't bother commenting on that.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Ocean County, I'm sorry.

SENATOR STOUT: Any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Just one question. Would not all of the argument that you have presented in so much detail apply with respect to the construction of any other major project within this State, such as the Turnpike Authority? I mean, I realize - I mean, the Turnpike itself, by the Turnpike Authority. Wouldn't these same arguments apply as of the date that was constructed?

MR. SELIGMAN: I don't see that they would, sir, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: I mean, from the standpoint of loss of tax revenues, jobs, and so forth and so on?

MR. SELIGMAN: You're talking about far less land. I was comparing the 10,000 acres that the Aviation Development Council people described at the March 18th hearing, as opposed to these 192 thousand acres described in the Blomquist Report. You're talking about a difference of 20 times. So that I'm talking about a difference in scale and a lot of this

loss of revenue was addressed to that.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: I've gone to three hearings conducted by Mr. Blomquist and this hundred and some acres you're talking about, I don't recall him mentioning it. I recall the 22,000 acres for a jetport and approximately 50,000 plus acres to be properly planned or coordinated through the State. But, as I recall, the local municipalities were to retain control of the land and receive the taxes. What they wanted was total planning in the area so that you didn't have a hodge-podge of high-rise apartments and things like that, like in New York, in front of the runways. Now, I've gone three times, I've listened to him three times and this is what I gathered from the discussions.

MR. SELIGMAN: Okeh. Your comment, sir, has about three parts.

With regard to the 192,000 acres, just to show that I didn't invent it, it's on page 6-17 of the Report and I refer you to that - at least it's on that of the copy that I have and it appears on a number of pages throughout. Now if the report is inconsistent, I can refer you to that particular page.

As far as control by municipalities - as far as the municipalities receiving taxes, the taxes referred to in S-377 are really payments in lieu of taxes, which is customary for an Authority. I think Assemblyman Wilson was complaining about that with the Port Authority in Essex County the other day. And these payments, according to S-377, would be based on the taxes that the land is now yielding. Now this is land

that is either open and wooded or agricultural, and is being taxed at absolutely the lowest rate, particularly if the communities are taking advantage of New Jersey's Agricultural Assessment Act, in which case it's taxed even lower. So that this is the only kind of tax return that you're talking about, Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: No. The land that would be developed for other means would be controlled, and I recall Mr. Blomquist saying that at the last hearing, I think, when he spoke here, - that the land that would be developed for industrial use or housing, and so forth, the control and taxes would lay with the local municipalities in the area. That's at least what he said.

MR. SELIGMAN: I see no evidence of it in the Bill, Assemblyman, and if it is there then I stand corrected, at such time that I see it.

SENATOR STOUT: Any further questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Seligman. I'm glad you finally got on this morning.

Some minutes ago I presented two Legislators who didn't happen to be in the room and I would like to acknowledge their presence now - Assemblyman John Ewing of Somerset County, over here, (applause) - It was just as loud when you were out of the room, Jack. And Senator Wayne Dumont of Warren-Hunterdon and Sussex. (Applause)

Senator, did you have a group whose presence you wanted to make known here today?

SENATOR DUMONT: Mr. Chairman and members of the

Committee, there are several groups here today from Hunterdon County and Assemblyman Ewing will introduce the group from Somerset County.

I don't know by any means that I have them all accounted for here but we have tried to make at least a partial list so that they get recognition for the great turnout and enthusiasm that they have displayed today.

The Hunterson-Somerset Jetport Association which has co-chairmen. Mr. Ewing will introduce the co-chairman from Somerset County. The one from Hunterdon County is George Brightenback.

The League of Women Voters is also well represented here today.

The Freeholders of Hunterdon County - all three of those gentlemen are here today - Vincent Abraitys, the Chairman of the Board, William Winter and Kenneth Myers.

The Clinton Women's Club of Clinton, New Jersey; the South Raritan Watershed Association; and two Boy Scout Troops that we know of - Troop No.198 from Whitehouse and Troop No. 1 from Fairmount.

Now there may be others that want to be recognized and I'm sorry if I don't have their names, but they're all here in support, to the best of my knowledge and I think I can make this statement with honesty- in support of S-377 and it's counterpart in the Assembly sponsored by Assemblyman Azzolina, and the Senate Bill is sponsored principally by Senator Maraziti. (Applause)

And I might say, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out on the

first day of these public hearings, that I completely support this group of people here today in so many numbers and of such good quality in their total opposition to a jetport at Solberg. (Applause)

SENATOR STOUT: Senator, that's pretty good this morning.

You forgot to mention the presence of the Republican County Chairman, over there, Mr. Foran.

SENATOR DUMONT: I'm sorry about that. (Applause) I certainly want to acknowledge his presence, Walter Foran. I was trying to be somewhat bipartisan.

SENATOR STOUT: Jack, do you have a group you want to introduce?

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Yes, I do. I appreciate the opportunity and I certainly appreciate the tremendous attendance we have here today. It shows the amount of interest we have in this whole project and the support S-377 has and what it means to people up in our particular area, and I want to give particular praise to Nat Toffee, here, who is Co-Chairman of the Somerset-Hunterdon County Jetport Association.

We also have representatives here from the Somerset Valley Chamber of Commerce.

The choir out front was from the Pernel School and did an outstanding job and should be well complimented.

The Upper Raritan Valley Watershed Association. Somerset County Junior College will be heard from shortly. The Somerset County Freeholders and the Somerset County

Planning Board.

These are a few that I can recognize out there.

A great number of these people came down here without a personal interest, they came down because they heard that the hearings were going on and they wanted to show their interest and support of S-377.

As I said out front, to the audience there, I say here before the rest of you that Dan Todd, the other Assemblyman from Somerset County, and myself are wholeheartedly behind these efforts to do everything we can as long as we're in office to stop any jetport going into Solberg.

Thank you. (Applause)

SENATOR DUMONT: Mr. Chairman, may I please just say a word on behalf of our two Assemblymen from the 15th District. Douglas Gimson, who is not able to be here today because of illness and who has been a long-time fighter against the jetport, and also Assemblyman Robert Littell, are both supporting this opposition to the use of Solberg. (Applause)

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you.

I will call Mr. Richard D. Goodenough, Executive Director of the Upper Raritan Watershed Association.

R I C H A R D D. G O O D E N O U G H: Mr. Chairman, my name is Richard D. Goodenough. I am Executive Director of the Upper Raritan Watershed Association, a non-profit, non-political corporation founded 11 years ago to conduct scientific research and public education on all aspects of natural resources. The geographical region of our concern is

the watershed of the North Branch of the Raritan River including parts of Somerset, Morris and Hunterdon Counties.

Today I speak on behalf of our Association of 600 members. Today I also speak on behalf of the Raritan Watershed Council which, in addition to our Association, includes the South Branch Watershed Association and the Stony Brook-Millstone Watersheds Association.

I also speak on behalf of the North Jersey Conservation Foundation, which, as you know, has compiled a record of land acquisition and public conservation action programs with few parallels in the Nation. I also speak as Vice-Chairman and on behalf of the Society of American Foresters, New Jersey Chapter, a professional society of scientists and managers of our forest-related resources.

Mr. Chairman, with all possible candor, I want to say that there are certain interests in our great State which would have us believe that the natural resource people are narrow-minded, provincial, seekers of the status-quo, and in any event, just not realists. Economic advantage is the overriding factor in any land-resource decision and technology can supplant any limiting factor, or so the argument goes. Advocates of this line of thought have the temerity to come before this Committee and suggest that because of a series of engineered structures at a Solberg jetport, there will be no damage to the water resources of the Raritan Basin. This, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, is perfectly ludicrous. To suggest this is analogous to saying that increased defensive measures around Saigon is the key to

solving the Viet Nam war. It is analogous to saying that strict adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, with no other international considerations, is to insure the protection of America from foreign insurrection. This isn't so, Mr. Chairman. What we have to look at is the whole - not just a part. Exploding development of the watershed region surrounding the Solberg site - for miles around - is the real cause for resource concern, above and beyond the facility itself.

The modern conservationist is truly a human ecologist. We are supporters of and beneficiaries of the multitude of technological innovations which have made our nation great. But we believe - and we say this with capital letters and red underlining - that we should have a clear understanding of what we must give up in order to get what we think is worth getting. We believe that a jetport decision should be reached in perspective with other decisions affecting the same resources, to avoid cross-cancellation of benefits. And we realize the ironic truth in the poetic words of Kenneth Boulding in the recently-published book, *Future Environments of North America*, where he said:

"With laissez-faire and price atomic,  
Ecology's uneconomic.  
But from another point of logic,  
Economy's unecologic."

A cry for ecological in-put to land use decision-making, a cry for better management of our strained environment is echoing throughout the land, in all areas, among all groups, and in the voting booths.

A Gallup poll has just been completed on this very

subject. In summary - and the full results of this poll are available to you for your analysis - 86% of Americans are concerned about environmental degradation. Now of all the multitude of natural resource problems - and you know them, I'm sure, - forest management, wildlife preservation, the pesticide problem, soil erosion ad infinitum - 36% of America views air pollution as the number one environmental problem and 32% water pollution. In other words, 68% view these two problems as the chief resource concerns of our society. And these are the two major concerns we have enunciated time and time again for the past two years, at least, in relation to the Solberg site. But who pays the bill for what needs to be done? In this same Gallup poll, 73% across the country expressed a willingness to pay more taxes to fight conservation problems. And those willing to pay more taxes, interestingly enough, represented all income groups, including 63% earning less than \$5,000 per year. Only 12% expressed little concern for conservation problems. Only 9% expressed no willingness at all to help pay the bill for what needs to be done. I suggest that this poll puts into striking perspective the feelings of our citizenry.

The people are willing to do what is necessary to correct the mistakes of the past. They are not willing to make new errors. If this Gallup poll had been confined to New Jersey, I suggest the results would be even more striking, for, as the most urbanized State in the Nation, we are faced with environmental strains and limits ahead of our neighbors. Our people know it. They have acted positively and so has

this Legislature. Our record is impressive. The modern era of this realization and its accomplished results began with passage of the Water Bond Act of 1958 providing two new reservoirs with surrounding open space and recreation lands. The Green Acres Bond Issue of 1961 passed substantially in all but three of our counties, and that in a day when bond issues were anything but popular. Two years later the people spoke again, even more strongly, when every county in the State of New Jersey approved the constitutional amendment on the farmland assessment amendment. It was amazing to some that the Hudson and Essex County electorate, for instance, should vote 2 to 1 in favor of giving more favorable tax treatment to farmers. But those voters in Hudson and Essex realized the benefit which the farms of rural New Jersey - many miles away - afforded them.

The wisdom of this Legislature has been seen on numerous occasions also in the past three years especially, in passing much-needed programs geared toward meeting the need of safe-guarding resources, and protecting open lands. The record is clear. Passage of the Municipal Conservation Commission Bill, the Natural Lands Trust Bill, continued support for the Skylands Bill, a bill passed in the Assembly to give added protection to our coastal wetlands, the Sunfish Pond action, new and visionary procedures in wiser use of pesticides, administrative changes through legislation upgrading the Bureau of Parks and Recreation to division status in the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, expanded staffing and funding of existing State

programs, invigorated and expanded programs of county park commissions and county planning boards, land acquisition programs and resource-oriented ordinances of many local government bodies, continued efforts to work out an equitable purveyance system of Raritan Basin water to urban areas, support growing daily for a \$200 million water pollution control bond issue next November, plans continuing for maximizing the water producing capability of the Raritan Basin through construction of the Confluence Reservoir, Six Mile Run Reservoir and others.

Last October I sat in this same witness chair before Assemblyman Rinaldi's Water Policy Commission. These galleries all around here were lined with big colored maps which showed where our future water supplies were to come from, and nearly every witness before that Commission, in the course of three days, mentioned strongly in one way or the other that water supply and water pollution are closely related problems. And so many, many experts expounded on our reliance on the Raritan Basin as the kingpin in our future water resources planning. And all of this, not even mentioning the host of other bills introduced this session and now in various committees which seek again to give better control and management to the limited capacity of the environment. And all of this not even mentioning the million dollar investment of the Department of Conservation in Raritan Basin flood plain delineation now in progress, designed to protect land and water quality.

But the irony of all this, all these broad-scale

projects in this field of resource management is that so much good work, so much investment, so many plans, can be literally wiped out by one bad decision regarding land use, and this is the case with the Solberg site in the Raritan Basin - our "Ace in the whole" as it were (Applause) - because the Raritan Basin is our "Ace in the whole" for North and Central New Jersey's future water supply.

Now let's put things in perspective. Hudson and Essex, and Newark and Jersey City, in particular, recognize the value of watershed protection. If technology can easily handle all problems of water management, irrespective of natural limitations, then why does the City of Newark cling on and own 63 square miles, 40,000 acres of watershed property, patrolled by armed guards, in order to protect its reservoirs? And why has it been necessary to halt all development in the Rockaway Watershed because we haven't had the wisdom or we haven't had the guts to treat our wastes wisely?

Witnesses have come before this Committee and suggested that no resource problems would be created at a Solberg site which could not be handled by engineering techniques. But they admitted that they really hadn't thought about the urbanization that will most assuredly accompany selection of that site. They minimize the averages on air pollution damages and didn't mention the recurring phenomenon of air inversions causing serious problems and, after all, isn't it the extremes we should worry about more than the averages? They said that water pollutants could be removed by downstream purification systems, but they

didn't suggest the cost, nor the degree of treatment sophistication that would be needed - and we already have a major problem in that respect, to wit, the reservoir water distribution controversy which centers around this particular issue of cost. They didn't mention noise in a settled area and that is a form of environmental pollution, and that in 1962 in the United States there were more than 1,000 law suits totalling more than \$14.5 million in damages, and that a 1967 study of the Somerset County Planning Board estimated that some 990,000 people would be significantly affected by noise at a Solberg site.

They attempted to draw analogies and comparisons between the Solberg site and other operating jetports as to environmental damages. But they gave no understandable means of judging those comparisons such as number of acres, area of pavement, nature of water ways, slope, terrain, geology, ground water, soil type, volume of air traffic, relation to regional planning, surrounding population, relation to urban areas, resource significance, and so forth and so on, and they didn't mention the hundreds of thousands of dollars in studies now being focused on Jamaica Bay in New York in order to find out what has gone wrong with the aquatic environment. They said that automobiles cause more pollution than jets, but they didn't think about how many automobiles would be brought into our watershed.

Other alternatives would seem to be at least useful tools toward a short-term airport solution, such as air fare

differentials whereby a premium would be charged for peak demand periods and lower rates for slack periods, similar to telephone rate schedules.

Now today I've spoken largely in a conceptual way attempting to show a measure of balance between the decision at hand and other decisions, other efforts, other investments which we have made. In prior sessions of these hearings we have entered into the record our technical judgments on the resource damages which can be expected at the Solberg site. I won't be repetitious today in repeating them, but at this time I would like to enter into the record still another study of the expected resource damages at Solberg. This was authored by Miss Leslie Jones, who is here today and who is a graduate student in ecology and land use planning. It serves to support and clarify many of the points we have raised. We believe these judgments to be true and certainly no one has offered any meaningful rebuttal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, our studies have not - and I say this with perfect sincerity -- they have not been of such depth that our case can be proven to you today to the greatest degree possible. The burden of proof should not rest with us. Those who propose a Solberg site should be required to furnish the answers, the evidence, - (Applause) -- they should be required to furnish the answers, the evidence, in depth, beyond all shadows of doubt.

Now what we have done today, again, is to raise the yellow flag of warning, raise it to the top of the flag pole for all to see. There it stands now, blowing in front of the

feelings of our citizenry.

The Raritan Basin and all of its resources is the lifeline of the future. The Solberg site is in the womb of the watershed. Let it not be said by our successors that we committed an abortion. Rather, let it be said that we today have proven that we have wisdom along with knowledge, that we acted with vision for the long run, rather than reacted to the demands of the short run, that we came and we judged rather than justified.

Permit me now to put on yet another hat, that of a council member of the New Jersey Academy of Science. This Academy is a scholarly association of scientists from a cross-section of scientific disciplines. Its chief purpose is the exchange of scientific knowledge and it has rarely involved itself in public issues. But today I would like to introduce to you for a short statement, Dr. Jack McCormick, President-elect of the New Jersey Academy of Science. Dr. McCormick is one of the real fine ecologists in the United States today. He is the author of several books on these matters, and he is eminently qualified to bring some thoughtful comments before this Committee and then a very, very specific recommendation. (Applause)

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Mr. Goodenough, would you be kind enough to wait for a few moments to answer any questions by the Committee when Dr. McCormick has finished.

MR. GOODENOUGH: Surely.

J A C K M c C O R M I C K: Mr. Chairman, my name is Jack McCormick and I am a professional ecologist. I am here today

as President-Elect of the New Jersey Academy of Science, which is a non-profit organization composed of and representing the scientists, science educators, and science students of this State.

The Academy is committed to promoting scientific research, science education, and the application of scientific knowledge to the problems of modern civilization. We seek to be of service to the State in every way possible. We would feel that we had been able to fulfill our duties and obligations to this Committee if I were able to proclaim our unanimous recommendation for the use of a particular site for the jetport, or if I were able to tell you unequivocally that the use of some other site would result in the total disruption of the precarious ecological balance of the region. But the Academy must base its judgments on the soundest, most complete scientific knowledge available. Under circumstances now extant, we can neither endorse nor condemn any one of the sites thus far recommended for the location of an intercontinental jetport. It is our studied opinion that insufficient evidence to permit an enlightened evaluation of the direct and indirect environmental impact of such a jetport and related facilities has been provided to your Committee or to any other concerned body. Testimony regarding environmental effects that has been submitted by various individuals appears to have been biased, or at least not to have been based on the fullest scientific data available for the site in question. Gentlemen, the Academy implores you to take whatever measures may be available to you to assure that no site shall be approved for

a jetport until an evaluation has been made of the ecological consequences of its alteration.

The New Jersey Academy of Science has little expertise in economic evaluation, so we must leave to others the decisions regarding the need for an intercontinental jetport within the State and its monetary cost-benefit ratio. We are gravely concerned, however, with the environmental costs of such a project. I cannot appropriately say "environmental cost-benefit ratio", for there virtually is no promise of environmental benefit from traditional airport construction. We can only strive to minimize environmental damage.

The dramatic changes that an airport can bring about were presented vividly by Exhibit VI-6 in the Blomquist Report. Three side-by-side photographs illustrate the mushrooming development - from spacious farmland to high-density suburbia - around Chicago's O'Hare Airport between 1948 and 1968. Clearly, airports require most intensive studies of the natural systems of the region, most skillful planning, and most stringent zoning to assure that they will serve and not dominate or disrupt a region. They require widespread reshaping of the landscape and generate a rapid and enduring flux in land use.

Several previous witnesses before this Committee have submitted conflicting testimony regarding the probable environmental effects of a jetport. Water quality will be gravely impaired and the rapidity of runoff could result in serious flood damage according to one faction. Another faction suggests that existing technology can correct any such

situation. The losses of agricultural land, of open space, and of recreational resources also have been brought to your attention. Some see greater beauty in thousands of new homes and acres of new highways.

It is a fact that this proposed jetport, wherever it is sited, will involve major distortions of the environment. Jet-plane emissions will pollute the air and excess fuel disgorged from them will foul the soil, vegetation, and water. Exhaust fumes spewed out by automobiles, trucks, and buses delivering and removing passengers, freight, and workmen will pollute the air. Thousands of new heating units at the airport and in the developments which will crop up around it will belch still more fumes into the air. Fuel, rubber, paving materials, lubricants, soaps and detergents, ice removal chemicals, human wastes, and civilization's other varied offal will defile the surface and ground waters. Excavation, filling, paving, and building will change the pathways and the speed of water runoff. Sound pollution will challenge the ears of the human and animal populations for miles around--witness that the inaugural take-off of the Franco-British Concorde was heard 20 miles away. Motor vehicles, power mowers, construction equipment, and a variety of other devices of civilization will join in an unremitting, cacophonous symphony. The eyescape can be polluted by flashing neon signs, attention demanding billboards, a hodgepodge of development houses, motels, service stations, and drive-ins. Indeed, the black smudges evacuated by departing jets could symbolize modern man's utter disregard for his environment.

The impact of a jetport may extend far beyond the watershed and the airshed in which it is located. During the past three years, for example, meteorologists at the National Center for Atmospheric Sciences at Boulder, Colorado, have studied the

evolution of filmy, white clouds, known technically as cirrus clouds, from the contrails of jet aircraft (BioScience 17: 693). Our present jets are spouting water vapor and freezing nuclei into the upper troposphere--the thin air 20 to 40 thousand feet above the earth's surface--in sufficient volumes to produce overcasts which persist for several days at a time along well-traveled routes. According to Dr. W. O. Roberts, President of the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, these clouds significantly reduce the amount of sunlight that reaches the ground and may absorb heat sufficient to raise the temperature of the troposphere as much as 1° Celsius (1.8°F.) per day (Science News 95:216). The effects of these unintentional climatic alterations now are being investigated, but their full importance is unknown. The new superjets--the Lockheed 1011, the Boeing 747, and the McDonald-Douglas DC-10--will burn 30 to 40% more fuel than the current generation of jets and will aggravate the contrail cirrus cover problem (Environmental Science and Technology 3:220). SST jets will consume still greater volumes of fuel and will complicate the situation even more. The skyways used by these huge aircraft may be marked by perpetual cloudiness; the ground beneath probably will experience lower temperatures, increased rainfall, and continuous low-pressure windiness. If heating in the troposphere affects the location and movements of the jet stream--the powerful, meandering river of air that exerts strong control over the air masses that produce our weather--virtually unpredictable changes in regional climates could result.

Man has achieved his long sought mastery over nature. Victory, however, has been tainted with regret and sobered by the realization that nature can be nudged gently, occasionally shoved, but when it is battered the backlash usually is violent,

and often is lethal to man. Today, more than ever before in our history, every action must be undertaken only after the most thorough and probing evaluation of its direct and indirect environmental consequences. Our streams, soil, and air already are choked with the excrement of our comfortable, but careless civilization. At present the load is onerous and disgusting. Tomorrow it may be deadly. As Professor H. H. Iltis of the University of Wisconsin observed, "Blind faith in the ecological good sense of man has dug graves for many human societies" (Science 156:581). Let us not risk digging our grave.

Fortunately, natural systems are resilient. If not distorted beyond the limits of adjustment, they largely are self-regulating and self-repairing. Our present knowledge of these natural systems is so meagre that we can evaluate them only qualitatively and can make only educated guesses concerning their abilities to resist additional disturbances. But even though our current environmental sciences are imprecise, we must utilize them to the utmost. This is not merely a suggestion--rather, it is an ultimatum when we envision a development that will immediately affect 19 square miles and ultimately will involve an area several to many times as large.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee, the New Jersey Academy of Science urges you to establish in the most appropriate manner a Commission for the Ecological Evaluation of an Intercontinental Jetport in New Jersey. This Commission should be charged with the responsibility and provided with the means to assemble all existing information on the geologic structure, surface and ground water conditions, soils, topography, climate and microclimates,

vegetation, animal populations, and existing land uses of all sites seriously considered for the location of a jetport. Furthermore, the Commission should conduct, or cause to be conducted, such studies as are required to secure additional or up-dated information to extend or supplement existing knowledge. It should be assured of the fullest possible cooperation and assistance from Federal, State, and local agencies concerned with aspects of the environment. And it should be authorized to consult with appropriate individuals and organizations to obtain assistance in any aspects of the studies, but particularly with respect to the interpretation of the assembled information for the purpose of submitting recommendations in regard to the proposed jetport and associated developments. This Commission also should identify the outstanding natural features of each region and propose methods by which these features can be conserved. As exemplified by studies now underway at the site of the new Miami jetport in Florida's Everglades, it should be possible to enhance these extensive new installations, to instill in them unique, individual (regional) characteristics, and to utilize them for protective, as well as exploitive purposes.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Thank you, Dr. McCormick.

I would like to ask if any members of the Committee have any questions for Dr. McCormick or Mr. Goodenough.

I have one of Dr. McCormick.

With respect to your general statement as to the damage caused by the operation of a jetport, I assume this would be true no matter where located in the State of New Jersey?

DR. McCORMICK: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Is there, in your opinion, any good location for a jetport in New Jersey at all?

DR. McCORMICK: On the basis of the information we have available, I would prefer to say it's insufficient for any decision. I have my own personal opinions but I don't think these are relevant.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Thank you.

Are there any questions at all by other members of the Committee?

Thank you, Doctor, for appearing.

The next witness is Mr. Walter Swain, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Somerset College.

W A L T E R S W A I N: Mr. Acting Chairman and members of the Commission, my words will be very brief. I am Walter Swain, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Somerset County College.

Because of the proximity of Somerset County College's recently acquired campus site to the proposed Solberg Jetport,

we at the College have been following the proceedings of your Commission with keen interest.

After two years of evaluating sites throughout the County, Somerset County College acquired, with State aid, a tract of land on Lanington Road in North Branch between New Jersey 24 and the River. This tract is within a two mile radius of the proposed jetport.

On behalf of the Trustees and the College staff, I would like to express publicly strong disapproval of the location of the proposed jetport on the Solberg site for several reasons.

One. We now have on the drawing board a multi-million dollar campus facility. Under current State legislation, approximately one-half of the capital cost of this facility will be borne by the State of New Jersey.

Two. It is entirely possible that the campus will have to be abandoned at some future date because of intolerable noise levels. A glance at the proposed air traffic patterns suggest that the noise factor alone would make it impossible to operate institutions of higher learning at this site.

Three. As estimated by the Somerset County Planning Board, the proposed jetport could bring 100,000 more cars per day to the immediate environs, using roads that must be shared by our student body made up entirely of commuters. Traffic safety and ease of access are the over-riding college site considerations.

Four. We are currently in the final stages of planning an institution to accommodate 3500 full-time students by 1980, based on Somerset County growth projections.

Should a jetport be introduced at Solberg, it is likely that today's estimated population growth would double by 1985, making our proposed campus obsolete.

We would like to add these reasons for opposing Solberg site to the many articulate expressions presented to you by the Somerset County Board of Chosen Freeholders.

Thank you. (Applause)

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Thank you, Mr. Swain.

Are there any questions of Mr. Swain? Apparently not.

Mr. Swain, could you tell us whether Dr. Evans was also planning to testify today?

MR. SWAIN: No, he was not.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Thank you.

Is Mr. William M. Kwalick here, of the Middlesex-Somerset, Mercer Regional Study Council?

MR. KWALICK: Yes, I am here.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: All right, Mr. Kwalick.

W I L L I A M M. K W A L I C K: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am William Kwalick, Executive Director of the Middlesex-Somerset-Mercer Regional Study Council. The Council was incorporated in January of 1968 for the purpose of promoting sound regional planning for the portions of Middlesex, Somerset, and Mercer Counties lying roughly between Trenton and New Brunswick and between Somerville and Hightstown.

An impetus to our formation was the fact that despite the significant growth forecast for this region and its acknowledged role as an educational and research center, it either lay at the fringes of existing planning agencies or was divided by them. Ironically, the Federal Aviation Agency boundary for describing the northwest airspace quadrant, which they believe is suitable for a jetport, parallels the northern boundary of our region; and the Allentown and Maguire sites described in the report for the Governor's Economic Evaluation Committee lie near the southern boundary of our region. Either of these general locations, under intensive discussion before your committee, will have an enormous economic impact on our region, and either could adversely affect our region with respect to pollution.

We have reviewed the disparate positions of the Port of New York Authority and the Governor's Economic Evaluation Committee, and, of course, we cannot presume to comment upon their technical validity. But, because the issue is of such crucial importance to the State of New Jersey and to our portion of the State in particular, we urge that a comprehensive objective evaluation be undertaken to determine aviation needs in relation to the total needs of the State.

We believe that the body to be charged with this evaluation should be instructed very carefully by the New Jersey Legislature to seek, with the aid of expert advice, a solution which provides the greatest public benefit with the least public damage. The need for a jetport must, of course, be carefully examined in its

own right and in the light of other essential needs. Should the need be confirmed, a site should be recommended which best complements the objectives of our society, including:

- a. Provision of the greatest economic benefit to the people of the State, including the economically deprived.
- b. Minimization of the damage to the environment upon which we all depend. In this we would include, of course, the factors of air, water, and noise pollution as well as the direct effects upon land use and displaced population.
- c. Enhancement of our ground transportation system.

We would hope that those conducting the evaluation would critically examine the technical aspects of the problem, including the availability of air space, the permanence of existing land uses, and financial feasibility. Further, they should insure that New Jersey's problems are related to those of our neighboring states and that their findings make recommendations for the establishment of a national aviation policy now apparently lacking.

We urge that the government of the State of New Jersey undertake this evaluation either directly or through a special commission instead of placing this problem under an authority new or existing at this time.

Perhaps the Committee on Regional Development, which is investigating this very problem for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, could, with expanded scope, undertake the evaluation.

Whatever body is chosen should be instructed to report by the end of this year. The basic research has been done, and only the evaluation remains. The people of our region and of the State, faced with such an enormous social and environmental problem, deserve a prompt, impartial, and judicious resolution.

Thank you for the opportunity to state our views.

(Applause)

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Kwalick.

Are there any questions?

You know, today is the first day we have had any reference to regionalization in terms of location of the jetport. Earlier one of the witnesses suggested that three or four of the states should get together and pick a site. You're talking about it here, and do you think a jetport out of New Jersey can serve New Jersey as well as one in it?

MR. KWALICK: Well, that's a question that I don't know that I should presume to know the answer to.

I should think, though, with any kind of objective evaluation the answer might turn out to be yes, that in terms of the regional need, the jetport might better be located elsewhere. Now the comment has been made that, with the improvements in ground transportation, the time difference will begin to diminish over the years, especially during the

lag period when the jetport might be in the process of being built. Let me rest there.

SENATOR STOUT: Fine. Thank you, very much, Mr. Kwalick.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Mr. Kwalick, I would like a clarification of the last page. You're suggesting that we do not place this problem in an existing authority at this time. Are you saying, then, that this existing authority would be unable to explore or re-evaluate the basic research that has been done and they would be unable to employ consultants which would become an evaluation team, so to speak? Is that your intention?

MR. KWALICK: No, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Can they do it then?

MR. KWALICK: Well, if we're talking about the New Jersey Turnpike Authority --

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: I'm talking about any authority.

MR. KWALICK: Well, no. What this comment relates to is the fact that the new authority, which is implied here, is the New Jersey Jetport Authority, if the pieces of legislation were passed. The existing authority implied is the Port of New York Authority. We feel that neither authority has to undertake the problem at this point, that some independent group - and, frankly, perhaps this Committee, after all of its deliberations, will come up with the final answer and there need not be any further study. And that's really what we're suggesting. But in the absence of this

Committee doing that task, we recommend that some other group do it. It doesn't have to be the creation of a new authority or any existing authority because either one of those implies a given site, and what we're suggesting in our statement is that we are not for or against any particular site, as we've indicated here.

I don't know that that helps explain it.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: I get the impression you're challenging the credibility of these authorities. Is that correct?

MR. KWALICK: Oh, no, sir. We just think it's premature to give it to an authority right now because that implies a certain site

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Thank you.

SENATOR STOUT: All right, thank you very much.

MR. KWALICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR STOUT: I am going to call Mr. Charles DeAngelis.

C H A R L E S     E.     D e A N G E L I S: Thank you. I wish to say, first of all, that I am here as Senior Vice President of Walter Kidde Constructors but, I think more importantly, I am here as a resident of the State of New Jersey, as a matter of fact of Mountainside, Union County.

SENATOR STOUT: You live in Mountainside, Union County.

MR. DeANGELIS: Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, ladies and

gentlemen in the Assembly Chamber, fellow residents of New Jersey.

I am pleased to appear before this Committee today to support the establishment of a New Jersey Airport Authority. I believe that such an authority is in the best interests of the citizens of New Jersey, not only with respect to a major jetport, but also with respect to planning of air and ground transportation systems and related facilities in New Jersey.

I support the creation of a New Jersey Airport Authority because it is a step toward keeping control of New Jersey's destiny in New Jersey's hands. (Applause) We cannot avoid the influence of New York City and Philadelphia; indeed, we should not want to, for our economic growth depends to a large extent on theirs. But we should not be the pawns of New York City. We should insure that New Jersey's development is channeled to benefit New Jersey, as well as New York City and Philadelphia. And I think that a New Jersey Airport Authority would help do this.

I get annoyed when I hear talk of New York City's fourth jetport. If the jetport winds up in New Jersey, it should be New Jersey's jetport, designed and located to serve the needs of New Jersey as well as our influential neighbors.

Don't misunderstand me. I have always advocated regional planning, and I grow more convinced of its importance every day. But there can be no meaningful regional planning when a crucial part of the region - New Jersey, in this case, has no voice in the proceedings. It is my hope

that a New Jersey Airport Authority would give us a strong voice in this regional planning for the entire Northeast.

With specific regard to the new jetport, I believe that a New Jersey Airport Authority could fill a crucial gap. Unless and until the people of New Jersey are convinced that a new jetport is in its own best interest, it is unlikely that the current controversy will subside. I feel that a New Jersey Airport Authority is our only hope for a truly objective analysis of the situation with respect to the needs and aspirations of New Jersey.

I further support a New Jersey Airport Authority because of the influence it would have not only on airports themselves, but also on related ground transportation systems. This, I think, is mandatory. If there is one lesson we should take from past experience, it is that we cannot build airports without providing adequate ground transportation networks to serve them. If you don't believe it, try driving to Kennedy airport during the evening rush hour. I believe that a New Jersey Airport Authority could help us avoid inadequate planning of this kind.

On the subject of ground transportation, let me offer some thoughts on the selection of airport sites, in New Jersey or elsewhere.

The primary market for a new jetport in this area is New York City. Few will argue that. But I will argue most strenuously with those who say that the jetport must therefore be as close as possible, in terms of miles, to New York City.

This is a fallacy. Distance in miles is largely irrelevant. What is relevant is time, the time it takes to get from an airport to center city. In the case of New York City and a New Jersey airport, whatever its location, the time required to negotiate the Hudson River crossings and city streets on the other side is unreasonable all by itself. I'm referring, of course, to peak rush hours, which are also the heaviest demand hours for air travel.

My point is that you can't put a new airport close enough to New York City to make travel time reasonable under current road conditions. And these conditions are not going to improve. We have reached our capacity for moving people and goods on the road system of metropolitan New York.

Therefore, we must start thinking in terms of some system of rapid mass transportation. If we do this, the range of possible locations for a new jetport expands considerably. We could design these mass rapid transit systems to move people and goods from any location in New Jersey to New York City in less time than it now takes to get from Newark Airport to the city on our present road system.

Yes, the cost of trackage and right-of-way will be more expensive. But isn't it better to plan an airport in accordance with a master plan projected well into the future rather than a limited, shortsighted plan that considers only today's requirements?

It is said that air traffic routes can't be changed. This is used as an argument for restricting the location of a fourth jetport to the northwest quadrant. But we have

heard in testimony before this very committee that a jetport thus located will not meet our future demands.

To me, this is an admission that we can and must change our air traffic routes eventually.

Mr. Chairman, I predict that unless we establish a New Jersey Airport Authority to properly plan New Jersey's role in the air transportation system of the Northeast, we will be plagued with controversy such as that raging right now every time we reach the capacity of New York's airports.

I'm convinced that much of the opposition to a jetport in New Jersey is motivated by uncertainty about its impact on the State. I think we've learned some valuable lessons from Kennedy and Dulles Airports. In both cases, sites were selected and airports built without consideration for the impact on surrounding communities. In each case, site selection was based on adequate space and compatibility with the existing air route structure, and development occurred without thoughtful planning for the surrounding areas. Additionally, Dulles was isolated from all other transportation systems and airports.

We must realize that a major new airport creates 100,000 job opportunities. This establishes entirely new ground rules for the development of residential areas, schools, hospitals, commercial and recreational facilities, and a ground transportation system to tie all these elements together and direct their development in an orderly fashion.

I advocate, and I think a New Jersey Airport Authority would help develop, the type of master plan that could turn

opposition into support by convincing people that a planned airport would bring desirable benefits and opportunities. By a good master plan I mean one that defines the location of both the airport and the ground system to serve it and provide for orderly development of the entire area.

Many people refer to major projects as progress. But others look at progress as the monster that chases us out of our homes. Even after we relocate, we live in fear that another such monster in the guise of progress will some day force us to relocate again.

I firmly believe that people may not be so hostile toward progress if they are shown a truly beneficial master plan and are given reasonable assurance of permanence. In this way, progress would mean a more secure and pleasant life rather than one of constant disruption.

The big fear we all have is the unknown. To show you what can be accomplished by orderly planning and the application of the systems concept to transportation, I have a few slides illustrating the Satell-Air concept developed by Walter Kidde Constructors. The Satellair concept is just one example of what can be accomplished when we orient our thinking to time rather than distance, recognizing the developing technology in rapid mass transit. I will go through these quickly.

This slide represents the major concern of the transportation system. The movement of these people and goods to and from the aircraft. When you realize that aircraft capacity is projected to as many as 800 passengers

per plane by 1980, and the time schedule for the planning, design and construction of a major airport is approximately 7 years, I am sure you will agree that if we have a problem today moving people and goods over our public transportation systems, by the time the next major jetport is completed, the situation will be completely unbearable. Unless some means of high speed transportation is incorporated in the planning, our airports will be obsolete before we put a spade in the ground.

One of the most attractive points of Bill 377 is the fact that the Authority will have the responsibility for not only the airport but also for related ground transportation facilities.

Here we have the airport functions in specific categories. Good design must relate to function. Therefore, it follows that if airport functions can be specifically defined, the design to satisfy these requirements, with projections for growth, can be more easily accomplished. It is difficult to expect that an airport that accommodates general aviation long haul jets, short haul aircraft, cargo, maintenance, etc. could serve all these entities well. Therefore, for best airport utilization and efficiency, the specialization of airport function offers many interesting possibilities.

Of course, as soon as you separate general aviation from the major airport or long haul operations from short haul operations there are immediate complaints because of the difficulty in making flight connections.

However, if it were possible to connect all these specialized airports by high-speed mass transit connector and further to connect them to regional activity cores we have what appears to be a spoked wheel.

I think the best way to make my point regarding the problem of mixing different types of aircraft operations is to tell you of my experience in being slotted in while landing at Kennedy Airport. Existing procedure permits smaller aircraft to be sandwiched in between two large aircraft for landing at major airports. In my case, we were in a single-engine craft and were slotted in between two 707 four-engine jets. The tower kept reassuring the aircraft behind us that there was ample space between us but you can imagine what happens when a single engine aircraft landing at approximately 60 miles per hour is on the same approach as an aircraft which lands at 100 miles per hour. We were advised to maintain our speed as long as possible and to take the first taxiway as soon as we landed. The landing lights of the aircraft behind us had our cockpit lit up to daylight intensity. The moment we landed and turned off the runway, I assure you, the 707 went buzzing by.

Of course, the previous slide showed the ideal. However, how realistic is this? On this slide, we have applied the Satell-Air concept to the New York area utilizing, wherever possible, existing transportation facilities. The Pennsylvania Railroad, the Long Island Railroad and the New York Central Railroad. In fact, I want to make a side point here that many times we talk about these

new systems and ideal systems and people automatically assume that everything we have will have to be scrapped. Our contention is that you can use existing facilities but you have to adapt them to the over-all systems concept.

We have identified existing airports in the metropolitan area. We have also located sites that have been suggested for the proposed fourth jetport. It is interesting to note that when you tie any of these locations into the ground transportation system, they all seem to work. Therefore, our contention is that the location of the airport only on the basis of politically available or desirable sites is not the immediate problem. We should think in terms of how the airport relates to the mass transit system - both existing and planned - and what consideration has been given for the development in the area of the airport.

Now we have an overhead view of the airport itself. You see here the aircraft servicing area, loading and unloading is removed from the terminal - similar to Dulles Airport. This permits you to design the terminal for a more specific function. Today, terminal design is governed more by the aircraft parking demands than by the efficient flow of passengers. Therefore, why not move the aircraft away from the terminal so that the criteria for aircraft parking and servicing can be satisfied at one location and the criteria for passenger movement and baggage handling can be satisfied at another.

There has been much criticism of the loading lounges at Dulles. The reason for the breakdown in this operation is

that the lounge represents what is referred to in industry as "a batch operation". Each lounge carries a specific number of people or batch of people. If these loading lounges could be replaced by a continuous movement, the movement of passengers and baggage could be accomplished more efficiently.

Here we see a cross section showing, on the left, the public mass-transit system arriving at the terminal. Within the confines of one terminal building, the passenger has immediate access to every flight of every airline. In the center section we see the underground connection between terminal and aircraft servicing. At ground level, is aircraft parking, V-Stol landing and take-off pads and to the extreme right, the aircraft servicing.

This slide shows a shopping center on the high speed ground transportation system. We see passenger stops located at such major shopping centers where parking is available. The attractive part of this system is that a man need not drive all the way to the airport. He can simply drive to one of these stops, board the system, and be sped directly to his aircraft. Another attractive feature with a completely transportation system, is that it can be used for movement of mail and cargo during off-peak hours, thereby increasing revenues which could well provide for operation on a self-sustaining basis.

This slide simple represents a computerized method of ticketing. A passenger boarding the system, can insert a ticket such as this into a computer, have his baggage directed to the proper flight, board the system himself and

be assured that he and his baggage will meet again at his final destination.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident you will agree that under the direction of a New Jersey Airport Authority, thinking in terms of not municipal airports but regional airports, a regional Master Plan for a jetport in New Jersey could offer tremendous benefits to all of us who reside in the State. It is, in fact, the best instrument we have to protect us from the sprawling influence of New York that will rapidly turn New Jersey into a chaotic maze of undesirable developments. For these reasons, I strongly support the establishment of the New Jersey Airport Authority.

Thank you.

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you, Mr. DeAngelis.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Do you think that the New Jersey Highway Authority could build this airport or do you think it should be a separate authority?

MR. DeANGELIS: I would recommend the authority that is established specifically for the determination of whether or not we should even have a jetport. I think of this as a New Jersey Airport Authority, as a specific entity for this purpose.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: You listened to Mr. Flanagan this morning, didn't you?

MR. DeANGELIS: Yes, I did.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: He mentioned that a certain amount of money would be needed and the Authority would put up the money; that they're better equipped, supposedly, to

build this airport rather than start a brand new authority from scratch. You don't agree with him then?

MR. DeANGELIS: I would take exception to that unless it could be married into an organization or an authority that could have control of our Turnpike Authority and the Airport Authority. I feel that the Airport Authority specifically designed to protect the interests of the State of New Jersey to determine the advisability of an airport would have no outside influencing factors.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Well, the New Jersey Highway Authority is a New Jersey Authority.

MR. DeANGELIS: I understand that.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Like the New York Port Authority.

MR. DeANGELIS: I realize that. But I think specifically for the airport - they could work in concert with the Turnpike Authority.

SENATOR STOUT: Any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: This may not be relevant but I would like to have it on the record at least and also for the enlightenment of this Committee.

You talk about an experience you had going in with a single engine airplane sandwiched between two large aircraft. Are you telling us that the tower cleared you in on a service runway, a commercial service runway, controlling the traffic at Kennedy Airport?

MR. DeANGELIS: Exactly, yes, sir. And again at Newark the same day.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Now let's clarify that. You were cleared in on the service runway that was being used by 707's. Is that correct?

MR. DeANGELIS: That is right, yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Would you believe that there are specific runways for itinerant aircraft arriving and departing from the air traffic control zone in an air tunnel such as this?

MR. DeANGELIS: I have heard of this. I am aware of it. I still insist that we were slotted in on the major runway between two 707's at Kennedy Airport.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: I think if you could peg this, there should be some charges brought against someone. I fly in and out of there myself, occasionally. We do not use the commercial pattern at all. We never have. You're controlled on a vector and you land on an auxilliary runway. Now I didn't want this Committee to get the wrong impression.

The last time I went into Kennedy on a commercial flight from down South there were seven aircrafts on final approach at the same time. I question whether or not the tower would clear anyone in an itinerant flight in a single engine aircraft cruising along at 90 miles an hour to come in on a service runway at any air terminal, let alone Kennedy or Newark. You either misunderstood it or --

MR. DeANGELIS: Mr. Vreeland, I was in the airplane. I assure you that I was slotted in between two 707's. Now if you want to challenge that, I will be very happy to adjourn with you to Princeton Airport where we hired this air

taxi and he landed at not only Kennedy Airport but at Newark Airport. And, in fact, I would like to add, Mr. Vreeland, that when we landed at Newark the 707 directly behind us elected not to land. He pulled up and went around because he didn't feel he had sufficient space to land.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Because of your presence on the field.

MR. DeANGELIS: Not because of my presence on - well, because of the aircraft not having safe clearance between.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: All right. So much for that. Now, your contention is that the location of an airport only on the basis of political availability. I would like you to explain that. What do you mean by that?

MR. DeANGELIS: I feel the criteria that's used for the location of a jetport is too sketchy and not thorough enough. There are many factors that have entered into our discussions on the location of a jetport. I firmly feel, no questions, that when you look at the advisability of an airport in any location, there are many factors that must be considered and certainly the fact that it's within a certain quadrant, within the air traffic system, in itself is not it. It certainly is one of the factors which must be considered.

As far as the political implications of it, I am really not sure that I can go into a great deal of detail explaining that, but these have gotten into many of the discussions regarding the location of a jetport. These are the points that I feel in themselves are not justifiable reasons for whether or not we should have a jetport and where

that jetport should be located.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Does this contention of yours , with regard to political aspects, then diminish the point that I would like to make, and that is the objectivity, the objective approach. I think we should handle it unemotionally. Does this diminish that completely.

MR. DeANGELIS: I would hope that it would lean in that direction, yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Thank you very much.

SENATOR STOUT: Mr. DeAngelis, I have been here for four days now and I keep hearing about mass transportation to jetports and that's going to solve all of the problems of coming in and out, and I'm not an air traveler, per se, I'm a Lawyer in Monmouth County and I don't get out much, but I have never been to a airport yet where they've had mass transportation and I was thinking, you can't go to Idlewild or to Kennedy by subway. You can go to Aqueduct, which isn't far away. I don't know whether you can go to LaGuardia or not. I know the Essex Delegation has been trying to get some mass transit out to Newark Airport. And are there any airports that do have mass transportation facilities?

MR. DeANGELIS: I guess Cleveland is probably the only one.

SENATOR STOUT: But that's brand new.

MR. DeANGELIS: Yes. And, of course, they're working on it down in Miami.

SENATOR STOUT: What's the answer for this? These jetports have been around for quite a while and it would seem

to be that they are financially feasible.

MR. DeANGELIS: I honestly feel that the mistake that is made so often is to be highly critical of what we have today. And certainly nothing that I've said today is intended to be a criticism of what we have today. But when we look at this, and we've heard it many times here that we're going to require at least seven years from the start of design to the completion of this jetport; we've seen the projections of passengers doubling over probably a five year period; air cargo tripling or quadrupling. These are things that we've got to start planning for and we've got to think ahead of what we see today.

Now, if we look at Newark Airport, and I've flown over Newark on a number of occasions, you'll see the Turnpike with the additional North and Southbound lanes, you'll see the major interchange, you'll see the intersection of Routes 1 and 9, and 22, you'll see the additional runways at Newark Airport itself and taxiways, then the Marine Terminal, of course, and if there is anything that closely resembles a completely paved area, I think that area right there does today.

Now, even with all that they cannot accommodate the movement of passengers and goods over the road system. So if they can't do it today, our question is what is it going to be like ten years from today.

SENATOR STOUT: My question is, why hasn't it been done anyplace?

MR. DeANGELIS: Well, it's being done right now.

SENATOR STOUT: Well, why hasn't it been done? Newark

Airport has two rail lines, three, I guess, alongside of it or not more than a half mile away.

MR. DeANGELIS: I think there are two problems. First of all, the vehicles are really not developed right now. They are in development and there are some major strides in this. The French, of course, have one; GE has one; Gruman Aircraft; they're moving in this direction of high speed rapid transportation vehicles.

But the other point is, all too often we identify the subway systems that we know today as a system of mass transportation that would be used if connected to the airports. I think people reject a certain amount of this and the air traveler feels he wants a little more convenience than this.

This is one of the reasons why I think people have knocked down the subway systems and the mass transit systems.

But I feel, and I think there is good justification for this, that if you can tie the mass transit system to the airport system, you could start utilizing your transportation system, your rail transportation systems, both subway and railroad, and using it during off-peak hours for movement of mail, cargo and this sort of thing, to get better utilization or a better utilization factor out of such equipment.

Today the commuter trains are going into New York in the morning and back at night, and they have a one round-trip operation. This probably results in a utilization factor of maybe ten percent, I don't know, just roughly, but no business can survive on that. Whereas if they could utilize

that very equipment and that management structure for the movement of goods and could tie it in to the airport for air mail and cargo, I think you might have more hope for a self-sustaining operation of the entire transportation system.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: I'm going to punch a hole into what you just said about using these mass transit systems to take passengers to and from the airport and then in between carry the freight. Well, you can't very well put freight in a passenger train.

MR. DeANGELIS: Have you seen the 727 aircraft? Braniff is using them and a number of aircraft carriers are using them. They convert from passengers to cargo and they do this rather --

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Yes, but it's not practical to do it during the day for trains, is it?

MR. DeANGELIS: I don't know. I think this type of thing can be handled. The utilization factor is something. I feel that there are things that can be done to get better utilization out of this equipment, and this might be a suggested way of doing it.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Sight-seeing.

MR. DeANGELIS: Well, all right. That's good, sure. That's certainly the type of thing.

SENATOR STOUT: Are there any further questions?

Thank you very much.

MR. DeANGELIS: Thank you very much.

SENATOR STOUT: We'll call Willard Berner.

W I L L A R D     B E R N E R: Gentlemen, I'm Willard Berner, representing the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization. I'm a Controller at Newark Airport. On my right is Bill Reppert and he's a Controller at Philadelphia. He's also of PATCO. We have 7,000 members out of a possible nine thousand and some odd Air Traffic Controllers.

You have probably heard that there are some 21,000 Air Traffic Controllers. This has been said. There are not. There are just over 9,000 Air Traffic Controllers, as such. The rest of the people that are referred to are management of one type or another.

Now, if and I repeat, if a jetport is ever created in this State, PATCO, the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization wishes to draw your attention to what we feel is the most important aspect in its site selection, and that is, how efficiently it will operate as an airport.

Because an airport's basic reason for existence is to be a place for aircraft to land and depart, it is not an end in itself but only a means, a fact that has appeared at times in the course of these hearings to have been forgotten. The size, speed and performance of aircraft should be the only restricting factors in traffic movement at the ideal airport and in its associated air traffic patterns. When a site has limiting and geographic restrictive problems from the start its desirability diminishes. We feel that the projected air traffic movement to, from and over any site must be primarily expeditious, yet safe; and further, we feel we are the most qualified group to endorse a site on this basis.

We have reviewed the suggested sites and their impact on the complete air traffic complex. Since last fall we have endorsed the development of a major international jetport at Calverton on the eastern end of Long Island and the expansion of McGuire Air Force Base into a civil or joint civil/military jetport as the immediate and long-term solution to the present and compounding air traffic crisis. We stand by this endorsement. Our reasons are adaptability into the existing air traffic enroute structure, existing airport proximity and projected aircraft performance.

We of PATCO are deeply involved in aviation, and are the very heart of this nation's air traffic control system. The safe and expeditious movement of aircraft through this system is not automatic or fortuitous. It is the result of our personal and particular attention. We are expert in our field. We are unique and as such offer to this Committee our position and our views.

The absence of a co-ordinated national airport placement plan has resulted in the present hodge-podge of airport location, and its associated clog of air traffic. The New York City area should stand as a classic example of this. Newark, Teterboro, LaGuardia and Kennedy are each complete and workable as an airport, but their proximity causes delay and inefficient use of airspace. The traffic flow to the various instrument landing systems and runways at these airports are so interlocked that a mere shift of the wind necessitating a runway change may start a complicated, highly-co-ordinated, time-consuming deviation in air traffic

that may affect enroute aircraft for hundreds of miles around. Technically and effectively there is not enough airspace to operate efficiently to or from these airports and their instrument traffic patterns simultaneously.

Departure and arrival routes overlies each other in complicated profusion. The large and fast aircraft must intermingle with the small and the slow. The magnificent climb performance of the jets or the almost comical short landing characteristics of the small propeller aircraft cannot be used because there is no room for such considerations. Climb restrictions due to proximity of airports and noise abatement, enroute airway structure, single runway sequencing of all types of aircraft, lack of surface area for the construction of proper parallel runways, taxiways and ramp holding areas, and passenger-cargo handling area for maximum use and efficient airport operation are some of the many factors that have a direct effect on the New York City air traffic picture.

To enumerate all the problems would be quite time consuming and the technical language would only serve to confuse the uninitiated. The point to be made is this, no longer can airports be constructed in a locally convenient area without proper regard to air traffic movement. Improper placement could very well negate all other economic considerations. Its location must be close as possible to the air traffic ideal or its very reason for existence is diminished.

A well designed airport built in an illogical

unworkable spot is much like an ocean liner built in the middle of the desert. To build only for the sake of building is a real and sometimes unconscious danger. It is our hope that mistakes of this kind will not be made in New Jersey.

I could make some further comments, if you would like, on some of the points that have been brought out during the hearings. We've attended them all. And these are Controllers' viewpoints.

First of all, you have the term jetport instead of airport. Why? Because it's quite different from the old airport concept. Everyone of these airports spoken of here today, the C-5A, the 747, and so forth, will, no doubt, be stretched. The 727's have been stretched, the DC-8's and all the rest of the major aircraft have been stretched, which means they will carry more people, more cargo.

Have you ever seen a stretched DC-8 turn? It has a tremendous turning radius. That's small compared to the 747. And I am sure if they can build airplanes such as the 747 - I know you've heard expert testimony on this - they'll build them larger to carry more people and unload more passengers and more cargo.

At Kennedy Airport I am sure there are probably plans to extend runways. Pan-Am, I think, is rebuilding terminals to accommodate the 747. This is fine. What happened last summer when you had the delays, and so forth? Traffic getting to and from that airport was tied up in some cases five hours just getting into the airport. People thought they had missed their airplane and would find out

they had to wait another two hours to get the airplane.

The point was made of size. We feel that every time you build a major airport, and you build two half size instead of one major one, to coordinate the flow of that traffic you have to draw a line between them. Sooner or later you cross over that line. Every aircraft crossing over the line has to be coordinated. Our thoughts are, build major airports in real strategic places. And on this basis you have the feeder flow, whatever kind, whether it be STOL aircraft, airtaxi, high-speed transportation, whatever it may be. And I think you will find that in the future high-speed ground transport is going to be mandatory for any airport development.

I've heard comment about the white elephant at Dulles, that there are only a couple of airlines going in there. That's not so any longer. Dulles activity has picked up and most of your major airlines go into Dulles.

The way I see it, they made one big mistake, they didn't put any high-speed transport to and from that airport. Also it doesn't compare favorably with the thoughts of a Central Jersey site because it sits off to the side, in a way, in the first place.

Then you get into two other airports. A controller once told me, in the '40's I believe it was, he flew over the site of the then being constructed Kennedy Airport and then Idlewild. He said, "What are they building an airport way out here for in the boondocks?"

Likewise, Chicago O'Hare - I remember this myself. O'Hare had three runways, I believe, and there was talk, when

the jets were about to come out, that they were going to go to O'Hare Airport and give up Midway. The people said, we won't go to O'Hare, we'll go to Midway, we want to be in downtown Chicago. They didn't buy enough land around Chicago, around O'Hare Airport.

You have a situation whereby in ten years time - for ten years, I believe, the airport didn't do too much, seven to eight years, and then it started to grow. In the next ten years all of the area around there was saturated with industry, population, homes, arteries for traffic and the airport strangled. Now what are they doing in Chicago? They're looking forward to another airport. Well, where do they want to put it? There's talk about out in Lake Michigan. How far away from the existing Midway? How far from Migs? How far from the O'Hare airport itself? Not far enough. If they think they're going to solve the problems out there by putting another airport that close, they'll just compound the problems.

Now it seems that my employer and I, I should say, agree on one site, that's Calverton. But we don't seem to agree on this other site.

Now I want to make this clear. The papers have quoted that we oppose Solberg. Not to that extreme. It's better to have some airport than none. We say which is the better of the two and we believe it's in Central Jersey. There has been some talk about the feasibility of traffic patterns in that area. Well, let me submit that you already

have traffic patterns set up for the McGuire area.

There was comment about a hundred thousand operations at McGuire and a hundred and thirty thousand at Lakehurst. I think you will find that the 130,000 at Lakehurst are for the most part helicopter operations, helicopter training. They raise off the ground 40 feet and they land. That's two operations. It's the instrument traffic that really causes your problem.

I'll agree that VFR traffic in the area makes for a density of traffic that an Air Traffic Controller has to call to other aircraft - that's true, but it's handling it on a positive basis that's a real problem.

As far as McGuire goes, I think you will also find that that figure is high, it has dropped off. However, at any given time that airport could go into a bigger operation, that's true.

Now, of course, when we suggest that particular area, and it doesn't necessarily have to be McGuire, though if you do move it away from there you could end up with a similar problem. If, say, Lakehurst were to be developed fully, which it really couldn't be, being only six and a half miles away from McGuire, if you're going to develop McGuire fully, unless you want to cause a LaGuardia-Kennedy situation. If you throw another airport in there and you don't work out some kind of comprehensive plan for the three, or at least for the two, you'll have additional problems.

Now, for whatever the requirements of the military are, we are not involved with that. If that can't be worked out, I

suppose that shoots that idea down but that's not for us to judge.

One other point. There has been comment about Allentown, New Jersey, and the Cranbury site. We're opposed to that also as being too close, too far north. Again you might say it's only ten or so miles - I'm not sure just how far - from, say, the McGuire site, but that additional ten or fifteen miles make that much difference.

By the way, Solberg, 28 miles from Newark, you've got to divide that airspace somehow or other to accommodate both airports. It's 30 miles east of Allentown, air miles. Allentown doesn't have the size, at the present time, or air traffic capacity as Newark, but I'm sure that Allentown area is growing. They're about to get radar very shortly. They should have had it some time ago.

So, again, we take our position as Air Traffic Controllers.

SENATOR STOUT: Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Mr. Berner, I find your testimony quite interesting because of the fact that -- first of all, let me clarify or get some of these points clarified.

First of all, what is the Association that you represent?

MR. BERNER: The Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, PATCO.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: And how many members did you say?

MR. BERNER: We have over 7,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: And how many Controllers are

there in the United States.

MR. BERNER: Air Traffic Controllers that actually work in the positions and do the work are somewhat over 9,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: And what is your position with them?

MR. BERNER: I'm an Air Traffic Controller at Newark Airprt.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Well, I think your testimony is quite interesting because of the fact that many times I see where the people that work in the particular job actually know more than their superiors because their superiors only rely on reports and are not actually working at say the particular job, whether it be teaching school, which I do, or actually working at an airport. And I think this is an important aspect to bring out.

Well, why is it that you and Mr. Gary, who is the Director of the FAA, I guess you refer to him as your boss, disagree? He said that in Central Jersey there wouldn't be any airspace for a jetport site and he said Solberg is really the only area.

MR. BERNER: Well, the only thing I can see here - well, it's based on two things. There was a feasibility study done a few years ago and it's been heard - well, the report that came out was that it was unfeasible. It has been heard around that there were Controllers who worked on that project, and I happen to know a few of them, that said there was no such thing at all, that it could be feasible. Also I

think in his testimony he mentioned the fact about 100,000 additional operations to the 130,000 at Lakehurst and 100,000 at McGuire. The additional 100,000 could be accommodated.

I submit that when you're referring to instrument traffic, and this is the problem, that more than 100,000 can be accommodated. Actually, in a sense, we got rid of 130,000 at Lakehurst, for the most part.

By the way, that DCA unit down there, I understand from talking with Controllers that work in the area, is on call on 45 minutes notice for an instrument approach which would give you some indication of the activity at that airport with reference to instrument traffic.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Well, you're saying then that your organization would back an airport or a jetport in Central Jersey rather than in Northern Jersey?

MR. BERNER: Yes, primarily.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: In Central Jersey, not a specific location.

MR. BERNER: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: You've mentioned McGuire and Allentown but you would say further South.

MR. BERNER: That's correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Fine, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: One question. Did I understand your testimony to be that from the standpoint of safety, as the main consideration, the location of a jetport would be better further apart at Calverton and at McGuire, you say?

MR. BERNER: Well, I don't really believe I

mentioned any particular point about safety. There is a case of congestion. I believe the newspapers quoted me somewhat on that. When you add more aircraft to an already congested area, it's got to have that kind of an effect. However, if you build one at McGuire it also adds to congestion but not in the same particular east-west corridor as New York. It would blend in with Philadelphia, we feel, much better.

Now there was mention of the northeast-southwest corridor and I believe the idea of the Agency is that you can service from out from under it at Solberg much easier than you could coming out away from McGuire and going through it. All I can say is that in talking with Air Traffic Controllers, not only terminal but in route controllers - see the route controllers have to contend with this - there is a dissenter here and there, both in the terminal and in the center, you don't all the time get a hundred percent, but for the most part, to a man that worked that Colts Neck's sector down there and the Philadelphia sector, they say they would rather work out traffic out of Central Jersey sites going westbound than out of another airport west of Newark.

ASSEMBLYMAN RANDALL: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Would you care to comment on the potention for semi-automatic and automatic area traffic control and navigational system?

MR. BERNER: I'm not that well versed in the complete automatic system, and if they come up with those I am sure it will be some time before they are ever able to be implemented fully.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Is this a hot potato that's developing?

MR. BERNER: No, I wouldn't say so.

SENATOR STOUT: Any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: You mentioned, Mr. Berner, that the O'Hare, Chicago development planning, if they put the new jetport or airport at some reasonable close proximity would compound the problem rather than solve it.

MR. BERNER: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: How do you then justify your position then at McGuire, if we increase traffic in there in the northeast corridor, will that not compound the problem as well?

MR. BERNER: Gentlemen, any time you build an airport in the New York area you compound the problem. It's compounded. It's not a good situation no matter how you look at it but something has to be done. And there was comment made about - ten years ago we knew, as traffic controllers, that they should be building an airport now, that was ten years ago and we're still talking about it. And last summer will be probably an every year occasion in the near future, in the very near future. In your projections for traffic, it was commented I believe that the National Air Space Administration, 1964, estimated that there would be 13 million IFR operations in the United States by 1975. I believe the fact was that there were 16 million in 1967, 3 million more and some 8 years sooner. Now the estimate for 1975 is 33 million.

Air Traffic Controllers have been subject to the, you

might say the improper projections of traffic demands over the past years. And when decisions are made that affect us from an unoperational standpoint - in other words, people who have been out of the actual field of running traffic for too many years, many times we get the brunt of what comes down to us.

There was talk about they will attempt to resolve the problems in the Solberg area, traffic controlwise. Usually what's done is that they move the problem somewhere else, they don't particularly resolve it.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: I have one more thing to clarify, if you wouldn't mind. Mr. Backy, in 1967, I believe in a statement about the traffic in the Metropolitan New York Region, said that over 90 percent was south and west. Do you agree that this may be possible?

MR. BERNER: That 90 percent of the traffic was southwest?

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: South or west, just about 10 percent overseas.

MR. BERNER: I don't know the validity of those statements. We generate a great deal of traffic to the south and southwest.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Geographically it sounds feasible, doesn't it, though?

MR. BERNER: Yes, it does because the nation spreads that way.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Exactly, going through the turnstile as was mentioned before.

MR. BERNER: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: If we accept that as being reasonably true then, wouldn't you agree that if the eastbound and northbound traffic were intercepted before it reached the congested area it might be helpful, at least in the air?

MR. BERNER: Try that one again.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: My question is, if the statement of Mr. Backy is reasonable and if we were to intercept traffic coming into the New York Metropolitan Area before it penetrates, wouldn't that be helpful at least in so far as the air congestion is concerned? That's my question.

MR. BERNER: I was trying to get the gist of what you were talking about. You mean land at a point short in coming into an area. In other words, traffic from the east would land in an area to the east and traffic from the west to an area from the west and so forth. Is that it?

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: I didn't quite understand what you said but what I'm trying to say is intercept it before it gets into the congested area, that's all. Because you had said that Chicago might compound its problem and I'm wondering whether or not if these incoming flights were intercepted before they penetrated that area.

MR. BERNER: Well it seems like a reasonable assumption.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: It seems sensible to me.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR STOUT: Any further questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Berner.

(Applause)

SENATOR STOUT: We will adjourn until two o'clock.

(Recess)

[Afternoon Session.]

SENATOR STOUT: Mr. Geyer.

D O N A L D W. G E Y E R: Mr. Chairman, my name is Donald W. Geyer. I am from Newark and I am sorry that Assemblyman George Richardson isn't here - I conversed with him some number of days ago and have been unable to get him during the last 24 hours - because my statement takes the form of -- Well, I will read from it.

A New Jetport in New Jersey. An Open Statement to the Honorable George C. Richardson, New Jersey Assemblyman, from Donald W. Geyer, licensed "Professional Planner" of Newark, April 7, 1969.

Before I get into the text of the statement, I would like to say that the gallery here this morning obviously perhaps would not have been basically in sympathy with what I am going to have to say. But I think that the outline form in which I have prepared this statement is very elementary really and gets at not very complicated technical points, but of some very simple basic truths. I will be able to delve into them individually if you would like. However, I think I will get on with the reading of the statement.

Permit me to commend your efforts to secure the critically needed additional Jetport at a location most accessible to both the aviation demands and employment needs of the 5,000,000 people of metropolitan North Jersey - specifically the Solberg site.

Regarding the Solberg site, let me state the following, against my professional background and over 40 years residence in

4 urban, suburban and exurban counties of New Jersey:

1. Solberg is the only site remaining under active consideration which falls within the "Northwest Quadrant" of New Jersey - strongly favored by the F.A.A. as relatively free from air traffic hazards and congestion.

2. Solberg will not conflict with national defense needs as will a civilian jetport at or near McGuire Air Force Base.

3. Solberg is, by far, the nearest site still being considered to Newark and New York.

4. Solberg, however, is clearly beyond the heavily, and I emphasize "heavily", populated area, with mostly, and I again emphasize "mostly", sparse development to its west, north and south.

5. Solberg, according to my on-site inspection in the summer of 1968, is largely undeveloped and remarkably similar still to its undeveloped state as I also inspected it in 1961.

6. Solberg has terrain which is much more gentle, much less hazardous, and much less expensive to develop for either ground or air access, specifically as compared to hilly Bowling Green or Bearfort Mountains or Pine Island, New York, which latter 3 sites have, accordingly, been removed from consideration.

7. Solberg is along a number of parallel existing transportation routes serving a common major ground transportation corridor which extends through Somerville, Bound Brook, Plainfield and Westfield to Newark and New York. It includes Routes 22, 28, 202 and Interstate 78, as well as the Central Railroad of

New Jersey, directly onto the site, and the nearby Lehigh Valley and Reading Railroads.

8. Solberg is also accessible to other North Jersey areas including Paterson, the Raritan Valley and the Lakeland Region -- and to Trenton, to the Jersey Shore and the Lehigh Valley (that includes Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton and Phillipsburg) via the above highways and/or others nearby, including Routes 206, 31, 29, 18 and Interstate 287 and 95, which connect also to the New Jersey Turnpike and Garden State Parkway.

9. Solberg may be served readily, directly, and comparatively inexpensively by direct rail passenger service onto the site - cited by the Port of New York Authority which conceivably might well operate rail service into the Solberg Airport via the Jersey Central - via the above-mentioned lines directly connecting to many cities including Newark, New York and Allentown, Pennsylvania, and potentially West Trenton and Philadelphia. Present Jersey Central commuter service goes to the site. Consequently, rail improvement costs would be far less than for any other site now being considered.

10. Solberg is the only site remaining which is acceptable to the airlines which are in apparent unanimity. All other sites are totally unacceptable to the airlines, based upon remoteness, uncertain patronage, exorbitant costs, including access, and economic infeasibility.

11. Solberg is by far the most accessible site for 135,000 Jetport-generated jobs, for a cross section of the metropolitan population including the disadvantaged and/or minority groups. As such, it is strongly backed by labor unions, building trade

organizations and minority group leadership.

12. Solberg is the only remaining site which can be developed, suitably, without tying up as much as \$1,000,000,000 of State capital funding and borrowing capacity which should be available instead for such critical needs as education, health, housing, crime prevention, anti-pollution, recreation and ground transportation.

Gentlemen, it is folly and false pride to conceive narrowly of regional demand for air service as confined to the strange configuration of the 21 counties of New Jersey, or to let South Jersey and "exurban" power-structure interests dictate Jetport location, against benefit to the much more populous North Jersey areas, in addition to New York. Clearly, the immediately urgent air use demand and overload is in the north; -- the lower Delaware Valley Metropolitan Region has a less critical need and easier opportunities for solution in the future.

The Port of New York Authority, whatever its virtues and faults, and each are considerable, is eminently correct in insisting that a North Jersey-New York solution cannot be met practically, economically and competitively, from a site far closer to Philadelphia. The Port of New York Authority has competent airport development and operating experience and pertinent proven bonding capacity.

I therefore urge that the Legislature:

1. Defeat - setting up a new jetport authority. In that connection I would urge that you not set up a creature parallel to the many authorities that we have and I refer to Bill 377. I would oppose that. This would make three such authorities for

the New York-Philadelphia areas, and would mean that an unsafe, inaccessible and uneconomical site will be picked.

2. Defeat - assigning jetport development to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, whose objectivity would be unduly affected by what is best for the New Jersey Turnpike.

2. Defeat - any legislation favoring using McGuire Air Force Base, the Pinelands, the Allentown-Hightstown area or similarly remote sites.

4. Discourage - any party platform pledges against North Jersey development.

I strongly support your efforts, and I say parenthetically here that this was prepared for Assemblyman George Richardson and I am sorry he is not here. He was not aware of the text of this, but I do support his efforts in general to have the Solberg site developed.

I strongly support your efforts to get on with development of a Solberg Jetport as being detrimental mostly to a vocal privileged few, relatively, but in the broadest public interest, including 135,000 jobs. Thank you, gentlemen.

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Geyer. Are there any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: I have a few.

SENATOR STOUT: Assemblyman Wilson.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Mr. Geyer, as I look at your points here, first of all, point number one, I believe the controller has just recently testified to the fact that they would favor, as far as hazardous conditions are concerned, a central site, that they would think it would be more advantageous from the standpoint of

safety. Point number 3 where you say Solberg is, by far, the nearest site, still considered, to Newark and New York. Are we building this jetport for the benefit of the citizens of the State of New Jersey or for the citizens of New York? [Applause]

I am just going through the various points.

MR. GEYER: My answer to that would have to be that we do have relatively in the northern part of the State five million people at the present time. We have one jetport within the northern part of the State, in my community, in fact, serving this need and I could conceive of those five million people projected ahead to who knows how many additional people as requiring an additional jetport at some time anyway. I am assuming also that at some much later or subsequent date there may be a need far out of New Jersey, say, Calverton or way up the Hudson Valley for New York to handle part of its growing demand elsewhere. But it does seem mandatory to me that somewhere accessible to all of North Jersey, including the core cities that we have within North Jersey, we will need an additional one within North Jersey or beyond the present population perimeter and in that connection Solberg seems to meet the test.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: All right. Now, points 5 and 6, you mentioned as far as the sites - what is wrong with the Central Jersey sites as compared to those two points? The terrain is very much similar.

MR. GEYER: Yes, I will concur in that. I would rule them out for other reasons.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: I am just going point by point. The next one, point number 8, says as far as transportation to

Solberg, etc., that Trenton and the Jersey Shore would be quite readily accessible to a jetport at Solberg. But this is not true. I feel that this is quite a distance as far as Trenton is concerned, also the New Jersey Shore.

MR. GEYER: People living at the Jersey shore and Trenton would have to travel some considerable distance out of their respective towns in any event. However, if you do think of the needs of such places as Passaic and Bergen Counties or Union County or other counties, I think in total numbers of people affected that it would be more advantageous at Solberg and yet by the highways that I mentioned here, there is a reasonable complex of connections which crisscross the State in its narrow neck between Trenton and the North Jersey Coast which do lead towards the Somerville area via present highways and those now under construction.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: And point number 10 where you say Solberg is the only site remaining which is acceptable to the airlines. I believe Mr. Halaby who is the President of Pan Am testified before the Committee that if the jetport was located maybe in Central New Jersey, they would have to consider using that as a possible source for a jetport. Therefore, I think as far as the location is concerned, the airlines have already said on the record that they might locate in the area of Central Jersey if it was built there.

MR. GEYER: They might be forced to do a very infeasible thing because they might be left with no alternative that was remotely favorable to the air consumer or the airlines or anyone else. If we just sort of bury our heads - and I think some of

the political leaders of both parties, not meaning to disparage anyone in particular, somehow seem to doubt that we have the basic need or that the demand isn't here. I think this is shortsighted and looking backwards. I think we are due to get some sort of a jetport in New Jersey anyway and my suggestion is that we get on with the development of the one which will be favorable to the majority of our population. I do feel that the needs from Central Jersey south may have to figure in some later development; whether it occurs in New Jersey or not, I don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Also in point 11, where you mention Solberg is the most accessible site for 135,000 jobs, you don't mention Atlantic City, Camden and Trenton which also have hard-core unemployed and perhaps the jetport site should be readily available for them so they could also be employed and not only those in North Jersey.

MR. GEYER: It is a matter of proportion, Assemblyman Wilson. I do feel that the number of disadvantaged that we have back in our own county far exceeds those that you might have in a number of counties put together in some other parts of the State. And whatever is the ultimate employment salvation for Philadelphia, Atlantic City and Camden and other communities in the southern part of the State just is not necessarily bound up in trying to solve all of the aviation ills of the State from one location in Central Jersey which is neither fish nor fowl.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: In point number 12, you mention about the one billion of State capital funding and borrowing capacity, etc., but if we have an Authority, you have revenue

bonds, and therefore the Authority is the one who has to put up the financing, not the State of New Jersey.

MR. GEYER: I am questioning whether this would really go and whether we wouldn't have to tie up a great deal of bonding capacity by way of the Legislature pledging credit to any operation which isn't as well established as the Port of New York Authority. I have many pet peeves with them, but I don't see any reason why we would be administratively well advised to duplicate their know-how.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Well, your statement does not say that. I wanted to point that out. You are saying it is going to cost the State one billion dollars and I would like the record to show that with revenue bonds, it is not going to cost the State; it is going to cost the Jetport Authority if we actually have the wisdom to set one up.

MR. GEYER: That depends on the marketability of the bonds.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: Well, this is not spelled out in your statement, Mr. Geyer, and I think this should be pointed out because this is a matter of public record.

MR. GEYER: I am glad you asked me the question because that is what I feel is the reason for it.

SENATOR STOUT: Any further questions? Assemblyman Olsen.

ASSEMBLYMAN OLSEN: I am going to ask a question, sir, similar to one that I asked Mr. Halaby. Doesn't it seem that the necessity for a New Jersey jetport is basically because of the congestion of the New York area? Now we are talking about an intercontinental jetport and this brings with it to my mind the

fact that many people will be deplaning from overseas flights and be connecting with domestic flights. They are not going to reside directly in the area. They are not going basically to New York; they may be going to Chicago, Washington, D. C., and so forth. Wouldn't it be a little more feasible to locate the site centrally between the New York-Philadelphia area and utilize the facilities existing now at Philadelphia International and Philadelphia Airport as well as perhaps, if we had to, expanding the Pomona site, which is the NAFEC site down near Atlantic City? In other words, give a broader area of travel to those taking domestic flights after the intercontinental travel than they would have if the airport were located in Solberg and they had to be confined to Newark and LaGuardia and Kennedy for their domestic flights.

MR. GEYER: I think we are going to have problems with regard to air traffic patterns no matter where we put it. I have a hunch that they are going to be much more aggravated if we do get it any place in Central Jersey in the vicinity of McGuire and what not. We are going to mess up the whole civilian, commercial, military air pattern complex. But if we do put it at Solberg, we have some opportunities via existing ground transportation as it might be improved to integrate with the other airports and I will give this type of illustration. Now some people haven't accepted it, but I haven't ruled it out yet. It is to me conceivable that a specialized type of rail facility with baggage-handling capabilities could operate through service along routes which would handle demand from commuter service as well and perhaps in different cars on the same train and would hit

major employment centers theoretically, let's say, beginning at Kennedy International, passing through Jamaica Center, which is proposed to be developed as a major employment center, correlated to the New York City subway facilities, on through mid-Manhattan, out through a meadowlands development station, through downtown Newark, into Newark Airport, looping out again, out via the Jersey Central or something else and on out to Solberg. It is conceivable you might have a maximum interchange via some continuous specialized route hitting several major airports within a relatively short run.

ASSEMBLYMAN OLSEN: This portends another question, sir, because right now, let's assume the airport were located in the Allentown area; you would have the availability of the New Jersey Turnpike, the Garden State Parkway - you would have, we have been told, a special interchange from the Jersey Turnpike which could take us in and you would also have the availability of high-speed rail transport which is being developed now in New Jersey on the Pennsylvania Railroad even if it went through the Trenton station.

MR. GEYER: My observations are, sir, that the rail facilities get closer to a terminal site at Solberg now than do any facilities in Central Jersey with regard to any sites that have been mentioned there; and, furthermore, that the facilities of the interstate highway network plus the earlier existing highways in the Somerville area and in that vicinity generally are as good as and probably superior to those in Central Jersey which are not served ideally by either the Turnpike or the Garden State Parkway at the present time.

SENATOR STOUT: Any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Just two short questions. What is your background in planning. It says here you are a planner. Are you an airport planner?

MR. GEYER: No, sir, I am not an airport planner and I haven't passed myself off as somebody who was highly knowledgeable in airport matters. However, I have followed the jetport situation fairly closely. I haven't read all of the reports on it, but for the period of the last ten years, I have followed it quite closely, particularly during the earlier period of controversy as between the Great Swamp, at which time I thought that Solberg was much the preferable location.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Well, I have been talking with some experts around the country that follow different airport developments and so forth and it is my understanding now that we no longer need only a fourth jetport, but we need a fifth jetport also. A fourth jetport we needed several years ago. So what the Port Authority wants to do is build a small jetport up in Solberg. When I questioned them about a fifth jetport or another jetport in the future, I got, "Yes, that may go in Central Jersey and it may very well be as soon as this one is completed, we will have to start building another one." Why can't we build one now big enough to take the place of two jetports? Solberg is too small a place to put this big gigantic jetport.

MR. GEYER: I suppose an aviation expert who was completely objective on this matter - I don't think we have very many of them around - would be the best person to answer that. I have a feeling that the jetport planned in the Solberg area might have

a very considerable capacity and it might have a much superior capacity to that which the FAA would consider approving in the Central Jersey area around McGuire.

SENATOR STOUT: Assemblyman Vreeland.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Mr. Geyer, in the last portion of your statement, you talk about defeating three different phases and discouraging another. You have mentioned the feasibility of the Port of New York Authority. Let's assume that we did pick our own authority of some kind. Would you feel that we were making the wrong move if we were to use our present Bureau of Aeronautics to develop this facility that we are talking about? It is an existing group. It needs legislation to make it work, I realize.

MR. GEYER: Assemblyman Vreeland, I do feel, without trying to impugn in any way the ability or the motives or anything else of our State body, that we ought to get away from any chauvinistic notions that a creature of the State of New Jersey and solely for the State of New Jersey is the one that can necessarily meet a highly-complex, technological and financial problem which has geographic dimensions which in some ways transcend the State of New Jersey. I do feel that although I have taken great exception to the Port Authority many times over a variety of issues, they do have infinitely more sophisticated expertise with regard to airport operation and development. The airports that they are now operating, none of them have they developed entirely from the ground up, but I would say that against their background and experience that they would want the one that was their baby from the start to be the very

best that they could develop. They had, for instance, three great airport tragedies at Newark Airport which affected the City of Elizabeth some years ago and I think their proven record of safety at Newark Airport, whatever some people may think about noise factor or anything else, attests to their extreme competence when they are put under pressure to produce. And I think they have a great backlog of experience to draw upon.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Because of your respect for them and their ability in the past, would you then give them the authority to select the site as well?

MR. GEYER: I would hope and think that they might benefit from a little bit of guidance in this matter. But again, I feel that you gentlemen, for instance, might be unduly sympathetic perhaps because of the vocal nature of the outpouring of people here today, that this might be a disproportionate influence to the economic needs of the State and I did mention 135,000 jobs and their accessibility partly to disadvantaged people. I didn't see many disadvantaged people who were able to make it here today and I am a little bit disappointed in that.

ASSEMBLYMAN VREELAND: Thank you very much.

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Geyer. We appreciate your taking the time to come down.

I would like the record to note the presence of Senator Milton Waldor of Essex County who is here today.

I called Mr. Checchio earlier. He told me he had a very short statement, but he hadn't returned from lunch.

M A U R O     A .     C H E C C H I O :     Thank you for this opportunity to speak in behalf of the New Jersey Federation of Planning Officials.

To that top statement, I have attached a statement presented at the hearing on Bill S-377 which is what I would like to make today, "to create an Airport Authority." This was a resolution, that which is attached to your statement, adopted as a Federation policy on November 6, 1968, being so noted on page 4, in item number 6 of the minutes of the Executive Committee.

Although I am speaking as Chairman of the Mass-Transportation Committee of the New Jersey Federation of Planning Officials, I am also authorized to express the official position of the entire Federation, which is a Statewide organization, incidentally, as indicated by its adoption of the attached resolution.

The officers are listed there, Senator, and in the interest of brevity, I won't go through them.

A copy of this resolution was sent to the Governor, receipt was acknowledged, and it was passed on by him to the Department of Transportation. Receipt was acknowledged also by the Transportation Commissioner, David Goldberg.

I would, if I may, read this resolution, which is a short, two-page statement.

[Reads]

Resolution to the Executive Committee of the New Jersey Federation of Planning Officials.

"Whereas Governor Richard J. Hughes has appointed an Economic Evaluation Committee to study the feasibility of the location of an International Jetport in New Jersey; and

"WHEREAS that committee, after a year of intensive and comprehensive study has issued a report for adoption; and

"WHEREAS the Mass-Transportation Committee has followed closely and in many instances worked closely with the consultants and businessmen involved in the development of this New Jersey report; and whereas the Mass-Transportation Committee has carefully reviewed in its own meeting, and recommends strongly that the Federation take an official stand in the findings of the report. Be it resolved that the New Jersey Federation of Planning Officials approve the report of the Evaluation Committee and its findings and recommend to the New Jersey Legislature that without delay consideration be given to the report and suitable legislative action be taken for the following reasons:

"1. The requirements of the subject Jetport with supporting land transportation service," - and we would like to emphasize that because it hasn't been emphasized here - "can best be met in the region bounded by an area formed by Lakehurst, McGuire Air Force Base, Hightstown and Freehold."

As many of you will recognize, this is the essence of the Governor's Economic Evaluation report. That is where the suggested jetport was indicated to be.

"2. It provides for the orderly planning of a total transportation system," and we would like to re-emphasize that, a total transportation system, "which will serve as a solid foundation for greatly improved transportation for the entire State of New Jersey.

"3. It provides for the protection of natural resources and wild life preservation."

I know there have been a lot of people here from the conservationist groups, but I think they should be made aware that this report does in fact delve into that area of activity.

"4. It provides for a significant forward thrust in the economic base of the state in jobs and gross income.

"5." And this is most important as far as our Federation is concerned. "It represents the development of a facility that serves all of New Jersey and the adjacent Metropolitan areas of New York and Philadelphia, in contrast to New Jersey simply continuing to be an extension of Metropolitan New York or Metropolitan Philadelphia as it now exists."

I submit this as the statement of the Federation. I would like to make just one remark. In the conversations at our various meetings, it was felt strongly by the Federation of Planners that this will be one of the first opportunities that we have to make a really comprehensive, fresh start in planning an entire development which can serve as a foundation for something that is vitally needed in this State and that is a comprehensive development for land service and air transportation facilities. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

[Statement presented by Mr. Checchio can be found on page 44 A of this transcript.]

SENATOR STOUT: Are there any questions of Mr. Checchio?

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Where do you live?

MR. CHECCHIO: Union County.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Would you like to have a jetport up in Union County somewhere?

MR. CHECCHIO: There is no room for it.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: How about out in the bay there

some place?

MR. CHECCHIO: We do have a jetport there. Newark Airport is located partially in Elizabeth.

SENATOR STOUT: So is Linden Airport.

MR. CHECCHIO: So is Linden Airport. Hadley Airport is next to it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILSON: I would like to make a statement. Mr. Checchio, I like this one point here where you say that New Jersey should develop a facility that serves all of New Jersey and not just the adjacent Metropolitan areas of New York and Philadelphia, like New Jersey is an "also ran," so to speak, to New York and Philadelphia, and that now we should come up with some type of independent thinking about a facility that is going to benefit the whole State of New Jersey and in turn help Philadelphia and New York. I think it is about time we start thinking along these lines.

MR. CHECCHIO: Well, I can tell you that the most enthusiastic reaction by the Federation and its officers was that. New Jersey, after all, is the seventh largest state in the Nation. It has always been known as a corridor state and I heard some somebody refer to it as a turnstile state this morning. The fact of the matter is that that is where we are. We are right in the middle of the corridor between Boston and Washington. As a matter of fact, this is one of the considerations in this report that we felt was important, that the Central Jersey-South Jersey location is right off of and serviced by the main corridor or strip city, as it is often called, this megalopolis, as it is referred to so many times.

It is just our feeling, and we are certainly in sympathy with any of these people who are concerned with environmental factors and those things which do get affected in quality of living in our State, that it is inevitable that we are going to have some sort of a mass-transit, jetport air facility in this State, just the fact that we are located where we are and that is what has made the State great. All we are saying as planners is that when you have the opportunity to plan with an economic-thrust foundation, that this could serve for all kinds of transportation, and that this is an opportunity that we think a New Jersey group ought to look at instead of somebody from New York or somebody from Philadelphia. It is about time that New Jersey grew into its own. You wouldn't think of not having your own water resources group that was from New Jersey. You do cooperate with regional groups around you because they affect you. But the fact of the matter is that we are big enough and mature enough to think of our own future and there are a lot of competent men in New Jersey who can serve on this kind of a committee. I think this is what our principal appeal would be, that we do have planners in the State and we ought to plan for New Jersey and the center of the State is probably the area we ought to be planning for by the time this facility could be developed.

I would like to re-emphasize it is not just for an air facility system; it is for a total system of transportation that is properly planned, with all of the environmental factors.

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Checchio.

Mr. Johnson.

T R I S T A M     J O H N S O N: Gentlemen, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you. I will try to be as brief as possible in spite of the volume of paper you see in front of me.

For the record, my name is Tristam Johnson, a life-long resident of Mercer County, with over 20 years in various phases of the Investment Industry. I have been a Director of the New Jersey Citizen's Transportation Council and Vice President. As Chairman of a subcommittee last year, I prepared and presented for the Council its position before the Governor's Capital Priorities Commission on the transportation bond issue section of that effort.

I wish to further state for the record that Mr. Ben Regan, a senior partner of my firm, is one of the Commissioners of the Port of New York Authority. Mr. Blomquist has made a presentation of his report to various members of our firm. His conclusions were soundly received and my presence here today is with the specific authority of my firm.

I have attended much of the three days of hearings before your committee. It has appeared that facts on authorities, airports and their financing around the nation can be helpful to the record of the Committee in determining the question before you which are the bills for a New Jersey Airport Authority as well as the financial feasibility of a New Jersey airport. These comments are not being made as a representative of the Transportation Council but from a volunteer witness from the investment industry.

The report of the Governor's Committee recommended development

of a system of airports in New Jersey coordinated with an intercontinental passenger and cargo jetport, supported by comprehensive land-use planning and a statewide ground transportation system to provide the integrated transportation network essential for the whole state, its future population and its economy.

The bills being considered call for the creation of a New Jersey Airport Authority for "the planning, construction, operation and maintenance of airport projects," plural, not just one.

The Legislature is being asked to create an Authority to be the negotiating and operating body to establish and to carry out an air transportation plan for the future.

No alternative to a New Jersey Airport Authority for this long-term statewide function has been presented in my opinion.

I will try now to treat briefly with the three existing Authorities that have been proposed.

With respect to the Port of New York Authority, in the Port of New York Authority's latest prospectus, dated December 17, 1968, on page 3, there is a section entitled, "Description of the Port Authority" which reads as follows: "In general, the purpose of the States in establishing the Authority was to provide transportation, terminal and other facilities of commerce within the Port of New York District."

Of the 25 Port facilities identified on the map in the prospectus, 15 were located on the Hudson River, 6 in Newark Bay area, plus Kennedy, La Guardia, Teterboro and Outerbridge Crossing.

The area of concentration of responsibility of the Port of New York Authority was outlined in 1921 and remains the Port of New York District. It does not seem consistent that the Port Authority be considered to be the proper vehicle to develop a system of airports and supporting ground transportation services for the State of New Jersey. New Jersey leadership has an obligation to all of the State - the Philadelphia-Camden-Trenton port district on the Delaware River, as well as other legitimate public transit goals that must be achieved and coordinated.

It would seem from the prospectus that the Port Authority has over 2 billion of net investments in present facilities. It is in the process of investing over \$1 billion in further improvements. The World Trade Center itself has been estimated to cost up to \$750 million, and with completion several years away, final costs are expected to rise further.

A New Jersey Airport System should seem important enough for the State of New Jersey to continue to remain outside the Port District of New York. It should seem important enough not to have to compete with \$3 to \$4 billion of projects which should be enough in themselves to call for the financial and management ability available to the Authority.

With respect to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, the New Jersey Turnpike Authority has also offered to serve the needs of a New Jersey Airport Authority.

The latest prospectus for the New Jersey Turnpike Authority is dated March 12, 1969.

It states that the total original cost of the Turnpike, end-to-end, was \$466 million.

In the first page of the Summary Statement the cost of the present widening and improvement program just between New Brunswick and the northerly terminal is estimated at \$606 million.

It states further, and I quote:

"The consulting engineers have recently revised their over-all estimate of cost of construction to \$398 million, up approximately 6 per cent over the estimate in the spring of 1968 and 26 per cent over the original 1966 estimate."

Additional financing still needed to complete the present project is estimated to be \$167 million. Further Turnpike improvements may then be scheduled after January 1, 1974.

It seems to me particularly relevant to note the following: the whole cost of the widening project must be paid for by bonds whose interest until January 1, 1976, must be raised through the sale of additional bonds. This is due to the fact that the indenture covering the original bond issues sold to pay for construction of the original Turnpike, as a protection to the original bondholders, prohibited the servicing of any further bonds from the earnings of the Turnpike as long as any of the original bonds were still outstanding.

In effect, the Turnpike has created a legally-binding compact with holders of the original bonds; there were about 50 per cent or \$234 million of the original total still outstanding as of January 31, 1969. All of these bonds have to be paid off before Turnpike earnings can service interest requirements on the new widening debt.

The Turnpike has also created a legally-binding compact with the holders of the new widening bonds: all original bonds

will be paid off by January 1, 1976. After that date, debt service requirements of the widening issues will be paid from net operating revenues.

Gentlemen, the cost of construction of this current widening program has increased more than \$100 million; the interest cost may have increased up to \$50 million.

Diversion of current earnings for any purpose would seem to jeopardize both compacts referred to.

The prospectus further carried the statement that if the remaining \$167 million bonds were to be sold at 5 3/4 per cent interest rate, which as you are aware was the rate at which the recent issue was sold within the last two weeks, estimated net revenue would provide debt service coverage ranging from 1.10 to 1.39 per cent during the years 1978 to 2005.

It has been stated at these hearings that New Jersey's population will reach 10 million by approximately 1980. More highway construction will be needed to serve that growth. I submit it is hardly appropriate or possibly advisable to divert the Turnpike from its authorized purpose. Its area of financial responsibility would seem well outlined.

The New Jersey Highway Authority - According to the New Jersey Highway Authority 1968 Annual Report, the Authority for several years has been studying ways to reduce extraordinary congestion, as well as to improve its safety record on the State-owned sections, primarily the 13.6 mile stretch in Union-Middlesex. As soon as President Johnson signed the 1968 Federal Highway Omnibus Bill on August 23, the way was cleared for the Authority to begin updating its feasibility studies for the

40-mile Toms River Garden State Thruway together with the purchase and widening of the State-owned sections. This feasibility report is to be due by spring of 1969.

According to the 1968 Annual Report, the New Jersey Highway Authority by January 1, 1969, had \$320 million debt outstanding, having retired some \$50 million senior debt, of which some \$10 million was retired ahead of schedule out of surplus operating revenues.

The improvement programs currently under consideration must be carried out and they could double the outstanding debt of the New Jersey Highway Authority.

Future demands can be expected to require further expansion of New Jersey Highway Authority facilities.

Again the New Jersey Highway Authority also would seem to have a major financial responsibility with its own outlined programs.

The New Jersey Airport Authority. The bills as drawn should be passed in my opinion. A New Jersey Airport Authority is the only logical vehicle for the "planning, construction, operation and maintenance of airport projects" in New Jersey.

With respect to the Intercontinental Jetport, I firmly support the suggested location of McGuire-Lakehurst. Land acquisition cost would be cheaper. No homes or personal property would be taken.

The Military Reservation is up to 22 miles East-West by up to 8 miles North-South. Ascending and descending glide patterns would be well retained within the Reservation.

A minimum area outside of the Reservation would be included

under any flight lanes. Holding patterns could be over the ocean.

New Jersey is a heavily populated state. There is absolutely no justification for planning a jetport now in direct contact with any part of the State's residential areas present or future for the many reasons that have been outlined here before you.

It is time that the State's leadership made it unequivocally clear that the mission of the citizens of New Jersey comes before the mission of the War Department.

While it may have been entered into the record, I have not heard reference to the release by U. S. Senator Clifford Case to the newspapers, September 27, 1967, wherein he referred to the letter finally received after 6 years of efforts by his office from the Department of the Air Force, analyzing military use of McGuire Air Force Base, and I quote:

"The Military Airlift Command (MAC) accounts for only a relatively small percentage of total annual landings and take-offs at McGuire. In 1966, this figure was 26.5 per cent. It was only 17.89 per cent of total capacity. By far the larger number of aircraft movements - 71,968, according to the Air Force - involved training of MAC, Air Reserve and Air National Guard units."

An additional 15,000 movements were for a Squadron since departed, an Aero Hobby Club and "transients" unrelated to MAC.

It is my understanding that much of the rest of the Reservation is used for fire practice.

It is also my understanding that as of November 1967 there were a number of airports being jointly used by Air Force and civilian planes throughout the country.

It is further my understanding that the new C5A cargo

plane will be used by both military and civilian air cargo, and that there is no runway in McGuire now capable of handling a C5A.

Creation of a major jetport under the auspices of the New Jersey Airport Authority could only enhance the value of this facility to the military in an emergency. The Air Force currently contracts for guaranteed stand-by emergency air carrier passenger space. It would seem a major opportunity for the military to guarantee a New Jersey Airport Authority Jetport as an emergency facility of vastly greater value to the Air Force than the present McGuire Airport.

Gentlemen, the New York Times of August 1, 1968, carried an interview with Mr. Austin Tobin, Executive Director of the Port of New York Authority:

"There is congestion in airports all over the United States, mainly because of us. . . . A passenger from Tel Aviv to Rome and back was delayed more than two hours on both flights last weekend because both planes originated at Kennedy. . . . I am hopeful that in a couple of years we will be able to work out a site." He added that "construction would take six years for a minimum of 8 years until congestion is eased. Until then it will get worse. Instead of two hour delays in peak hours, we'll get three hour delays, and then four hour delays and maybe five hour delays."

Preparation of McGuire should not take 8 years. Distance to any jetport site in New Jersey is immaterial when contrasted with 5 hour delays.

Gentlemen, 1976 is only 7 years away and 1976 is the year New Jersey should be the site of the National Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of the birth of our Nation. It is up to you whether the Gateway for the World to that Celebration will be a New Jersey Intercontinental Jetport. There is little time left.

I submit in further evidence here lists of airports now operated by public bodies, either authorities, cities or departments of states.

[Mr. Johnson distributes lists to Committee members. Copy of the list can be found on page 46 A of this transcript.]

I include in this list the location of the airfield, the negotiating body responsible for relationships with the airlines and the bondholders, you might say, and the rating service rating - Moody, M; and SP standing for Standard and Poors. As you can see, these represent airports around the whole United States. They represent ratings that are fairly consistent.

I just wanted to add a few more comments relative to the financing of airports. It is our opinion that a New Jersey Airport Authority can be a financially feasible vehicle. It must be understood that the creation of an airport is different than creating a department store. You don't build a department store and the customers come to the door. Before you build an airport, you create a relationship with your tenants. No airport on that list was constructed without a prior agreement with the airlines considering the use of the facilities to be constructed there.

Airport revenues come from many sources: rental of terminal space, hangars to airlines, automobile parking, other concessions, landing fees, fuel sales, fees and others. Many of these airports are financed by bonds whose income comes from airport revenues, from adjustable fees paid by the airlines, from, in one case, a back-up of a debt covenant - I think it is

the Wayne County, Michigan Airport. There are some in which there is a covenant with the city or the state involved, much as our own State of New Jersey had a covenant on the New Jersey Highway Authority. It is my understanding that the New Jersey Highway Authority did not need to call on the State for revenues, but it was initially financed by State-guaranteed bonds. There are two types of obligations outstanding on the Garden State Parkway, one is State guaranteed and one is not. I do not believe it had at any time the need to call on the State for funds.

SENATOR STOUT: Are you ready for questions?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

SENATOR STOUT: Mr. Azzolina.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: He answered two of mine already.

SENATOR STOUT: Well, I would like to ask one.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Wait - I am not through yet. I had four. Would your company develop or obtain the seed money to finance the initial operations of a separate authority without the credit of the State being involved?

MR. JOHNSON: This is a question again that can only be answered on the basis of the vehicle that has been created and the indenture or the law creating the vehicle. Let me be clear in what I am saying. Step number one is delegating responsibility to a body to officially represent the State of New Jersey in negotiating with airlines as well as location of a site. Whether this body is your Department of Transportation in its Aviation Division or a newly-constituted Airport Authority, that step has to be first. Beyond that step then, yes, we would be glad to be in a position to work with such an Authority to

build a pattern and we would be able to help them provide a framework that would provide a marketable financing.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: What are the normal operating expenses at a major airport, less debt service, at the major airports in the U.S.A.? The Blomquist Report shows about 10 per cent.

MR. JOHNSON: What are the major airport expenses?

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: This again I am afraid would have to vary with each individual situation. You can find airports here of half the size of other airports. The Massachusetts Port Authority which also runs Mystic Bridge is being invited to take care of the central part of Boston to reconstruct areas. I think the majority of these operations are single airport services.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: His report shows about 10 per cent. Miami has 34 per cent; Los Angeles, 33 per cent; Philadelphia, 23 per cent, etc.

MR. JOHNSON: It all depends who draws up the list what kinds of expenses are included in what list.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Do you want me to repeat the question?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: I will repeat the question. I don't think you really answered it. What are the normal operating expenses at a major airport, less debt service, at the major airports in the U.S.A.? Blomquist report shows about 10 per cent. And I have figures here that show Miami as 34 per cent; Los Angeles, 33 per cent; Philadelphia, 23 per cent.

MR. JOHNSON: The best direct answer to you is that we are in the financing business, not in the airport management business, but I would be glad to secure those figures for you if I can.

SENATOR STOUT: You have been here when the other interested groups have testified and you talked about relationship with the airlines and you feel that you could entice them to come to McGuire. That is what you are saying. They unequivocally said they wanted to go some place else.

MR. JOHNSON: I appreciate your compliment to our firm, sir. But my answer would revolve back on the initial concept of the purpose for which New Jersey is launching a new study of its transportation needs. If the leadership in New Jersey determines that an airport authority is a valid vehicle through which New Jersey's air and supporting ground transportation needs can be reviewed, a plan developed and activated for the years to come, this is the body then that determines where a site should be located rather than anybody outside of the State of New Jersey.

SENATOR STOUT: Well, the testimony as I remember was that Solberg could be an economically feasible airport a lot sooner than McGuire. Who would pick up the cost of carrying the bonds during the period which comprises a difference in time between the two, which appears to be some ten years, as I remember?

MR. JOHNSON: Questions of determining feasibility or the rate of feasibility of one airport or another, we would not be in a position now to comment on obviously. However, it would be

feasible to state that any airport on that list was not sprung full-blown for its first airline take-off. Each one of those has been a progressive development procedure. A New Jersey jetport could be financed at a pace at which the financing would be self-supporting.

SENATOR STOUT: Well, you mentioned the Garden State Parkway. They were not revenue-producing bonds. They were backed by the full faith and credit of the State and to do that you have to have a statewide referendum. Do you feel in light of what you have heard around these halls the last four hearings that a referendum of that nature would pass?

MR. JOHNSON: In the first place, I don't want to indicate I recommend it. I do not. I do not think it would be necessary to finance a self-supporting airport.

ASSEMBLYMAN AZZOLINA: Would you repeat that answer?

MR. JOHNSON: My answer was this, that I am not recommending a State support, a State backing, to a New Jersey Airport Authority financing. I do not feel that would be necessary to make a facility financially self-supporting.

SENATOR STOUT: Let me ask you about this list of airports. These are all financed by you say public bodies. They were built and financed by public bodies as opposed to Newark Airport which was built by the City of Newark, I think.

MR. JOHNSON: That's correct.

SENATOR STOUT: And then later the Port Authority leased it.

MR. JOHNSON: Again many of these originated as municipal airports. Many of them originated as military airports and after 1945, '46, '47, became owned or passed on or taken over by

authorities or -- for instance, Hawaii obviously requires the use of its airports for inter-island transportation. The Hawaii airport system is managed by the Department of Transportation of the State of Hawaii, all thirteen airports including their major Honolulu International. There are variations between each of these that are pertinent to each kind.

I have here, which I will leave with you, a manual supplying an analysis of each one of these airports.

SENATOR STOUT: Aren't there many more than this in the same category?

MR. JOHNSON: There can be smaller ones. These are the major-sized airports. Others might be supported by general obligation bonds supported by the faith and credit or taxing power of municipalities. This was an attempt to put together a list of airports not supported solely by full faith and credit taxes.

SENATOR STOUT: That's all. Thank you very much, Mr. Johnson.

I think we have one more witness.

S T E V E N M. C I C A L A: My name is Steven Cicala, Cape May County, New Jersey, businessman and pilot of my own airplane, and I have had reason to travel the length and breadth of the eastern seaboard and as such I am quite familiar with the problems of air traffic control.

I have had the pleasure of sitting here for the last four hearings and the word "air traffic" has been bandied about. I am submitting for the record reprints of articles appearing in Flying Magazine entitled, "Air Traffic Control." The gist

of these articles is that today's system of air traffic control and tomorrow's needs are on a collision course.

Now since this Committee has been entrusted with the responsibility of investigating every phase of the problems involved in establishment of a jetport or another airport in the State of New Jersey, I feel that as much information as possible in arriving at a fair evaluation is necessary at this time. And I am sorry to state that up until this afternoon, there hasn't been much light shed on this particular air problem because, after all, air traffic as such is the problem. That is what causes the congestion we have been talking about and that is what is bringing about this idea or talk of another jetport.

There is no question - every expert agrees - that there is air traffic congestion and I would like to quote from the first page of this reprint. As the in-flight and ground delays get longer, the number of near-misses increases and the procedures necessary to be in the system, that is, the air traffic system, mount in complexity; serious questions arise as how well ATC, that is, Air Traffic Control, is doing either of its jobs. Along with this suspicion, there is a growing conviction that if we are to have any real improvement in safety and in the orderly flow of traffic, there is going to have to be a complete overhaul of the present ATC system, its rules, its equipment and its philosophy.

Now briefly I would like to run down a few of the subjects that are discussed in this particular article, and I might say at this point that this particular article or any related articles

are must reading for any person with the slightest responsibility in projecting the future of air traffic and all its ramifications. I might also state that I have no particular preference at this point. I am not for or against anything, but rather here for information. As I remarked earlier, we were treated to the first shed of light of what the real problem here is by the gentleman representing the professional Air Traffic Controllers' Association and as they can well testify, things are a sorry mess upstairs.

First, let's take a quick look at what the problems are and as outlined in the article, we will suggest some solutions. The present air traffic control system was inaugurated strangely enough right here in New Jersey about 30 years ago when the airlines banded together to form a common system whereby they can have some form of control which was lacking at the time. At that time, we had what we call the low frequency range which was actually oriented to only four positions of a compass. From that system evolved what is presently known today as the omni-system, that is, where a navigational facility is used to home in on from any point of the compass rather than the four originally with the low frequency system.

As the system progressed, more and more airways were added to the point where today we have a complex system of airway traffic. I say "complex"; if you were to fly from one point to another, there are certain airways that are established for your proper guidance. This makes it uniform so that any pilot regardless of the type plane he is flying can go from any point, from point x to point y, with a system using the Victor

airways, as they are called, as guidance. We will get into that more later. The result has been that the airlines and the general aviation public have been using these airplanes with not too much difficulty enroute, say, from Newark to Pittsburgh or Newark to Miami, while they're enroute. The problem that has come up is that when all these planes start gathering at the terminal point, what we call the high density area, that is when the problems begin to multiply.

Gentlemen, the inescapable fact is that any runway at any airport can only land or take off one airplane at a time. If an airline schedules 50 flights - not one airline - I'm sorry - but rather if a combination of airlines schedule 20 flights to arrive at the same time, there is nothing in this world, no system in this world, can accommodate all 20 at one time. I will repeat. Only one plane can land at a time and that is where the complications come in.

Aside from the fact that the air carriers or the commercial airlines do use the airways as such leading to the termination -- and incidentally I might point out that every one of these airlines is what we call an instrument flight plan. He may have 100 miles of visibility, unrestricted visibility, but yet he is on an instrument flight plan which means that from the very moment that he takes off to the moment he lands, he is under direct control of air traffic. That means that he has to report positions. His altitude has to be monitored and there are communications constantly between him and the controller, which adds to the difficulty. Along with this - and there is one factor that has not been brought up in all of these hearings and I think it is so

essential it cannot go by any longer - and that is, that there are 50 times more private airplanes in the air than there are air carriers and when that controller sits at that radar scope, it makes no difference to him whether that blip on that screen is my airplane or United Airlines' biggest jet. To him, they are both blips on a screen and he has to provide service or control so that a maximum amount of safety is exercised. That is one of the greatest problems today. And yet, as I said, in all of these four hearings, never once has that been brought out. You may say, "Well, why bring it up now? What good is it to us as planners?" The simple truth is that we must face the fact that these airplanes are there and they are as much a part of the air traffic control system as any jet airliner.

This may sound startling, but any private pilot can take off from any airport in the State of New Jersey or anywhere for that matter and fly over Kennedy with absolutely no control, provided he stays above 2,500 feet over that particular area; that is, the control zone of any airport. Now that may sound like a ridiculous statement, but it is true and is as it should be. The skies are free, as they say, and this air control system is a government process and everyone feels that they are entitled to get in the air space, of course, staying within bounds of the rules and regulations.

Now the problem of congestion and safety between the air carriers and the private airplane only manifests itself in and around the high density areas, around the New York Metropolitan area, possibly Miami, Chicago and other places, and as such, we just can't wish them away. It is a problem. But having the

problem here, there must be solutions, which we will get into in just a moment.

What I have tried to point out here is the fact that we do have this problem of dealing with jet airliners along with public aviation.

This brings us to the point where we do get to the terminal area. Now 20 planes want to land at the same time. Well, it is a physical impossibility. What is the answer? The most pressing need today in planning is longer runways are needed, that is, for the air carriers. I will go into the reason. I believe at the last hearing one of the experts was asked the question: Why does Miami want 15,000-foot runways? Well, as stated in the article, it is very simple. In the offing and as a present reality, we have what they call automatic landing of airplanes - I am talking about airliners now - where they can be guided in electronically to the point of touch-down where no human hand touches the controls. It is all done automatically. Now the purpose of that is that you can get more precise control of your air traffic. If a plane is programmed to touch down, say, in the first 1,000 feet of the runway and you have scheduled another aircraft behind it in a matter of, say, 2 minutes, it can be timed so precisely that you get to a more increased flow of air traffic, consequently, less congestion.

If we have 15,000-foot runways and have an automatic landing system, it is natural to conclude that you have a higher degree of efficiency and most certainly a higher degree of safety, which after all is one of the prime responsibilities of air traffic control.

Now automatic landing systems are not dreams; they are realities. As a matter of fact, I understand Pan Am has been testing them regularly. In England, it is an accomplished fact. They use them, as the article points out, almost constantly. Possibly this will answer the question: Why the 15,000-foot runways? As it stands now, if you are scheduled to land, say, within the first thousand feet and another plane is scheduled behind you, they provide such separation that they will not clear the traffic to the rear unless the aircraft that is on the runway is cleared of the runway. At least, that is the way the system is today. So that would call for larger runways naturally.

Speaking of runways, I heard the statement here in these halls, talking about ten runways, a fantastic concept. If they put them crisscross, yes, I can see ten runways. But what could be the benefit, say, of only four runways, parallel, at 15,000 feet each? At the present time, air traffic control will not allow parallel runways more than 5,000 feet distance between them, with the result that the space on the ground takes up much more room and you can't accommodate the flow of traffic as readily.

The new concept seems to be that parallel runways, as many as you possibly can have, would be the answer to expedite traffic.

When we talk of high density areas, one of the recommendations that has been brought out is that in these high density areas, flying corridors be established; that is, where a plane takes off directly, straight on out, at its maximum rate of climb to get as high an altitude as quickly as possible.

Now visualize this. I have a little model there - Assemblyman Vreeland, if you will hold it up there. That is one concept of a flying corridor. We start off from my right and take off at a maximum performance climb. I have that marked in gradations, from 3 miles, 6 miles, I believe 11, 19, 25. Now at the end of 3 miles, he should have gotten at least to 3,000 feet. In other words, that is the air space allotted in that particular climb corridor. So a private airplane flying through that area would have to fly beneath this traffic zone or air space, thereby avoiding the traffic in that climb corridor and I think eventually this will be the pattern of all control zones in all high density areas because your airliners are restricted to that particular climb area only and everyone else stays out of that area.

We have a more graphic picture on page 26 of the air traffic control. You will see exactly what is mentioned here. To me, that is the thing, not only because I say it, but rather it is the opinion of most experts that this is going to have to be a must in any high density area of the future.

Now we come to the last point that I would like to make here and that is in reference to what has been bandied about here as air traffic. We have heard only air traffic with no meaningful definition. I understand that the FAA has voiced an opinion about a particular area in North Jersey and mentioned that that area would not be suitable due to the air traffic considerations. Well, gentlemen, I can only state that air traffic as such can be changed by the simple publication of a notice to all airmen, which is done daily through the Airmen's

Information Manual.

I would like to hold up here an air chart that pilots and navigators use getting from one point to another. Unfortunately, I don't have additional copies of this, but I have taken the liberty of marking specific routes that pilots are requested to follow. This is known as preferred air routes and they are prescribed by the FAA. Any pilot going from one point to another, certain routes are recommended. And I might point out here that in the red and green pencil marks here - points of departure of Kennedy, La Guardia and Newark - all take in areas either to the extreme west or to the extreme right of Central New Jersey, up and down the coast.

Additionally we have what are called standard instrument departures. From departures out of Newark and La Guardia, you can see that it is published that planes are asked to take a radar-vector heading and are vectored over the Solberg omni - have to mention Solberg, not from the ground location, but it happens to be a fact that at Solberg - I only know it as an inverted ice cream cone really - there is a radio navigational facility called Solberg, to which all planes on a standard instrument departure from Newark are vectored to the Solberg OMNI, that is, the radio navigational facility, and from there they go on to Victor 3, Victor Airway Number 3, and then they continue on to whatever destination they have chosen, that is, either Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore and any point south.

Now as I point out, this is not like a road map. If you look at a road map, you will see a ribbon of a road. It is a physical impossibility to pick up that road and move it elsewhere;

whereas, in air traffic, these lines are just imaginary lines in space and they can be changed just as easily as - well, publishing a report that that airway has been changed to this direction or that direction - and it is done every day simply by looking in the Airmen's Information Manual. They have substitute routes at all times and special notices. So if changes are to be made, it is a very, very simple thing, of course, taking into consideration the present structure and the amount of notice that is given to the people who are using these particular airways.

So when we talk of this area or that area not being suitable for air traffic, well, at this point I must take issue because it is within the jurisdiction and certainly can very simply be done by the FAA and there is no area in the sky because the sky is open. There are no concrete roads that have to be moved or bridges to be built. It is all there, free and open.

Now the purpose of what I am saying here actually is to help in arriving at a conclusion or a determination in relation to the jetport. For instance, this military climb corridor that I speak of -- Assemblyman, if you will lift that climb corridor up, you will notice - you fly yourself - at McGuire you will see there is a climb corridor or rather there was up until a few years ago. And if you will just turn that around and place that right on McGuire, there is your air corridor leading out of McGuire. Now I point this out for one reason. It is not pointing to Toms River. It is not pointing to Asbury Park. I don't know exactly where it is pointing. But the fact is that it is pointing

in only one direction and if we can establish climb corridors out, then the quicker they get upstairs, the better it will be for everybody concerned. In any problem that is due to noise, what we have determined about pollution and any other subject related to these climb corridors, you can see that a little basic knowledge of what the airman is concerned with in air traffic control will bring about a better understanding; not only that, it probably can eliminate many of the problems that the people have been talking about.

Now, to me, the climb corridor is one great aspect because it will confine the area which will be subject to any problem that may come up. The 15,000-foot runways, parallel runways - again where years ago an airplane had to depend strictly on where the wind came to effect a successful landing, that is all changed. The air carriers don't have these problems today, not to the degree that they affected the small plane of yester year.

Therefore, I hope that this little discussion here will go a long way in making people realize that there are things that can help in arriving at a fair determination here at the least inconvenience to the general public. Thank you.  
[Applause.]

SENATOR STOUT: Thank you. Are there any questions?  
[No response.]

I want to thank all of you for your patience and there being no further witnesses, we will adjourn the hearing for today.

[Hearing Adjourned]

March 4, 1969

Attached is a statement presented at the Hearing on Bill S-377, "to create an Airport Authority." This was a Resolution adopted as Federation Policy on November 6, 1968, being so noted on Page #4 in item #6 of the minutes of the Executive Committee.

Although I am speaking as Chairman of the Mass-Transportation Committee, I am also authorized to express the official position of the entire Federation as indicated by its adoption of the attached Resolution.

The officers of the Executive Committee of the Federation are as follows:

President

Mr. Samuel P. Owen  
Metuchen

First Vice President

Mr. Jules W. Marron  
Newton

Area Vice Presidents

Mr. Joseph J. Carr - North Plainfield  
Mr. John J. Daly - Kearny  
Mr. Donald C. Hart - Bridgeton  
Mr. Paul L. Opdyke - Stewartsville

General Counsel

Mr. Harry E. Bernstein - Plainfield

Associate Counsels

Mr. William M. Cox - Newton  
Mr. Harold Feinberg - Point Pleasant Beach  
Mr. Charles A. Reid - Plainfield  
Mr. Harry L. Sears - Boonton

Treasurer

Mr. Harry A. Maslow - Berkeley Heights

Assistant Treasurer

Mr. William F. Gillette - Point Pleasant Beach

Assistant Secretary  
Mr. Juhan Simonson - Trenton

Executive Vice President  
Mr. Thomas A. Hyde - Mountainside

A copy of this Resolution was sent to the Governor, receipt was acknowledged and it was passed on by him to the Department of Transportation. Receipt was acknowledged also by the Transportation Commissioner, David Goldberg.

M. A. CHECCHIO



**HORNBLOWER & WEEKS - HEMPHILL, NOYES**

35 WEST STATE STREET  
 TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08608  
 (609) 396-7551

AIRPORT FACILITIES  
FINANCED AND OPERATED BY PUBLIC AGENCIES

Alaska - State Dept. of Public Works - Fairbanks and Anchorage International Airport	M-BAA SP-BBB
Atlanta, Georgia - Atlanta Airport	M-BAA SP-A
Chicago - O'Hare International Airport	M-NR SP-BB
Dade County Port Authority, Florida - Miami International A/P plus 3 small general airports	M-BAA SP-BBB
Denver, Colorado - City & County of Denver - Stapleton Airport	M & SP Under Review
Hawaii Airports System - Airports Division of the Dept. of Transportation of the State of Hawaii - 13 airports including Honolulu International	M-NR SP-BBB
Hillsborough County Aviation Authority, Florida - Tampa International Airport replacing Municipal Airport	M-BAA SP-BBB
Los Angeles - City's Dept. of Airports, Board of Airport Commission - Los Angeles International, Ontario International, Van Nuys Airport	M-BAA SP-A
Mass. Port Authority - Logan Airport, Hanscom Field, Mystic Bridge and Center Boston	M-NR SP-A
Port of Oakland, Calif. - Metropolitan Oakland International Airport and miscellaneous facilities - 5 member Board of Port Commissioners	M-BAA SP-a
Port of Seattle, Wash. - Seattle-Tacoma International Airport and miscellaneous facilities - Municipal Corp. co-extension with King County	M-A SP-AA
St. Louis, Mo. - St. Louis Airport Commission - Lambert - St. Louis Municipal Airport	M-BAA SP-A
Wayne County, Mich. - Detroit Metropolitan Wayne Co. Airport (Wayne County debt service covenant)	M-A SP-A



