

The Remarks of
The Honorable Gerald L. Baliles
Former Governor of Virginia

and

Chairman, Coalition for a Global Standard on Aviation Noise

before the UC Berkeley Airport Noise and Air Quality Symposium 2001

San Diego, California
Monday, February 26, 2001

I want to thank you for inviting me here. This gathering has gained in importance over the years, and is now seen by many as the major conference on aviation noise and environmental issues in North America.

Concurrent with the increase in this meeting's importance has been the growth in importance of the issue of noise to the aviation industry.

Concern about noise is certainly one of the reasons why there have been so few new airport and runway projects approved in this country in the past 20 years.

Concern about noise has also begun to enter heavily into decisions airlines make about which aircraft to fly on certain routes and which to order for the future.

Indeed, a major issue now surrounding the Airbus project to develop the new super jumbo A380 that will carry more than 600 passengers is how to insure that it will be quiet enough to operate in and out of London's Heathrow Airport, where operations are constrained by a stringent noise budget. One of the things I hear from both airlines and manufacturers is that the airlines have begun asking aircraft builders for assurances that new planes will meet not just today's Chapter 3 noise standard, which officially goes into effect around the globe next year, but also any noise standard that comes into place during the useful life of that aircraft.

So, noise is not just a neighborhood issue anymore. It is not just an environmental concern any longer. It is a matter of great economic importance to

airlines, manufacturers and airports. It is also an issue of increasing importance to airline passengers because of the effect it can have on the ability of the aviation system to expand to meet demand for air travel, a demand that grows by 100,000 people per day in this country alone.

So, when I was approached several months ago about speaking at this conference, I was delighted to accept. After all, I am chairman of a 65 member, worldwide coalition of airlines, airports, manufacturers and labor organizations whose major organizing principle is that the adoption of a new international Chapter 4 aircraft noise certification standard is critical for the future growth of the global aviation system. There was never any question of whether I would accept your invitation. This meeting and this issue are too important for me not to be here.

There was a major question in my mind when I accepted, however, about what I would be able to say, whether this would be an upbeat speech about progress made, or a downcast dissertation about opportunities lost.

Several months ago it was not at all clear that ICAO's Committee of Aviation Environmental Protection, CAEP for short, would be able to agree on a new standard or much of anything else. There were sharp, fundamental, disagreements among governments, among industry officials and others over what the new standard should be, whether relatively quiet aircraft could be re-certificated to meet that standard, and whether a global phase-out of older marginally compliant airplanes would be imposed on the airline industry. There were sharp disagreements over how to interpret the data emerging from the cost and benefit models that had been developed specifically on this issue for CAEP's use in making its decisions.

And while the political climate last month was not as bad as earlier in 2000 when the dispute between the United States and Europe on hushkits was in full flower, there were still questions in some minds about whether governments would be able, or willing, to make decisions on some of these issues.

At stake was the very question of whether the most international of all industries would be governed by an international standard, or whether the system would disintegrate into a crazy patchwork quilt of local noise requirements and operating restrictions.

At stake was whether the aviation system would be able to grow to meet rapidly rising demand in almost every corner of the globe.

At stake was whether people who live near airports would continue to see improvements in the noise climate, or whether expanding operations would result in expanding noise contours.

So, the stakes were obvious. So were the risks. What was less obvious was whether the will existed within the industry to allow CAEP and ICAO to succeed. So,

when I told the organizers months ago that I would come to San Diego to speak, I had no real way of knowing what kind of speech I would be able to deliver. I just knew the topic was incredibly important not just to the aviation industry specifically, but to the global economy in general.

So, what happened in Montreal last month?

With a lot of hard work and careful analysis, CAEP was able to reach agreement on a far-ranging list of issues that will produce additional aviation noise relief for communities.

A recommendation was made for a new noise certification standard for new production aircraft. (I'll speak more about that in a minute.)

Agreement was reached on re-certification of aircraft and on global harmonization of national certification procedures.

Agreement was reached on noise abatement departure procedures, an issue of great importance to pilots.

Agreement was reached on how to move forward on a wide range of aircraft emissions issues, which I'm sure you will be hearing more about later in the week when this conference shifts its focus to that important subject.

Why is all this good news?

History teaches us many lessons, if we pay attention. One of the clearest lessons is that as a region grows economically, and as the standard of living improves, people become more concerned with matters of environmental quality. In today's growing economy, environmental issues, generally, are of serious public concern and will increasingly affect the aviation system's ability to expand services, and thus its ability to respond to the demands of the global economy for fast, efficient delivery of people and goods. It is that simple.

When roads become congested, it may be possible to find alternative modes of transportation, a train or a subway for example. But there really is no good substitute for air transportation. For, while the Internet permits us to communicate instantaneously around the globe, it is air transportation that gets the business executive from Europe to Asia for a critical meeting in less than a day. It is air transportation that gets the essential part for a critical machine to a factory in less than a day so that production may resume.

Last November, I attended a meeting of airport executives in Budapest, Hungary, which ended on a Tuesday evening. I was due at a meeting of airline executives by early Friday morning – in Auckland, New Zealand. Take a look at a globe and see how far away that actually is! For me, there was simply no substitute for air travel; there was no other way to get there – even if I had had a week. Indeed, for most of us, coming to San

Diego for this meeting would not have been possible without air travel. We simply would not have had the time. It is probably fair to say that is true for many of our business meetings and much of our leisure travel.

And what about the two billion passengers who use air travel every year, many of whom need to travel on short notice to business or personal engagements far away?

What about shippers? Forty percent of the world's international cargo, by value, now moves by air. Why? Because consumers – yes even residents around airports - want quick deliveries. They want their fresh produce or flowers. They want electronic equipment delivered to their doors, or their offices, when they want them. Not next week, or next year. But tomorrow.

That's why, by the way, cargo flights arrive or take off during the night, because the shippers at the point of origin want to ship during the last hour of the business day and the recipients want the goods to arrive during the first hours of their business day.

To all these travelers, shippers and others, the world's airlines and airports are vital; they are dependent upon an aviation system that is international in scope, and none of us could even contemplate being without it. That is why the ICAO process can not be allowed to fail. And that is why a number of leaders in the aviation industry from around the globe joined the coalition I now lead, to help insure the success of ICAO's important work.

If the global system for setting aviation noise certification standards had collapsed in Montreal, aviation equipment manufacturers would have been forced to return to the rather expensive and time-consuming process of getting their equipment certified by multiple regulatory authorities.

Airlines might not have been able to cross-utilize their fleets in various markets, producing enormous economic penalties and higher prices for consumers.

Airports would have had an even tougher time gaining approval for projects to expand capacity, though I suppose the extra capacity wouldn't have been needed if the system crumbled.

Passengers could have found that the time they traveled would be chosen by the political dictates of their destination, not by their personal or business requirements.

And air freight customers would have needed to build and operate more warehouses to accommodate the vagaries of the airplane that couldn't land and deliver the goods because a weather delay half-way around the world caused the flight to miss the curfew at the destination airport.

And finally, it was clear that the international air transportation system would have been stymied in its ability to meet the expected increases in demand for air transportation.

Fortunately, the results of CAEP and their expected adoption by the ICAO Assembly in September this year will help us avoid these dire consequences.

The new standard recommended by CAEP was set at a cumulative level of 10db below Chapter 3. That is significantly quieter. I believe this new standard will help produce long-run noise relief for people around airports.

Although the newly proposed standard does not come into effect until 2006, it will become the de facto standard for production aircraft as soon as the Assembly ratifies it in September. That is the way this game works. The last standard, set more than two decades ago but not globally implemented fully until next year, has resulted in the production of new airplanes that already exceed it by 8 to 20 db. So, the public will not have to wait five more years to begin to see – or hear – these effects. Indeed, manufacturers are already at work on modifications to aircraft and engine packages that will reduce noise on planes now being produced at minus 8 or minus 9 db.

Let me make one more important point about the noise standard. Some people have said that a minus 10 standard does not go far enough because current production airplanes already meet minus 8 or better. Indeed, some, like the 777 are quieter by minus 20. Some say that going from the current Chapter 3 standard to a Chapter 4 minus 10 standard is nothing, especially when a few very new planes are now being produced at minus 20 or better. I would like to argue to the contrary.

The fact of the matter is that manufacturers design, and airlines buy, planes at a noise level well beyond the ICAO standard. Manufacturers do not have the luxury of designing and building exactly to the standard – nor can airlines afford to buy right at the standard. Airlines demand a plane that can meet the standard with plenty of margin so that they can use their large investments in the markets for which they were intended for years to come. Since a new airplane can cost well over \$100 million, that only makes sense. In essence, most planes are produced at minus 8 or better today because the Chapter 3 standard was set where it was. Therefore, a Chapter 4 minus 10 standard will really mean that airplanes will be produced at minus 14 or better in actual performance.

And what of the planes being produced at minus 20 or better? The 777, as I said earlier, is the example most people point to. Why can't all airplanes be that quiet?

The problem is that the technology involved, including the large engine size, is not now applicable to the smaller "workhorse" planes, particularly the Boeing 737 and the Airbus A321. The engines that fit the 777 simply do not fit structurally under the wings of a 737 or an A321. I am confident, though, that the new standard will help push manufacturers to address the issue of improving the noise performance of these smaller planes, which account for a large percentage of the takeoffs and landings at airports, and,

thus, account for a large percentage of the airplane market. With new technology applied, neighbors of airports will hear a difference in the future.

While this paints a hopeful picture from the manufacturing side of the noise equation, CAEP did not solve every issue. Indeed, members were unable to agree on the elements of a balanced program for noise abatement around airports or the ability for the most noise impacted airports to have the flexibility to take special action to contain any growth of noise contours.

The balanced program concept would require aviation noise abatement to be worked on not just at the source of the noise --- the aircraft --- but also on the ground using a wider variety of methods such as land use planning, appropriate zoning regulations, noise insulation of buildings and houses, airport land acquisition, placement of noise barriers, and changes in operating procedures, for example changing approach patterns or runway use during certain sensitive hours.

Flexibility for special actions to contain any growth of noise contours refers to whether, and under what circumstances, regions or local airport authorities would be able to apply operating restrictions to certain types of aircraft or during certain times of the day in different ways depending upon local circumstance.

Because those issues were not resolved last month in Montreal, airports, including those who are members of our coalition, are not completely satisfied with the results of CAEP. They believe, for the most part, that minus ten may provide enough noise relief in the long-term, but their short-term requirements to reduce noise were not addressed in any manner adequate enough to get community support for growth at their facilities. So, airports, and their associations, are applying pressure on governments around the world to reach a multilateral agreement within ICAO that would allow this short-term relief by placing operating restrictions on noisier aircraft at their facilities.

As the ICAO process moves toward its conclusion later this year, the question for the manufacturing and airline industries becomes whether they will be willing to submit to a patchwork of individual airport actions unguided by any international standards or framework of basic elements, or whether they would prefer an ICAO adopted international framework of basic standards for airports wishing to apply some of these additional measures.

The fact is that some of the busiest airports in Europe and elsewhere are already applying measures on an individual basis. They will continue to do so, with the support of their national governments so that they can continue to grow their businesses. Other airports have restrictions drafted and are waiting in the wings to spring into quick action if ICAO members fail to reach an agreement on regional flexibility in the context of a balanced program.

So, the story is not yet ended. That is why it is important that ICAO succeed in resolving these remaining issues, so that any additional actions taken on a regional or

local level to reduce noise exposure – including operating restrictions – can be done within an internationally agreed framework.

ICAO members will be reviewing ideas on how to address these issues between now and the ICAO Assembly in September of this year. Our coalition will be working with our members and with interested governments to help find agreements on these issues. The challenge is to find the words that can bridge the gap between the short-term needs of certain severely noise impacted airports and the need for long-term stability in the overall, global industry.

Let me conclude with a few words about air system capacity. This is an issue to which increased attention is being paid, finally, in this country. As I noted earlier, 100,000 new passengers are being added to the U.S. air transportation system every day. You can do the math: 700,000 per week, three million per month, maybe as many than 30 million per year. That's about twice the number of people handled by just one airport, Washington Reagan National Airport each year.

Let me repeat: we are adding twice the number of passengers handled by National Airport every year. Yet, during the past thirty years we've added just two new airports in this country. We have added precious few runways. Indeed, Seattle got approval for a new runway in 1993, but has not yet been able to break ground. Memphis needed ten years to get its runway approved, and an additional six to actually finish it. There are many other stories, many of which you will hear over the next couple of days.

There is a long list of reasons for this. It should be noted that airline resistance to some projects has been a factor over the years. But I believe that resistance is breaking down as the impact of congestion has begun to show up on the airlines' bottom line. What remains, though, are community concerns over noise and other environmental issues. And they cannot be ignored or dismissed.

We must respond to these concerns so that new runways can be built in the many places where needed, new terminals can be added to ease congestion and new airports can be built when required.

Air traffic control reform and advances in air navigation systems can help relieve some of this pressure. But infrastructure growth on the ground must also be part of the solution.

So, while we act to address concerns about noise and to bring noise relief to people around airports, we must also make the case that as aviation gets quieter the system must be allowed to grow. The agenda cannot be one of producing noise relief by shrinking the aviation system. To those who would advocate such a solution, we must ask them how they will defend the resulting limits on economic growth and opportunity. They must be asked to explain to people the reason for the adverse impact on their standard of living. For if we are not able to deliver people, goods and services to destinations and markets, we can neither compete nor prosper.

I don't believe most people really want reduced aviation service to be the solution to the noise problem.

So, let's support the work of ICAO in resolving the issues of balanced program and regional or local flexibility. Let's support ratification of the new standard, so that new production planes become quieter. Let's follow the example of airports who are willing to do the hard work of getting together with their communities to address concerns so they can meet their communities' growing aviation needs.

If we do this, we can have a future that is both quieter and better – and an aviation system that is more responsive to the needs of people everywhere.

Thank you.

###