



KF 27
.I5587
1966c

Author *U. S. Congress, House*

Title *Airports at National Parks*

Imprint



AIRPORTS AT NATIONAL PARKS

4 - OCT 10
HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION.

AND AERONAUTICS.

OF THE

CARD DIVISION

J. S. Congress. House. COMMITTEE ON
INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 11089

A BILL TO AMEND THE ACT APPROVED MARCH 18, 1950, PROVIDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF AIRPORTS IN OR IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO NATIONAL PARKS, NATIONAL MONUMENTS, AND NATIONAL RECREATION AREAS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

SEPTEMBER 27 AND OCTOBER 3, 1966

Printed for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Serial No. 89-51



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1966

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

HARLEY O. STAGGERS, *West Virginia, Chairman*

WALTER ROOERS, Texas	WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, Illinois
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland	J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, California
TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Massachusetts	SAMUEL L. DEVINE, Ohio
JOHN JARMAN, Oklahoma	ANCHER NELSEN, Minnesota
LEO W. O'BRIEN, New York	HASTINOS KEITH, Massachusetts
JOHN E. MOSS, California	WILLARD S. CURTIN, Pennsylvania
JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan	GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
PAUL G. ROGERS, Florida	JAMES T. BROYHILL, North Carolina
HORACE R. KORNEGAY, North Carolina	JAMES HARVEY, Michigan
LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, California	ALBERT W. WATSON, South Carolina
J. J. PICKLE, Texas	TIM LEE CARTER, Kentucky
FRED B. ROONEY, Pennsylvania	
JOHN M. MURPHY, New York	
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, Virginia	
DANIEL J. RONAN, Illinois	
J. OLIVA HUOT, New Hampshire	
JAMES A. MACKAY, Georgia	
JOHN J. GILLIGAN, Ohio	
CHARLES P. FARNSELY, Kentucky	
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Mississippi	
BROCK ADAMS, Washington	

W. E. WILLIAMSON, *Clerk*

KENNETH J. PAINTER, *Assistant Clerk*

Professional Staff

ANDREW STEVENSON
KURT BORCHARDT

JAMES M. MENGER, Jr.
WILLIAM J. DIXON

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, *Maryland, Chairman*

JOHN D. DINOELL, Michigan	SAMUEL L. DEVINE, Ohio
J. J. PICKLE, Texas	GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
DANIEL J. RONAN, Illinois	ALBERT W. WATSON, South Carolina
J. OLIVA HUOT, New Hampshire	
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Mississippi	

RVS 7N66

~~CONGRESSIONAL~~ 8-9-2
~~HEARINGS, PRINTS AND REPORTS~~

KF 27
I 5587
1966c

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearings held on—	
September 27, 1966.....	1
October 3, 1966.....	15
Text of H.R. 11089.....	1
Report of—	
Air Force, Department of the.....	3
Budget, Bureau of the.....	1
Federal Aviation Agency.....	3
Interior, Department of the.....	2
Statement of—	
Baker, Howard W., Assistant Director of Operations, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.....	7, 15
Bowers, Chester G., Deputy Director, Airport Service, Federal Aviation Agency.....	5
Johnson, Hon. Harold T., a Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	13
Olsen, Hon. Arnold, a Representative in Congress from the State of Montana.....	4

0000

AIRPORTS AT NATIONAL PARKS

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1966

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Samuel N. Friedel (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The meeting now will come to order.

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics meets today to consider H.R. 11089.

First I would like to make a brief statement about that. The Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics will consider H.R. 11089, which provides for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to the national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas.

This bill was introduced by our colleague, Congressman Arnold Olsen.

(H.R. 11089 and agency reports thereon follow:)

[H.R. 11089, 89th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend the Act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act approved March 18, 1950 (64 Stat. 27; 16 U.S.C. 7a-7e), is amended by striking the figure "\$2,000,000" at the end of section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$3,500,000".

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to the Committee's request of September 17, 1965, and subsequent requests for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 11089, "To amend the Act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes."

The report which the Secretary of the Interior is submitting describes the purposes of the bill, outlines the proposed program, and recommends enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of H.R. 11089.

Sincerely yours,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
Acting Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1968.

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

DEAR MR. STAGGERS: Your Committee has requested a report on H.R. 11089, a bill "To amend the Act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes."

We recommend the enactment of the bill.

Section 2 of the Act of March 18, 1950 (64 Stat. 27; 16 U.S.C. 7b), [authorized the appropriation of not more than \$2 million for the Secretary of the Interior to develop or participate in the development of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas. At the present time the \$2 million authorization has an uncommitted balance of only about \$330,000.

In 1950 the number of visitors to units of the National Park System was 37,209,700. Today, however, that number is more than 111,385,800 and air travel has become a popular means of visiting and enjoying the rich scenic, scientific, and historic features of the National Park System. The current need for airport facilities at national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas cannot be met with the funds available under the 1950 authorization. In the 88th Congress the Senate Committee on Appropriations took note of this fact and urged the Department to give expedited attention to legislation that will increase the authorization.

H.R. 11089 amends section 2 of the 1950 Act by increasing the authorization from \$2 million to \$3.5 million. The increase will be used principally by the Department to assist in two airport projects: one at Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming; and one at Glacier National Park, Montana. The two projects have been proposed as a result of the Department's comprehensive survey of the current need for airport facilities to serve national parks. Under the 1950 Act and the Federal Airport Act of 1946 (49 U.S.C. 1101 *et seq.*), as amended, the Department may share the cost of airport projects in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas with State or local agencies and with the Federal Aviation Agency. That agency also provides technical services in order that the project will conform with the national airport plan.

The project at Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming, will consist of reconstructing the present Jackson Hole Airport which is within the park. Traffic at the Jackson Hole Airport has increased sharply in recent years and it is expected to continue to do so. The present runways, taxiways, aircraft tie-down, and hangars are inadequate and need to be expanded. The terminal building, vehicle parking area, and the airport access routes require upgrading to modern standards. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$959,785 of which approximately \$495,000 will be borne by this Department. It is expected that the balance will be contributed by the Federal Aviation Agency. Teton County and the City of Jackson Hole, Wyoming, will pay the costs of operating and maintaining the airport.

The project at Glacier National Park, Montana, will involve the construction of an airport at East Glacier, Montana, of a size sufficient to facilitate visitor access to this increasingly popular park by feeder-line commercial aircraft, and to provide for emergency operations and administrative needs of the National Park Service of this Department, the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, and other Federal agencies. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$1,030,000 of which about \$523,000 will be contributed by this Department. It is expected that the balance will be contributed by the Federal Aviation Agency. The Montana Aeronautics Commission will operate and maintain the airport and pay the costs thereof.

The Department's share of the cost of the two projects is thus about \$1,018,000. The remainder of the \$1.5 million increase provided by H.R. 11089 (approximately \$482,000) and the uncommitted balance in the present authorization (approximately \$305,000) will provide about \$787,000 for future projects. Having such an amount available will obviate the necessity of the Department seeking funds for future airport projects on a piecemeal basis. It is expected that the \$787,000 will ultimately be used to provide airport facilities at other places where needs are anticipated but for which further study is required.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY A. CAIN,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request to the Secretary of Defense for the views of the Department of Defense with respect to H.R. 11089, 89th Congress, a bill "To amend the Act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes". The Air Force has been delegated the responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense.

The Act of March 18, 1950 (64 Stat. 28; 16 U.S.C. 7a-7e) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish and operate airports in the continental United States in, or in close proximity to, national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas when determined by him to be necessary to the performance of the functions of the Department of Interior, provided such airport is included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Airport Act.

To carry out the purpose of the Act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire necessary lands with the consent of the State and political subdivision in which the land is located, and to contract for the construction and maintenance of such airports, provided "That the authorization herein granted shall not exceed \$2,000,000".

The purpose of H.R. 11089 is to amend the Act of March 18, 1950 to increase the scope of the authorization granted by the Act from \$2,000,000 to \$3,500,000.

The Department of Defense interposes no objection to the enactment of this bill. However, inasmuch as the Act of March 18, 1950 requires the inclusion of such airports in a current revision of the national airport plan as a prerequisite to the establishment of any airport pursuant to this authority, it is recommended that the views of the Federal Aviation Agency be obtained with respect to the proposed amendment.

Enactment of this measure will have no effect on the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the Committee.

Sincerely,

LEWIS E. TURNER,
Deputy for Installations.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for the views of this Agency on H.R. 11089, a bill to amend the Act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes.

The Federal Aviation Agency maintains an annually revised National Airport Plan which contains our best estimate of the Nation's airport needs. Included in the current plans are certain airports in or in close proximity to national parks, monuments, and recreation areas. We therefore favor enactment of H.R. 11089 as a means of providing funds for the construction of needed airport facilities.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this report to your Committee.

Sincerely,

NATHANIEL H. GOODRICH, *General Counsel.*

Mr. FRIEDEL. We will hear first from our colleague, the Honorable Arnold Olsen.

STATEMENT OF HON. ARNOLD OLSEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, allow me, first to extend my appreciation for this opportunity to testify before you in support of H.R. 11089. When I introduced this bill last fall, I was acutely aware of the need for better airport facilities near our national park units. After reviewing the subject more closely, I am even more convinced of this need.

H.R. 11089 proposes to amend section 2 of the original authorizing act of 1950 by increasing the authorization from \$2 to \$3.5 million. I am informed that the increase will be used principally to assist in two airport projects: one at Grand Teton National Park, Wyo.; and one at Glacier National Park, Mont. These two projects have been proposed as a result of the Department of the Interior's comprehensive survey of the current need for airport facilities to serve this Nation's national parks.

The project at Glacier National Park, Mont., will involve the construction of an airport at East Glacier, Mont., of a size sufficient to facilitate visitor access to this increasingly popular park by feeder-line commercial aircraft, and to provide for emergency operations and administrative needs of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, and other Federal agencies. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$1,030,000 of which about \$523,000 will be contributed by the Department of the Interior. It is expected that the balance will be contributed by the Federal Aviation Agency. The Montana Aeronautics Commission will operate and maintain the airport and pay the costs thereof.

Glacier National Park is one of the world's outstanding scenic attractions. It was visited last year by nearly 900,000 people from every State in the Union and many foreign countries. Because of its location in the northernmost region of the United States, it is somewhat inconvenient for many people to visit this famous national park. The completed airport at Glacier would permit thousands of people to visit the park from all parts of the United States. A similar airport, completed near Yellowstone Park last year, attracted 20,000 people in the first 3 months of operation, which is nothing compared to the traffic this airport will receive when the general public becomes fully aware of the advantages a park airport provide for tourists and vacationers, and many of the visitors to Yellowstone Park would also visit Glacier National Park.

In 1950, the number of visitors to units of the national park system was 37,209,700. Today, however, that number is more than 111,308,800 and air travel has become a popular means of visiting and enjoying the rich, scenic, scientific, and historic features of the national park system. The current need for airport facilities at national parks,

national monuments, and national recreation areas cannot be met with the funds available under the 1950 authorization. In the 88th Congress the Senate Committee on Appropriations took note of this fact and urged the Department of the Interior to give expedited attention to legislation that will increase the authorization. I have been informed that the necessary authorization has passed the Senate. I am also informed that the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior, and the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Air Force have been consulted and all have given their approval of the measure before us.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I urge your approval of this bill. To a Nation of vacationers it will mean greater accessibility to the natural wonders of my State of Montana. To Montanans, it will mean a new opportunity to serve the urban centers of our Nation with the beauty of our land.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Thank you for your views Mr. Olsen.

Mr. Chester Bowers, Deputy Director of the Airports Service of the Federal Aviation Agency, is the next witness.

Mr. Bowers, you may proceed in reference to H. R. 11089 and S. 476.

**STATEMENT OF CHESTER G. BOWERS, DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
AIRPORT SERVICE, FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY**

Mr. BOWERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

These bills would amend a 1950 act which originally provided to the Interior for airports projects in or near national parks, national monuments and national recreation areas. The proposed authorization would add \$1.5 million for the same purpose.

Under the Federal Airport Act, the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized to use grant-in-aid funds to match funds of other Federal agencies for airports at these locations, and we have done so in past years.

The Federal Aviation Agency has assisted the National Park Service in the development of airports serving the national park at Kill Devil Hill, N.C., and the national parks at Grand Canyon, Ariz., and West Yellowstone, Mont. The Agency recognizes the need for civil airports in national parks to provide air access to the public:

The Department of the Interior has indicated that it will use a portion of the \$1.5 million for improvement of the airport at Jackson Hole, Wyo., and for construction of an airport at East Glacier, Mont. Both airports are included in the national airport plan and would, therefore, be eligible for financial assistance from FAA.

We favor enactment of these bills.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Is this for general aviation only, or commercial aviation?

Mr. BOWERS. The proposal to improve the existing airport at Jackson Hole, Wyo., would benefit air travelers who travel by scheduled airline service, namely, Frontier Airlines, as well as the general aviation public.

The airport proposed to serve the Glacier National Park in Montana would serve only general aviation.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Pickle, any questions?

Mr. PICKLE. No, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe so.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Williams?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have a question I would like to ask Mr. Bowers.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This increases the figure of \$2 million which I presume is set aside in the Airport Act to other Government agencies. Is that correct?

Mr. BOWERS. No, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are these funds earmarked in the Airport Act?

Mr. BOWERS. Not in the Airport Act administered by FAA. This is a bill for the Department of the Interior authorizing appropriations to the Department of the Interior which that Department would propose to use as funds to match an FAA grant for improvements.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand it, this is not an amendment to the Airport Act?

Mr. BOWERS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. PICKLE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, surely.

Mr. PICKLE. In construction of airports in or in close proximity to the national parks is there any designation as to what kind of facilities there will be at the airport with respect to whether it would be regular power or jet planes? Would it permit the construction of jet fields?

Mr. BOWERS. It could, Mr. Congressman. It could provide the construction of facilities to meet whatever need exists.

Now, if you talk about the airport at Jackson Hole, Wyo., the critical need, that is, the size of the airport, would largely be determined by the equipment the scheduled airline would use; namely, Frontier.

Frontier is acquiring jets. They are operating turboprop aircraft now, so the airport would be enlarged to accommodate improved service by Frontier Airlines.

Mr. PICKLE. There has been criticism in my State of building a jet field in the heart of a national recreation park. I am just trying to establish that it is not your intent for these kinds of fields to be established.

I assume certainly with respect to the money involved that it couldn't be more than just a normal light airport for light planes, relatively, planes of small capacity, and regular powered motors. Is that correct?

Mr. BOWERS. If I understand your question, sir, that is not quite correct.

The airport at Jackson Hole, Wyo. is certificated for scheduled service and presumably would be improved to accommodate turboprop aircraft and possibly even pure jet aircraft.

Mr. PICKLE. I simply would say to the gentleman that I have had a request for a national park out in the western part of my State and there has been considerable criticism from the people that they do not want jet planes flying in right in the heart of that national park and I would want to have it established before we take final action just what was the intent of this type of construction.

Mr. BOWERS. One thing of clarification, Mr. Congressman.

This act provides for construction of airports in or near national parks. It does not require that the airport be in the park. As a matter of fact, the airports at Grand Canyon and at West Yellowstone in which FAA assisted the Department of the Interior, along with

the States, to develop, were both outside the national park but adjacent to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And isn't there a town of Jackson Hole?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes, the town of Jackson.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How big a town is this?

Mr. BOWERS. I don't know, Congressman.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Bowers, who would determine what type of construction you have? Would a State be able to regulate that themselves?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, the 1950 bill of the Department of the Interior which is proposed for amendment requires concurrence by the Governor, I believe, before an airport can be located in the State.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have one further question along the lines that Mr. Pickle has been asking.

Mr. FRIEDEL. For your information, we go into session at 11 o'clock today so I am trying to speed this thing up if we can.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

I am not in too big a hurry to get into executive session myself. I would like to ask a question of Mr. Bowers about the legislation before us.

This airport serves Jackson Hole. Is there airline service in there?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes; by Frontier Airlines.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the local political subdivision—whether it be State, county, or city—be responsible to some extent for participation in the financing of these improvements on this airport, or will this be a 100-percent Federal project?

Mr. BOWERS. I cannot speak for sure about this, Mr. Congressman. The city of Jackson, and the county, operate and maintain the airport. I do not know whether they also contribute funds for its capital improvement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, I am getting around to this. The city itself apparently benefits from the airport and I would presume that in traveling in and out of that airport a great deal of it is travel to the city and not to a national park.

I would just like to know if the city does have to participate by putting up a share of the funds for the development or construction of this airport, and if not why not?

Mr. BOWERS. This I cannot answer other than that the city and county provide the cost for operation and maintenance. Perhaps the Department of the Interior representatives can tell whether the city participates.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't know whether they are here or not.

Do we have the Department of the Interior representatives here?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Is anyone here from the Department of the Interior? Could you answer that question?

STATEMENT OF HOWARD W. BAKER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am Howard Baker, Assistant Director of National Park Service.

I didn't hear the question, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Will you repeat the question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The question is, Will the city, the county, or the State be required to participate to any degree in the financing of the improvements on Jackson Hole Airport?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Williams, as the FAA has indicated, the town of Jackson is a very small community and so far as I know they have never been able to participate to any extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What size town is Jackson?

Mr. BAKER. It is around 2,000 or 3,000 people. They have never been able to participate, but they do maintain and operate the facility. I think the larger part of the participation will have to be by the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you think that we are setting a good precedent here of providing for the Federal construction of airports in areas adjacent to the national parks without requiring the local political subdivisions or the States to participate as a partner in the financing of the construction to some degree to reflect their own benefit from it?

Mr. BAKER. Sir, I think they should participate to the extent possible.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will put it on that basis, to the extent possible.

Mr. BAKER. I think they should.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have in mind a situation that we have down in my district in Vicksburg. We have a national military park at Vicksburg which is operated by the Park Service with an airport at Vicksburg.

If we set the precedent for the Federal Government moving in and building airports in areas adjacent to the national parks with 100 percent of Federal funds then I would be in good shape to come in and ask them to build me a nice airport over at Vicksburg, wouldn't I?

Mr. BAKER. You might, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't think that really is too farfetched. I think we should be very careful with the precedent that we are setting in this and, of course, I realize that Jackson, Wyo., is probably not able to participate to any great extent in this.

Approximately how much of the traffic can be attributable to the fact that there is this national park near there?

Mr. BAKER. I would say perhaps 90 percent of the traffic that comes in there would be attributable to the fact that the airport is serving Grand Teton National Park and also in part serves Yellowstone National Park.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am reasonably familiar with that area. I have been in there. As a matter of fact, I think in the mid-1950's they didn't even have a paved runway at that little airport. I don't know whether they do now or not.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Devine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, do we get another round if not concluded?

Mr. DEVINE. Would the gentleman from Interior state your name again.

Mr. BAKER. I am Howard Baker, Assistant Director.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Bowers wasn't exactly sure about the financing of the original act of March 18, 1950, in which the sum of \$2 million was provided.

Now, is there an annual appropriation each year for this purpose, or is this the original \$2 million that has been there for 16 years?

Mr. BAKER. The act of 1959 authorized the National Park Service to request through appropriation processes up to \$2 million. So far we have used all except about \$330,000 of that authorization.

Mr. DEVINE. Therefore, you want authorized by virtue of the current Senate bill an additional \$1,500,000?

Mr. BAKER. Of authorization, yes.

Mr. DEVINE. Of authorization. That is on top of the \$300,000 you have left of the original appropriation that has been there for 16 years?

Mr. BAKER. That is right. Well, we have over the years spent all of that except the \$330,000.

Mr. DEVINE. I am surprised you haven't spent more in that length of time. I see where the President late last week called in several of our key Governors and, suddenly discovering a need for economy in Government, asked the States to stop requesting Federal funds.

Do you think this bill fails in keeping with the President's most recent discovery?

Mr. BAKER. This is a long-term program and I realize that at the present time the economy probably would not indicate that this would be desirable at the time for us to request additional money.

Mr. DEVINE. Was the \$2 million requested in this legislation included in the budget?

Mr. BAKER. The \$2 million, no; at the time this 1950 act was not included.

Mr. DEVINE. No; I mean is it in the current budget for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BAKER. No; we have no money in there except we are authorized to request appropriations to spend up to the \$330,000 we still have left.

Mr. DEVINE. That is your own funds, but this is for \$2 million new money. Is this a budget item?

Mr. BAKER. No.

Mr. DEVINE. Has it been approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. BAKER. No; we have no request yet.

Mr. DEVINE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BAKER. That is merely an authorization, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Are there any other questions?

Mr. Watson?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir; I have a question or two.

As I understood from the questions by Mr. Devine you have used all of the \$2 million from the 1950 act except \$300,000.

Mr. BAKER. That is right.

Mr. WATSON. You have used all but \$300,000.

Mr. BAKER. That is right; \$330,000 actually.

Mr. WATSON. \$330,000. And since 1950 you have received no subsequent authorization nor appropriation and I assume that you have not requested same; is that correct?

Mr. BAKER. That is correct, sir. I might clear up one point that Mr. Devine asked about, if I may. Actually the Bureau of the Budget has cleared our request for this additional million and a half of authorization.

Mr. WATSON. They have cleared it, but actually it was not included in the President's budget request initially?

Mr. BAKER. That is right.

Mr. WATSON. So this would be above the President's budget request?

Mr. BAKER. No; it would not necessarily be above. You see, we have not asked for the money itself. We have only asked for the authorization.

Mr. WATSON. Of course it naturally follows as night follows day that you wouldn't want the authorization without the appropriation. This isn't just going to be an exercise in good intentions, is it?

Mr. BAKER. We have to work out with FAA as to when we come in with the program for the expenditure of this authorization.

Mr. WATSON. Of course you can understand our concern, because the President wants to cut back and keep expenditures down to a minimum. I assume this is to be matching funds with the Department of the Interior and the FAA.

Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATSON. Perhaps Mr. Bowers can respond to this.

In the present budget of the FAA do you have the matching funds set aside for this particular project?

Mr. BOWERS. The appropriation for the Federal Airport Act, Mr. Congressman, does not include line items. It is a lump sum. The appropriation pending in the Congress for fiscal year 1967 is the last year under which appropriations are authorized under the Federal Airport Act.

The full committee is having a hearing tomorrow on the extension of the Federal Airport Act. Whether we will have funds for these projects will in part depend on what happens to this legislation on which you are having a hearing tomorrow.

Mr. WATSON. I can appreciate that fact, but the direct question is, Does your current budget request include the matching funds for this particular project?

Mr. BOWERS. It does not.

Mr. WATSON. It does not?

Mr. BOWERS. That is right.

Mr. WATSON. So we not only have this amount for the Department of the Interior, but the matching funds for the FAA which would be over and above the current request of the President?

Mr. BOWERS. Let me make clear, sir, that the FAA budget for grant-in-aid airport funds is a lump-sum figure and if funds are appropriated in the future some of those funds could be used for these projects.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; but in your calculation of your budget request did you specifically include the amount of money for the matching funds for the Department of the Interior?

Mr. BOWERS. No.

Mr. WATSON. You did not. I see. So if you should get a sum out of the lump-sum appropriation for airport grants it would have to be taken away from some other airport project which you included in your initial budget request? That is a fair statement; isn't it?

Mr. BAKER. Not quite, sir, because the budget request did not include funds for any particular airport.

Mr. WATSON. You did not just pick a figure out of the air. I am sure that your budget request was based upon factual information as to what you projected your need to be and this was looking at general airport needs throughout the United States; wasn't it?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir; but with the further limitation of the authorization bill which sets a limit on the amount of funds that we can ask for appropriation.

Mr. WATSON. I want it clearly understood I am all for the FAA. We are just looking at the financial end of it now and trying to govern our expenditures in accord with the President's budget request.

Mr. FRIEDEL. We will take that up in executive session.

Mr. WATSON. May we ask one final question?

This is a brief one. As I understand, Jackson Hole, Wyo., is a small place. I believe you said 2,000 or 3,000 population.

Mr. BAKER. 2,000 or 3,000, as I recall.

Mr. WATSON. And they would not be in any position to give any substantial financial assistance in this project, but Wyoming is not necessarily a small governmental entity. I know in South Carolina we have State grants for these small airports to assist in the improvement or development of the airport.

Have you made a request of the State of Wyoming to give financial assistance for the development of this particular airport?

Mr. BAKER. We have not, sir.

Mr. WATSON. In other words, the Federal Government just wants to take care of all of it and not request any assistance from Wyoming and so forth?

I share the sentiment of Congressman Williams. It might be nice for us in South Carolina and in Mississippi to stop spending locally. We will just ask the Federal Government to take care of it. That is the concern I have.

Mr. BOWERS. You seem to be looking at me, Mr. Congressman. We have no proposal before us for improvement of the airport at Jackson Hole nor at East Glacier. These would be future plans, proposed to be authorized by this bill, but in previous instances where we have participated in an airport to serve a national park the States have contributed.

In other words, for the airport in Kitty Hawk in North Carolina the State of North Carolina contributed one-third of the funds.

Mr. WATSON. That was the next question I was going to ask.

Mr. BOWERS. The airport at Grand Canyon, the State of Arizona contributed to that.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Springer.

Mr. SPRINGER. This has raised some questions with me here. This is a boost of 75 percent in the authorization, which is a rather substantial one, and I haven't quite got the justification for that kind of a boost as I listened to the testimony.

Mr. BAKER. I had a prepared statement here to present this morning.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is what I thought. You were going to testify. We had you on the list of witnesses here, but I didn't want this to go by without any justification of a 75-percent increase. Let me ask you this.

I am friendly to your legislation, but I certainly wouldn't want to do it on this kind of a record that is made thus far, which is what bothers me a little bit in the thing.

Mr. BAKER. I would be happy, Mr. Chairman, if you would like to have me make a short statement.

Mr. FRIEDEL. If there is no objection your statement will be included in the record. If you want to read it it is perfectly all right.

Mr. BAKER. It is up to you.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Is it a brief statement?

Mr. BAKER. It is about three pages; two and a half pages.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Just offer it for the record and it will be included in the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HOWARD BAKER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear in support of this legislation. We believe it will greatly assist us in carrying out our function, which is to provide the best possible experience for every visitor to the Nation's National Park System.

The National Park Service of the Department of the Interior administers 32 national parks, such as Yellowstone, Big Bend, and Isle Royale; 11 recreation areas, such as Lake Mead and Glen Canyon; 6 national seashores, such as Padre Island, Cape Hatteras and Assateague Island; 77 national monuments, such as Death Valley and Devils Tower; and 84 historical areas, such as Independence in Philadelphia and Harpers Ferry in West Virginia and Maryland.

Visitation to these units of the National Park System has grown tremendously with the abundance of vacation time and increased awareness of the people in the scenic and historic wonders of their country. As an example, in 1965 alone there has been a 9.4 percent increase in visits over 1964—from 102 million to more than 112 million visits. These people need and we try to provide a variety of facilities and services to make their visit to the parks an enjoyable and rewarding experience.

As part of our effort to project the need for access and other facilities, two years ago we conducted a survey of facilities which were available to people reaching the parks by airplane. As a result of this survey the airport serving Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming was determined to be in need of improvement to serve increased traffic, and a new facility was determined to be needed for Glacier National Park in Montana. The need for airport facilities is anticipated at other areas also, but further study is required before they are undertaken.

The Act of March 18, 1950 (64 Stat. 27), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to participate with the FAA in the construction of airports within or in close proximity to areas of the National Park System. The Act limits funds that may be appropriated to the Secretary for this purpose to \$2 million.

H.R. 11089 will increase the authorization to \$3,500,000. (An identical bill, S. 476, has passed the Senate.) The additional \$1.5 million authorization will be used largely to finance this Department's share of improving the existing Jackson Hole airport for Grand Teton (\$495,000) and constructing a new facility at East Glacier, Montana, for Glacier National Park (\$523,000). The remainder of the \$1.5 million increase plus the uncommitted balance under the present authorization will provide authority for \$787,000 for future projects.

Mr. Chairman when the present limitation of \$2 million was enacted, the number of visitors to the National Park System was about 37 million per year (1950). Our most recent figures, however, point to an annual visitation of more than 112 million, and air travel has become an increasingly popular means of visiting the parks. We support the enactment of this legislation in order that we can meet the need for more and better facilities.

Thank you very much.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Would anyone else like to have his statement included in the record?

Besides Mr. Baker we have listed as witnesses H. G. Smith, Chief Program Coordinator of the National Park Service; Mr. Frank E. Harrison, Chief, Division of Legislation and Regulation, National Park Service.

Mr. BAKER. They were simply here to help me.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if I may be recognized for a moment.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Dingell.

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with Mr. Springer—and we are referring now to this legislation, H.R. 11089—I don't believe we have a record that would justify this subcommittee reporting that bill to the full committee, and I am satisfied that we can receive the information for the record.

I would be content to consider this matter in executive session on the basis of the information submitted by the agencies concerned, the FAA, the CAB, and by the Park Service, but I certainly would have to have something more than we have seen here in the way of testimony from the agencies, and I would like to have a chance to review the comments of the Department before we proceed on this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite things, there appears to be some feeling on the part of some members of the committee that they would like to know a little bit more about the bill that is presently before us.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, before we go into executive session, am I to conclude that we have finished the discussion of this particular bill and hearing from the witnesses?

Mr. Baker is an excellent witness. I think we can establish a good record here and I would hate for it to close now. I would like to see us have the opportunity next week to meet with these gentlemen again.

Mr. FRIEDEL. We could ask them to do that or it might be sufficient to study the statement over the next few days.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a statement now, but a statement can't answer questions. I would like to have the gentleman here to respond to some questions which a statement might provoke if we could.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Can you return Monday, October 3?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. At 10 o'clock?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Will that satisfy you?

Mr. WATSON. That will be fine.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Are you from Washington?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. All right.

At this time we shall hear from our colleague from California, the Honorable Harold Johnson.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you, and the members of your committee for allowing me to testify in support of the bill before this committee. H.R. 11089 proposes to increase the authorization of funds for the construction of airports near the various units of the national park system. It is a sound proposal. It is urgently necessary. It is in the best interests of all Americans.

The last decade has seen a number of startling changes in American life, but one of the most far reaching is the widespread support and use of air travel by the American public. No longer are the airplanes a mode of travel for a small minority. The airplane has become an

integral part of our transportation system while other forms have declined.

Paralleling the growing use of the airplane, has been another development—the rising demand for recreation areas and national parks. Many Americans are demanding that some forest and natural areas be set aside for the enjoyment of future generations. They want natural wonders to be protected. They want natural scenery to be saved.

Mr. Chairman, it is to these two developments—the technology of air travel, and the growing demand for recreation areas—that this bill before us speaks. In years past, the beautiful, and awe-inspiring park areas could not be visited unless a long journey were undertaken by car or by train. But nowadays, these areas can be reached in a matter of hours by airplane. It is possible to spend a short vacation in a national park and return to a job without spending days getting there and days returning. But this, I underline, is possible only if there are adequate airport facilities near our national parks.

For these reasons, I urge the committee to pass this bill to construct the necessary facilities, so that these national parks can be brought closer to the American public.

Thank you.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Thank you for your concise statement Mr. Johnson. The subcommittee is now adjourned until Monday, October 3.

(Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene Monday, October 3, 1966, at 10 a.m.)

AIRPORTS AT NATIONAL PARKS

MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1966

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Samuel N. Friedel (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The meeting will now come to order.

The purpose is to consider H.R. 11089, to amend the act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes.

At the last hearing Mr. Baker was prepared to submit his statement and, Mr. Watson, I think you agreed that it would be included in the record.

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Are there any questions to ask Mr. Baker?

Mr. WATSON. I think at the time, Mr. Chairman, we were trying to develop the relationship between the State's or the local government's participation in the construction and/or renovation of these airports and I personally was interested in trying to find out just what be the State's participation in these particular matters.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD BAKER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—Resumed

Mr. BAKER. The Jackson Hole Airport is located in Teton County in Wyoming, a county that perhaps has 75 percent of its land under public ownership. The town of Jackson, Wyo., the only community of any size in that locality, has a year-round population, which I checked on the other day, of 1,437 people.

This airport is located in Grand Teton National Park. It was located on this site before the park was extended to include the Jackson Hole territory. This airport serves Grand Teton National Park and also Yellowstone National Park because many people come into that country through this airport.

The other closest airport would be, I think, some 150 to 200 miles away over mountainous roads, so I think it is important that this airport be expanded to provide for the increased traffic that is coming into the Jackson Hole country.

Frontier Airlines would like to increase their capability to provide for small jet airplanes coming into this airport. There is also a terrific amount of private air activity at this airport and the storage place for

private planes needs to be increased. The runway needs to be extended. The town of Jackson, Wyo. in Teton County manages and operates and maintains this airport.

Before we go into this expansion program we certainly want to check with the State of Wyoming and we will urge them to participate to the extent possible in improvement of this airport.

Mr. WATSON. We appreciate that fact.

I want to underscore my position that I am in favor of expanding these facilities and giving broader access to these particular parks, but I think it was established at the last hearing that not only do visitors to the park utilize this, but also people coming into Jackson itself.

I believe the record will further show that in North Carolina there was State participation in the development of that park, and I know in my State that we almost yearly have definite and specific appropriations for various airport improvements throughout the State where the locality is unable to assume the financial burden and I think if others are doing it, then we should certainly treat them all alike.

With the assurance, Mr. Chairman, that the Department will insist on the State of Wyoming doing their part in reference to this, then certainly I would have no objection, but my whole thought is that all would be treated alike in this regard.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Is that my understanding, that the States will participate?

Mr. BAKER. As I said, we certainly will make efforts to have the State participate to its capability and, as I pointed out, the town of Jackson and the county of Teton do operate and maintain the airport.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Thank you, Mr. Baker.

Are there any other questions? No questions.

Well, thank you very much. I think we understand the bill.

The committee will retire into executive session and ask all others to leave.

(Whereupon, at 10:13 a.m., Monday, October 3, 1966, the public hearing was adjourned and the subcommittee proceeded in executive session.)

○



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 018 423 752 0

