

253220

Author: Grand Canyon River Guides <gcr@InfoMagic.com> at smtpgate

Date: 1/22/97 1:34 PM

Priority: Normal

TO: F-ARM-NPRM-COMMENTS at ARM

subject: Grand Canyon Overflight rule

FAA-03-14215-37

19

This was e-mailed to you earlier, but the sender neglected to include the docket # which is:

DOCKET # 28770

>To: nprmcmts@mail.hq.faa.gov
>Cc: gcr@boris.infomagic.com
>Date: Tue, 21 Jan 1997 21:12:26 PST
>Subject: Grand Canyon Overflight rule
>X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 0-1,6,11,13,17,19,21,23-26
>From: hahorn@juno.com

>
>To: Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt

>
>I have just recently read of the new ruling your agency has announced on
>the Grand Canyon Overflight rule. I must tell you I am very concerned
>that the Interior Department just doesn't get it. My understanding of
>the new rule is that you all have NOT REDUCED SUBSTANTIALLY THE NOISE
>POLLUTION OVER THE GRAND CANYON!!

>The Canyon is perhaps the most magnificent natural wonder this country is
>blessed with. The Noise pollution your ruling would allow is
>unacceptable. With efforts underway to restore more of the natural
>ecosystem in the Canyon, i.e. reintroduction of the Condor why can't the
>Interior Department tighten up its ruling, specifically:

- > * Tour operators should be required to convert to the
> quietest technology available.
- > * We should not allow whatever gains are made by this
> conversion to be lost by allowing more aircraft into the
> airspace. The cap on the number of aircraft should be firm
> and permanent.
- > * Specifications for categorizing an aircraft's noise
> efficiency should be more stringent than those proposed.
- > * No aircraft - even the less noisy ones - should be granted
> a route through a flight free zone.

>Thanking you in advance for your consideration of the above points and in
>expectation of your reply.

>
>Sincerely,
>Helen A. Horn

>
>

RECEIVED
JAN 23 1997
11 58 AM