

**LAND DISPOSAL SITES NEAR AIRPORTS
REPORTING BIRD/AIRCRAFT HAZARDS**

A Division of Technical Operations
Open-File Report (TSR 1.6.004/0)

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

LAND DISPOSAL SITES

NEAR AIRPORTS REPORTING BIRD/AIRCRAFT HAZARDS

A Survey for the Inter-Agency Bird Hazard Committee

A Division of Technical Operations
Open-File Report (TSR 1.6.004/0)

GEORGE R. DAVIDSON, JR., TRUETT V. DEGEARE, JR.,
THOMAS J. SORG, and ROBERT M. CLARK

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Solid Waste Management Office

1971

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	1
RECOMMENDATIONS	4
INTRODUCTION	
Magnitude of the Problem	6
Department of Interior Surveys	7
Canadian Experience	8
Study Development	9
Study Procedure	10
FINDINGS	15
DISCUSSION	26
REFERENCES	30
BIBLIOGRAPHY	31
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	33
TABLES	
1 AIRPORTS REPORTING BIRD HAZARD PROBLEM CAUSED BY SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SITES	11
2 AIRPORTS REPORTING A BIRD HAZARD	16
3 AIRPORTS REPORTING NO BIRD HAZARD	17
4 DISPOSAL SITE INFORMATION	18

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In 1969, the Inter-Agency Bird Hazard Committee designated 70 airports with bird/aircraft hazards, resulting in part from the proximity of the airports to solid waste disposal sites, where the problem needed to be studied. The Committee ranked 30 airports as high-priority, 16 as medium-priority, and 24 as low-priority study sites. At the request of the Committee, the Solid Waste Management Office surveyed 32 of these airports, consisting of 27 high-priority, 2 medium-priority, and 3 not on the Committee's list. The 32 surveys were evenly divided between civilian (16) and military (16) airports. Adjacent to the 32 airports, the survey team inspected 105 land disposal sites.

The survey consisted of discussions with the airports' personnel to obtain opinions on the bird/aircraft hazard, meetings with State and/or local solid waste management officials regarding the operation of land disposal sites around the airports, and inspections and evaluations of the sites. At 19 airports the bird/aircraft hazard was considered by the local personnel to be extremely serious, and, in fact, most personnel at those airports felt that their respective facilities were extremely fortunate in not having had serious accidents. At the other 13 airports, the bird/aircraft hazard was reported to be eliminated or nonexistent. Almost all airports had some type of bird control program to either minimize the attraction of birds to the airport grounds or to scare the birds away. Only 29 of the adjacent disposal sites were

classified by the survey team as sanitary landfills; the remaining were open, and sometimes burning, dumps. Birds had been reported at all sites at various times during the year, with gulls being the predominant species. In several cases, a single disposal site was contributing to the bird hazard problem of more than one airport.

Discussions with State and local solid waste management officials and the landfill operators revealed that most officials and operators were unaware of the potential bird/aircraft hazard. Following the discussions, many felt that the need to provide solid waste disposal sites was an equally pressing problem.

Analysis of judgments following two lawsuits resulting from aircraft/bird strike accidents indicated a strong possibility that both government and a disposal site owner could be liable for an accident attributed to birds if the disposal site was knowingly attracting birds and contributing to the risk of bird/aircraft collisions.

The following conclusions were drawn from studies of the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Government of Canada, as well as from discussions with wildlife experts and the Solid Waste Management Office survey.

1. Solid waste disposal sites around airports which attract birds contribute to potential bird/aircraft collisions.
2. The majority of the land disposal sites inspected during the survey were open dumps, which not only contribute to the bird/aircraft hazard but are also sources of environmental pollution. Many of these sites were in violation of State and local regulations.

3. Closing all existing disposal sites around airports will reduce the risk of bird/aircraft collisions at the airports.
4. Although sanitary landfills are less attractive to birds than open dumps, they are not always completely free of birds. Various bird-scare devices at these sites, however, may be sufficient to keep birds away.
5. The government and a land disposal site owner could be liable for a bird/aircraft collision if the site is known to contribute to the bird hazard.
6. Research is needed to determine methods of operating sanitary landfills that will not attract birds.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the Solid Waste Management Office's study indicated that proximity of land disposal sites to airports was associated with the bird/aircraft hazard at airports. Furthermore, it is suggested that if these sites, most of which are open dumps, are either eliminated or converted to sanitary landfills, the bird/aircraft hazard can be substantially reduced. Thus, the following two alternatives are offered to reduce the bird/aircraft hazards associated with existing land disposal sites. The recommendations are listed in order of potential effectiveness.

1. Close all land disposal sites near airports--the closing of all dumps and sanitary landfills around airports is the most effective measure that can be taken to eliminate the food sources attracting and supporting the large bird populations at these sites.
2. Due to the many social, political, and financial problems involved in locating new sites or constructing new disposal facilities, all land disposal sites cannot be closed. Therefore, to minimize the bird/aircraft hazard, all land disposal sites should be operated as sanitary landfills. All waste, particularly food waste, should be covered immediately following deposition. It is probable that some birds will, nevertheless, continue to frequent the site, particularly if it is the only food source in the area. These birds should be frightened away using any measures found effective. Specific details and help on such bird control techniques can be obtained by writing the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Research, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., 20240.

An additional recommendation is presented as a preventative measure for minimizing the bird/aircraft hazard that might arise from sites which are contemplated but not yet operational. The potential bird/aircraft hazard should be considered when planning new solid waste disposal sites around airports. Airport officials and wildlife experts should be consulted for their opinions on the increased risk of an airplane accident due to the new disposal site.

Finally, an intensive research program should be initiated with the following objectives:

1. To operate sanitary landfills in such a manner as to minimize their attractiveness to birds.
2. To determine the optimal locations for disposal sites adjacent to an airport that will minimize the risk of a bird/aircraft accident.

LAND DISPOSAL SITES NEAR AIRPORTS REPORTING BIRD/AIRCRAFT HAZARDS

INTRODUCTION

Magnitude of the Problem

The collision of birds and aircraft is a potential problem at airports throughout the world. Many nations, including the United States, have initiated programs for collecting statistics of such collisions (termed "bird strikes") to assist in determining guidelines for reducing the frequency of the strikes. In the United States, the Federal Aviation Agency and the U.S. Air Force are the principal agencies engaged in collecting data on bird strikes with commercial and private aircraft, and with military aircraft, respectively.

A report published by the U.S. Department of the Interior for the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) stated that commercial U.S. air-carriers reported 476 bird/aircraft strikes in 1966 and 2,196 strikes during the period April 1961 through June 1967.¹ Of the many bird strikes that have occurred since 1960, several resulted in the loss of human life and extensive aircraft damage. Examples include: (1) the accident in Boston, Massachusetts where in 1960, a flock of starlings contributed to an engine power failure of an Electra aircraft resulting in the loss of the aircraft and 62 lives; (2) the strike by a whistling swan at Elliott City, Maryland in 1962, which caused the loss of an aircraft, and the death of 17 people; (3) the collision in March 1963 of a Beechcraft and a loon

near Bakersfield, California, resulting in a crash fatal to both pilot and passenger; (4) the loss of a \$1.5 million aircraft in 1968, in Cleveland, Ohio, where a flock of sea gulls was ingested by the engines of a private jet aircraft; fortunately, the three crew members were uninjured.

The U.S. Air Force (USAF) reported that in 1968 there were 1,192 bird-aircraft collisions involving their aircraft, with 363 collisions causing damage and 829 collisions where no damage was sustained.² There were two major accidents involving jet fighter aircraft. Both aircraft were destroyed and one pilot was fatally injured. The total cost of damage to the two jet aircraft was over \$1.5 million.

The FAA reported that most strikes occurred at altitudes of 2,500 feet or less.¹ The USAF reported that over 50 percent of the known military aircraft strikes happened between the ground and 1,500 feet.² These strikes occurred during take-off and landing and during low-altitude flights.

Department of the Interior Surveys

U.S. Department of the Interior studies and surveys showed that "garbage dumps"* located near airports are major attractors of sea gulls, the most common bird species involved in aircraft strikes. Case studies by their Division of Wildlife Research at New York City's Kennedy International, Newark, and Boston's Logan International airports further

*It is not known whether, in these reports, the term "garbage dump" also refers to a sanitary landfill or whether it is used in its true meaning as defined by the Solid Waste Management Office, EPA.³

documented the contribution of solid waste disposal sites to the bird hazard. As many as 8,000 to 10,000 sea gulls were feeding at some of the sites surveyed by the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior concluded that the removal of these food sources would alleviate the sea gull hazard considerably around the airports.^{1,4}

Canadian Experience

In 1963, at the request of the Canadian Department of Transport, the National Research Council of the Canadian Government set up the Associate Committee on Bird Hazards to Aircraft to study the problem and recommend solutions. Initially, the problem was considered to be partly of an engineering nature and studies were begun to determine the necessary strength of aircraft components to resist bird impact without serious damage. It soon became apparent that because of the weights of birds involved and speeds of aircraft, not much engineering improvement could be done until international standards were developed.

It also became obvious that to make a completely bird-proof aircraft would involve creation of a structure of such weight that flight would not be economically feasible. After recognizing the difficulty of solving the problem by engineering methods, the Associate Committee directed its major effort toward biological solutions. Biological studies were conducted at a number of airports to learn about the bird species involved, the reasons why they were present on airports, and what could be done to disperse them. Studies were also made to determine ways of making airport environments unattractive to the birds.⁵

A major attraction of birds to airport environments was the availability of food, and one of the most important sources was dumps where food wastes were present. The Committee recommended that land disposal sites be moved away from the airport environment. In some cases, complex negotiations with neighboring municipalities were required to remove these sources of attraction.

The Department of Transport spent about \$10 million modifying the immediate environments at the major Canadian airports to reduce bird hazards. The cost benefits were reflected in lower Canadian Airlines hardware replacement costs. Before the airport modifications average annual hardware replacement costs due to bird strikes for one airline for the five-year period ending in 1963 was about \$240,000. For the five-year period ending in 1968, the annual average cost was about \$125,000, while for 1969, it was less than \$50,000. Comparable figures are not available for other Canadian carriers, but it is reasonable to assume similar cost savings have occurred.

If the airport habitats had not been modified, the airline could have expected hardware replacement to be about \$360,000 per year. Although it would take about 30 years for hardware replacement costs to equal the expenditure for modifications, the potential saving of lives certainly justifies any costs.

Study Development

In June 1968, the Inter-Agency Bird Hazard Committee (IABHC) requested the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to investigate the relationship between solid waste land disposal practices

and bird hazards in airport environments and to identify the solid waste disposal sites contributing to the hazard. The Committee reported that many airports have a bird hazard primarily because of solid waste disposal sites in the vicinity of the airports. Studies by the U.S. Department of the Interior and others have shown that disposal sites are a major source of attraction to birds and that the elimination of dumps in these environments will reduce and in some cases may eliminate the danger of bird strikes at the airport.

This report summarizes a survey conducted by the Division of Technical Operations, Solid Waste Management Office of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to determine the extent to which solid waste disposal sites contribute to the bird hazard at certain airports in the continental United States. It describes the bird hazard at these airports and the operation of the adjacent land disposal sites that are believed to be contributing to the problem. All public and private officials and agencies associated with these problem areas are strongly urged to exert efforts to either improve or eliminate the operation of the disposal sites. Such action is necessary if we are to reduce the risk of bird/aircraft collisions and the possible loss of life.

Study Procedure

The Inter-Agency Bird Hazard Committee identified 70 airports that were judged to have a bird/aircraft hazard resulting in part from solid waste disposal sites. In order to aid the studies the Committee assigned a high priority to 30, a medium priority to 16, and a low priority to 24 (Table 1). Because of manpower limitations, the survey concentrated

TABLE 1

AIRPORTS REPORTING BIRD HAZARD PROBLEMS
CAUSED BY SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SITES

Eastern region*			
Airport	Civil (C) Military (M)	Location	Priority ⁺
Cleveland Lake Front	C	Cleveland, Ohio	1
Cambridge	C	Cambridge, Maryland	3
Norfolk Municipal	C	Norfolk, Virginia	1
Eastport Municipal	C	Eastport, Maine	2
Presque Isle	C	Presque Isle, Maine	2
Laconia Municipal	C	Laconia, New Hampshire	3
Burlington Municipal	C	Burlington, Vermont	1
Logan International	C	Boston, Massachusetts	1
Fall River Municipal	C	Fall River, Massachusetts	3
Lawrence Municipal	C	Lawrence, Massachusetts	3
Bridgeport Municipal	C	Bridgeport, Connecticut	2
John F. Kennedy Int.	C	New York City, New York	1
La Guardia	C	New York City, New York	2
Flushing	C	Flushing, New York	2
Greater Buffalo Int.	C	Buffalo, New York	2
Newark	C	Newark, New Jersey	1
Teterboro	C	Teterboro, New Jersey	3
Philadelphia Int.	C	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	2
Brunswick Naval Air Station	M	Brunswick, Maine	1
S. Weymouth Naval Air Station	M	S. Weymouth, Massachusetts	2
Hanscom Air Force Base	M	Bedford, Massachusetts	2
Quonset Point NAS	M	Quonset Point, Rhode Island	2
Floyd Bennett Field NAS	M	New York City, New York	1

*Regions are FAA regions.

⁺Priority: 1, high; 2, medium; 3, low.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Southern region			
Airport	Civil (C) Military (M)	Location	Priority
Wilson Municipal	C	Wilson, North Carolina	3
New Hanover County	C	Wilmington, North Carolina	3
Tifton	C	Tifton, Georgia	3
Seymour Johnson AFB	M	Goldsboro, North Carolina	1
Shaw Air Force Base	M	Sumter, South Carolina	1
Myrtle Beach AFB	M	Myrtle Beach, South Carolina	1
Charleston AFB	M	Charleston, South Carolina	1
Moody Air Force Base	M	Valdosta, Georgia	1
Hunter Air Force Base	M	Savannah, Georgia	1
Elgin Air Force Base	M	Valparaiso, Florida	1
Patrick Air Force Base	M	Cocoa, Florida	1
Homestead AFB	M	Homestead, Florida	3
Norfolk Naval Air Station	M	Norfolk, Virginia	1
Central region			
Hutchinson Municipal	C	Hutchinson, Kansas	3
Renner Field Municipal	C	Goodland, Kansas	3
Grand Forks International	C	Grand Forks, North Dakota	3
Duluth International	C	Duluth, Minnesota	2
Madison	C	Madison, Wisconsin	2
General Mitchell Field	C	Milwaukee, Wisconsin	1
Minot Air Force Base	M	Minot, North Dakota	2
Grand Forks AFB	M	Grand Forks, North Dakota	3
Glenview Naval Air Station	M	Glenview, Illinois	3
Kincheloe Air Force Base	M	Sault Ste Marie, Michigan	1
Wurtsmith AFB	M	Oscoda, Michigan	2

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Southwestern region			
Airport	Civil (C) Military (M)	Location	Priority
Arkansas County	C	Rockport, Texas	3
Mineral Wells Municipal	C	Mineral Wells, Texas	3**
Dallas Naval Air Station	M	Dallas, Texas	1
Western Region			
Clallam County	C	Port Angeles, Washington	3
Seattle International	C	Seattle, Washington	1
Spokane International	C	Spokane, Washington	1
Yakima Municipal	C	Yakima Municipal	3
Milton Sweet	C	Eugene, Oregon	3
Pendleton Municipal	C	Pendleton, Oregon	2
Oakland International	C	Oakland, California	1
San Francisco International	C	San Francisco, California	1
Los Angeles International	C	Los Angeles, California	1
Sonoma	C	Sonoma, California	3
Santa Rosa	C	Santa Rosa, California	3
San Jose Municipal	C	San Jose, California	2
Hayward Municipal	C	Hayward, California	3
Fremont Municipal	C	Fremont, California	3
Fallon Municipal	C	Fallon, Nevada	3
Alameda Naval Air Station	M	Alameda, California	1
Hamilton Air Force Base	M	Hamilton, California	1
Travis Air Force Base	M	Travis, California	1
Mather Air Force Base	M	Mather AFB, California	1
McClellan Air Force Base	M	Sacramento, California	1

**Delete from list. FAA reported that dump was cleaned up and problem eliminated.

on high-priority airports. If medium and low-priority airports were located near high priority airports and required little additional effort, they were surveyed. Several high-priority airports were not surveyed because communications with the safety officers or FAA personnel indicated that a bird hazard did not exist.

A two-man team conducted each survey in three phases. Phase I consisted of interviews with airport managers and other airport personnel to obtain their views on the extent of the bird hazard, the principal causes of the hazard, and methods being used at the airport for bird control. Information on land disposal sites in the area and their relation to the airport's bird hazard was obtained from state and local solid waste management officials as Phase II. In Phase III the land disposal sites were inspected and the operations were evaluated. During Phase III, general information on the type of solid waste handled, size of operation, the expected life of the site, and other background information was gathered. In most cases, the operations were documented by photographs.

FINDINGS

The survey teams conducted the surveys between April and December 1969 (Table 2). The 32 airports surveyed consisted of 27 high priority, 2 medium priority, and 3 not on the original list, and were evenly divided between civilian (16) and military (16). All of the airports were located in coastal states or states bounded by the Great Lakes.

Interviews with airport personnel indicated that the severity of the bird hazard varies between airports. Of the 32 airports surveyed, 19 reported a bird hazard and 13 reported that the hazard had been eliminated or did not exist (Tables 2 and 3). Of the 19 airports reporting bird hazards, 10 were military and 9 were civil.

At the airports reporting a problem, most airport managers considered the problem to be serious. In fact, most of them felt that the airport was fortunate that a serious accident had not occurred. At these airports, bird control programs ranging from environmental cleanup activities to bird scare devices had been initiated (Tables 2 and 3). A few airports indicated that the problem was either slight, or seasonal. On occasion there were conflicting reports between the airport management and the air controllers or safety personnel regarding the aircraft/bird strike hazard.

Of the thirteen airports not reporting problems, two of the airport managers indicated that potential hazards would exist if the number of aircraft operations increase substantially. One airport reported the

TABLE 2
AIRPORTS REPORTING A BIRD HAZARD

Airports	Degree of hazard	Bird control measures							Number of Disposal Sites contributing to hazard
		Chemical	Deterrents	Noise Devices	Distress Recording	Insect & Weed Control	Shotgun	Vehicle Patrol	
Brunswick NAS, Brunswick, Maine	Severe	X					X		2
Logan International, Boston, Mass.	Severe		X	X	X	X	X		2
Trumbull, Groton, Connecticut	Severe		X				X	X	1
Kennedy International, New York, N. Y.	Severe	X		X					2
Floyd Bennett Field NAS, New York, N. Y.	Slight						X		2
Newark International, Newark, N. J.	Severe	X	X				X		2 or more
Burke Lakefront, Cleveland, Ohio	Slight						X		0
Norfolk Municipal, Norfolk, Virginia	Slight	X	X						5
Shaw AFB, Sumter, South Carolina	Slight (seasonal)	X							2
Myrtle Beach AFB, Myrtle Beach, S. C.	Severe	X	X						7
Charleston AFB, Charleston, S. C.	Severe	X	X			X	X		4
Moody AFB, Valdosta, Florida	Severe	X	X			X			0
Traux Field, Madison, Wisconsin	Severe (seasonal)		X					X	2
Oakland International, Oakland, Calif.	Severe	X							12
San Francisco International, S. F., Calif.	Severe		X			X	X		12
Alameda NAS, Alameda, California	Severe	X	X	X					12
Hamilton AFB, Hamilton, California	Severe	X	X					X	1
Travis AFB, Travis, California	Severe	X	X	X		X			3
McClellan AFB, Sacramento, California	Severe (seasonal)	X				X			3

AIRPORTS REPORTING NO BIRD HAZARD

Airports	Bird control measures							Remarks
	Chemical Deterrents	Noise Devices	Distress Recording	Insect & Weed Control	Shotgun	Vehicle	Patrol	
Bangor International, Bangor, Maine					X	X		Potential hazard exists.
Presque Isle Municipal, Presque Isle, Maine								Smoke from burning dump provides visibility problem.
Bridgeport Municipal, Bridgeport, Conn.					X			Potential problem when jet traffic increases.
Norfolk NAS, Norfolk, Virginia								No bird problem since dump closed in 1967.
Seymour Johnson AFB, Goldsboro, N. C.								Potential problem exists from blackbirds.
Hunter AFB, Savannah, Georgia								Ninety-seven percent helicopter operations; no problem.
Patrick AFB, Cocoa, Florida	X							Potential problem but bird control program has presently eliminated it.
General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisc.				X	X			Problem, but is under control--a "nuisance".
Dallas NAS, Dallas, Texas								Potential problem if number of flights increases.
Seattle International, Seattle, Wash.		X				X		Problem ended with closing of open dump.
Spokane International, Spokane, Wash.								Problem ended with burning of piggery.
Mather AFB, Sacramento, California								
Los Angeles International, L.A., Calif.					X			

problems had ended with the closing of an open dump and a piggery in the area. Another airport manager stated that an open burning dump nearby created visibility problems.

Airport personnel expressed various opinions on the cause of the bird hazard. These opinions varied from land disposal sites to the weather as the principal cause of the hazard. The general opinion was the land disposal sites were one of the principal factors causing bird hazards.

The airport surveys included inspection of 105 adjacent or nearby disposal sites (Table 4). The number of disposal sites believed to be contributing to a bird hazard at any one airport ranged from 1 to 14 sites. In several cases, a single disposal site was believed to be contributing to the problems of more than one airport. For example, the San Francisco Bay area where 14 sites were within an 8-mile radius of 3 airports: San Francisco International, Oakland International, and Alameda Naval Air Station (NAS).

The majority (73%) of the landfill sites inspected were classified by the survey teams as dumps (Table 4). Only 28 of the 105 sites surveyed were judged to be sanitary landfills. Some birds were reported at all sites at sometime during the year. A number of disposal site operators reported that the problem was seasonal, with birds, particularly gulls, frequenting sites only during the winter months. The number of birds and their occurrence at the sites was reported to be dependent on the climate, the type of operation, the type of waste handled, and bird control measure utilized. Other factors which undoubtedly contribute to the attractiveness of land disposal sites are the presence of water and

roosting grounds. The number and amount of other food sources available in the area, but not associated with disposal sites, is important. However, these sources were not part of the survey. The relationship should be determined.

Discussions with State and local solid waste management officials and landfill operators revealed that most officials were not aware of the bird/ aircraft hazard. We believe, therefore, that one of the primary benefits already accomplished by this survey has been the enlightenment of these officials to the hazard and the relationship of the hazard to the adjacent disposal sites.

TABLE 4
DISPOSAL SITE INFORMATION

Eastern region					
Airport	Disposal site				Birds reported or observed
	Name	Size (population served or quantity handled)	Cover material frequency	Expected life (years)	
Presque Isle	Presque Isle	15,000 people	None	NA*	None
Bangor International	Brewer	NA*	Weekly	10	Gulls
	Herman	NA*	None	NA*	
	Bangor	40,000 people	None	3	Gulls
Brunswick NAS	Topsham	5,000 people	Twice monthly	10	Gulls
	Brunswick (conical burner)	25,000 people	None	10	None
	Brunswick NAS	NA*	Weekly	NA*	Gulls
Logan International	Saugus	500,000 people	Daily	1+	Gulls
	Wintrop	20,000 people	Occasionally	5	Gulls
Trumbull	Groton	45,000 people	Occasionally	10	Gulls
Bridgeport	Bridgeport	NA*	Occasionally	NA*	Gulls
	Incinerator Residue Stanford	NA*	Occasionally	NA*	Gulls
JFK and Floyd Bennett NAS	Fountain Avenue	3,500 tons/day	Daily	3-4	Gulls
	Edgemere Landfill	380 tons/day	Daily	15-20	Gulls

*Not Available

TABLE 4 (Contd.)

Eastern region (contd.)					
Airport	Disposal site				Birds reported or observed
	Name	Size (population served or quantity handled)	Cover material frequency	Expected life (years)	
Newark International	Oak Island (Newark)	1,000 cu yd/day	Weekly	1	Gulls
	Disposal Area Inc.	1,900 tons/day	Daily (top)	2-3	Gulls
	Rozelle	3,500 tons/day	Daily (top)	2	Gulls
	Hackensack	2,500 tons/day	Daily (top)	NA*	Gulls
	Staten Island	8,000 tons/day	Weekly	4-7	Gulls
Norfolk NAS and Norfolk Municipal	Naval Base	NA*	None	NA*	Gulls
	Hampton	NA*	None	NA*	Gulls
	Williamsburg-				
	Newport News	NA*	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Chesapeake Sanitary				
	Landfill	170 tons/day	Daily	18-20	Gulls (winter)
	Virginia Beach	250-500 tons/day	Daily	5	Gulls
	Norfolk	NA*	None	NA*	Gulls
Burke Lake Front	Little Creek Naval	NA*	None	NA*	Gulls
	Rockside Hide-Away	2,000 cu yd/day	Daily	3	Few gulls when lake frozen
	Garden Park				
	(demolition wastes)	100 tons/day	Daily	2	Few gulls
	Ridge Road				
	(incinerator residue)	300 tons/day	None	6-8	No

TABLE 4 (Contd.)

Southwestern region					
Airport	Disposal site				Birds reported or observed
	Name	Size (population served or quantity handled)	Cover material frequency	Expected life (years)	
Dallas NAS	NAS Landfill Irving	Closed 100,000 people	Daily	2	Gulls, blackbirds, starlings
	Grand Prairie	55,000 people	Weekly	5	Gulls, crows, blackbirds
	Dallas Landfill	NA*	Daily	NA*	Pidgeons, gulls, blackbirds
Central region					
Traux Field	Mineral Point	125 tons/day	Daily	1	Sparrows
	Traux Landfill	500 tons/day	Daily	2-3	None
	Olin Street	NA*	No	NA*	Gulls, blackbirds
	Maple Bluff	1,600 people	No	60	Gulls, blackbirds
General Mitchell Field	Milwaukee County	300 tons/day	Daily	3	Crows
	South Milwaukee (no food wastes)	NA*	No	10	None
	Oak Creek (no food wastes)	NA*	No	NA*	None
	Oak Creek Disposal Co.	NA*	No	NA*	Crows
	Hunt Landfill	NA*	Daily	10	None
	Nipe	NA*	No	10	Gulls, crows

TABLE 4 (Contd.)

Southern region					
Airport	Disposal site				Birds reported or observed
	Name	Size (population served or quantity handled)	Cover material frequency	Expected life (years)	
Seymour Johnson AFB	S-J AFB Landfill	12,000 people	Daily	1	Few sparrows
	Mt. Olive	20 tons/day	None	1	Sparrows
	Goldsboro	115 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Crows, blackbirds sparrows
	Cherry Hospital	4 tons/day	Twice-weekly	NA*	None
	Pikeville	3 tons/day	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Fremont	6 tons/day	NA*	5-10	NA*
	Eureka	1 ton/day	NA*	NA*	NA*
Charleston AFB and Charleston Municipal	AFB Landfill	20 tons/day	Daily	5-10	Gulls
	Charleston	200 tons/day	Occasionally	2-3	Gulls
	North Charleston	80 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Gulls
	St. Andrews	65 tons/day	Monthly	10	Blackbirds
	Hanahan	20 tons/day	Occasionally	NA*	Gulls
	Roadside (I-26)	White goods	None	10	None
Myrtle Beach AFB	AFB Landfill	NA*	Daily	10	None
	Myrtle Beach	NA*	Every 2 days	50	Crows, gulls
	Garden City	NA*	None	NA*	Gulls
	State Camp Site	NA*	None	NA*	Crows
	Gravels Gully	NA*	Occasionally	NA*	Gulls, crows
	Surfside	NA*	Occasionally	NA*	Gulls
Shaw AFB	AFB Landfill	NA*	Daily	1 1/2	No
	Sumter County	NA*	Occasionally	NA*	Blackbirds, crows
	Fish Road	NA*	None	NA*	Blackbirds, crows
Moody AFB	AFB Landfill	NA*	Every 2 days	10-12	Blackbirds, crows
	Valdosta	75 tons/day	Occasionally	1	None
	Hahira	2 tons/day	Twice weekly	10	None

TABLE 4 (Contd.)

Southern region (contd.)

Airport	Disposal site				Birds reported or observed
	Name	Size (population served or quantity handled)	Cover material frequency	Expected life (years)	
Hunter Army Field	Army Landfill	3,800 cu yd/month	Daily	Indefinite	Crows, gulls,
	Savannah	330 tons/day	Daily	3	Gulls
	Port Wentworth	10 tons/day	Occasionally	30-40	Blackbirds
	Cole	20 tons/day	Occasionally	NA*	Gulls
Patrick AFB	AFB Landfill	350 cu yd/day	Occasionally	5	Gulls
	Melbourne	50,000 people	Weekly	5	Gulls
	Brevard County	50,000 people	Daily	3	Gulls
	Cape Kennedy	1,000 tons/day	Daily	10	Gulls

Western region

Los Angeles	Toyon Canyon	3,500 tons/day	Daily	10	Gulls (infrequently)
	Mission Canyon	4,000 tons/day	Daily	15	No
	Palos Verdes	4,000 tons/day	Daily	3-4	Swallows, gulls
San Francisco International					
Oakland International					
Alameda NAS	NAS Site	150 tons/day	Sporadically	2-3	Gulls
	Turk Island	25 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Gulls
	West Winton	400 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Gulls
	San Leandro	60 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Gulls
	Davis Street	975 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Gulls
	Alameda	225 tons/day	Sporadically	NA*	Gulls
	Berkley	95 tons/day	Sporadically	NA*	Gulls
	Fleming Point	165 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Gulls
	Richmond	880 tons/day	NA*	NA*	Gulls
	San Mateo	400 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Gulls
	San Mateo				
	Rubbish	NA*	Daily	NA*	Gulls (few)
	Burlingame				
	Rubbish	100 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Gulls

TABLE 4 (Contd.)

Western region (contd.)					
Airport	Disposal site				Birds reported or observed
	Name	Size (population served or quantity handled)	Cover material frequency	Expected life (years)	
	Brisbane Danner Avenue (demolition site)	1,800 tons/day Closed	Daily	NA*	Gulls (few) None
Travis AFB	AFB Landfill	15,000 people	Occasionally	4-5	Blackbirds, starlings, crows
	Vacaville	60 tons/day	Occasionally	10+	Blackbirds, gulls
	Fairfield	48 tons/day	Occasionally	10+	Gulls
Mather AFB	Mather AFB	8,000 people	NA*	15	Gulls
	McClellan AFB	NA*	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Incinerator (Residue Site)				
	Gerber Road	NA*	Every 2 days	20	Gulls
	Sacramento	250,000 people	Weekly	10	Gulls, crows
	White Rock	500 tons/day	Daily	20	Gulls
Hamilton AFB	Redwood Landfill	250 tons/day	Twice weekly	20	Gulls, crows
Spokane International	Hog Farm--Destroyed by fire in 1969.				
Seattle International	Kent Highlands	700 tons/day	Daily	10	Crows
	Midway Landfill	700 tons/day	Daily	NA*	Very few crows
	King County	1,400 tons/day	Daily	20	Crows

DISCUSSION

From this and previous studies, there is little doubt that improper solid waste disposal sites in many areas of the country contribute to the bird/aircraft strike hazard at airports. Several important questions are raised when the bird hazard/solid waste disposal relationship is considered:

(A) Are both dumps and sanitary landfills equally attractive to birds?

(B) How should a solid waste disposal site be operated to discourage birds from visiting it.

(C) What is the critical radius for the location of solid waste disposal sites near airports, or, more clearly stated, how far from an airport should a disposal site be located so that there will be no interference to air traffic?

In answering question (A), we must remember that a dump is an area where wastes from various sources are discarded and sometimes burned. The wastes are infrequently covered and there is little or no control over the disposal operation. At these sites, birds find food and water available to them. In addition, these areas make ideal roosts and shelters from inclement weather.

In contrast to the operation of a dump, a sanitary landfill is a controlled method of disposing of solid waste on land which minimizes environmental pollution, nuisances or hazards. In a sanitary landfill the solid wastes are unloaded, compacted, and covered with a layer of

compacted soil each day. No solid wastes are left exposed and therefore available as harborage and food. This operation decreases the attractiveness of the site to birds by reducing and eliminating the food and water supply.

In answering question (A), we have partially answered (B). All conditions which attract birds to an area must be removed before the birds will discontinue their visits. By quickly covering the deposited solid waste and providing adequate drainage from the site, the sources of food and water are minimized. However, some birds may continue to visit the area to roost and seek shelter unless repelled by scare devices.

The scope of this study was limited to identifying solid waste disposal sites that contribute to the bird hazard and has not provided an answer to question (C). As a result, a primary recommendation of the report is that additional investigations be made to resolve this question.

The disposal sites mentioned in this report have a special significance because of the possible relationship of the bird/aircraft hazard to the specific airports. Many of these sites are supporting large bird populations which contribute to the risk of a serious aircraft accident. Regardless of who has the major responsibility to assure the proper operation or the closing of these sites, the responsibility is upon the shoulders of all officials, agencies, and the public who are associated with the problem. Good solid waste disposal facilities are expensive and are not easily constructed or operated. Nevertheless, when a problem exists, responsible officials must take immediate action.

Failure to accept responsibility may result in a catastrophe similar to the Boston accident, where sixty-two people were killed and ten were injured in the crash of an Eastern Airlines Lockheed 188 Electra.

Three suits involving fatalities and one involving injuries to a survivor arising from that crash were transferred to the United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania. All were tried to the Court without a jury. On January 20, 1967, Judge Harold K. Wood found for the plaintiffs, stating in Paragraph 7 of his conclusions of law: "The Government was negligent in failing to require the Massachusetts Port Authority at Logan Airport to remove the attractions to birds on the airport surfaces by filling in the ponds, closing the dumps, cutting down the phragmites and prohibiting the dumping of garbage and food particles on the airport surface and in failing to take adequate measures to insure that birds would not act as airport hazards when planes were taking off." Accordingly, judgment was entered in favor of the three fatalities against the Federal government for a total of \$374,000. The personal injury case was not decided at the time of this decision.

The judgment was based in part upon a section of the Federal Airport Grant Act, 49 U.S.C.A. 1101 (a) (4), which states: "Airport hazard means any structure or object of natural growth located on or in the vicinity of a public airport, or any use of land near such airport, which obstructs the air space required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking off at such airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or taking off of aircraft."

Appeals were perfected and the cases were remanded to the trial court for consent judgments against the United States. One wrongful death and survival action was settled for \$8,374.62. One personal injury was settled for \$15,030, and Eastern Air Lines was awarded \$7,477.50 in a cross-claim in that case. Another wrongful death and survival claim was settled for \$31,735.12, with an additional award of \$253,881 which was not assessed against the United States. In all consent judgments against the United States it was agreed by the parties that payment was a compromise, not an admission of liability or an adjudication on the merits.

The results of this court decision indicate that any person, either public or private, who is responsible for an aircraft hazard in the vicinity of an airport could be liable for death and accident. For this reason, all operators of land disposal sites should take adequate measures to prevent a bird hazard.

REFERENCES

1. Seubert, J. L. Control of birds on and around airports; final report. SRDS Report No. RD-68-62. Washington, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Oct. 1968. 30 p.
2. USAF aircraft collisions with birds, 1 Jan. 68 thru 31 Dec. 68. Report No. 3-69. Norton AFB, Calif., Directorate of Aerospace Safety, Deputy Inspector General for Inspection and Safety, USAF. 17 p.
3. Sorg, T. J., and H. L. Hickman, Jr. Sanitary landfill facts. 2d ed. Public Health Service Publication No. 1792. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970. 30 p.
4. Personal communication (summary report). J. Bull, Kennedy International Airport, to Dr. J. L. Seubert, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, [1965.]
5. Bird, W. H. Bird strike hazards can be reduced. Montreal, Engineering Research and Development Department, Air Canada, Sept. 15, 1965. 19 p.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bird, W. H. Bird strike hazards can be reduced. Montreal, Engineering Research and Development Department, Air Canada, Sept. 15, 1965. 19 p.
2. Caithness, T. A., M. J. Williams, and R. M. Bull. Birds and aircraft: a problem on some New Zealand airfields. Proceedings New Zealand Ecological Society, 14:58-62, 1967.
3. Drury, W. H., Jr. Gulls vs terns; clash of coastal nesters. In Massachusetts Audubon--Summer 1965. Lincoln Massachusetts Audubon Society. 6 p.
4. Fisher, H. I. Airplane-albatross collisions on midway atoll. Condor, 68:229-242, 1966.
5. Hild, J., W. Keil, and W. Przygodda. Research projects of the Committee of the Federal Republic of Germany for the Prevention of Bird Strike Hazards to Aircraft. Technical Translation 1357. Ottawa, National Research Council of Canada, 1969. 8 p. Also published in Luscinia, 40(314):101-106, 1968.
6. Kadlec, J. A., and W. H. Drury. Structure of the New England herring gull population. Ecology, 49(4):644-676, Early Summer 1968.
7. Kinney, W. A. Strictly for the birds. Airman, 12(6):34-37, June 1968.
8. LaHam, Q. N. Report on aircraft turbine engine birdstrike investigations. Report No. CM4-S. 17-2. The National Research Council of Canada, Jan. 17, 1967. [37 p.]
9. Myres, M. T. The detection of birds, and study of bird movements, with radar. Alberta, Canada, University of Calgary, [1969.] 28 p.
10. Saul, E. K. Birds and aircraft: a problem at Auckland's new international airport. Journal of the Royal Aeronautical Society, 71(677):366-376, May 1967.
11. Seaman, E. A. Evaluation of "Avitrol 200" for bird control at seven U.S. Air Force Installations. Nov. 1968. 5 p. Unpublished report.
12. Bird hazards to aviation. AC 150/5200-1. [Washington], Federal Aviation Agency. [4 p.]
13. Bird vs. aircraft. Resource Publication No. 5. Boston, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. 11 p.

14. Control of birds on and around airports; final report. SRDS Report No. RD-68-62. Washington, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Oct. 1968. 30 p.
15. Recommendations of a working conference on the problem of ecological studies in support of the problem of hazards of birds to aircraft. Davis, University of California, May 31--June 2, 1966. 12 p.
16. Personal communication on herring gull populations and movements in Southeastern New England. W. H. Drury, Jr., Massachusetts Audubon Society, to J. L. Seubert, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Apr. 15, 1963. 106 p.
17. USAF aircraft collisions with birds, 1 Jan. 68 thru 31 Dec. 68. Report No. 3-69. Norton AFB, Calif., Directorate of Aerospace Safety, Deputy Inspector General for Inspection and Safety, USAF. 17 p.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Solid Waste Management Office expresses appreciation to the many individuals who cooperated in this study. The names of the participants are too numerous to list but include many State and local airport and solid waste officials and operators, private landfill operators, personnel from the FAA, the Departments of Defense and Interior, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's regional solid waste management representatives.

Members of the study teams from the Solid Waste Management Office were: Robert Clark, Stephen Friedman, Elmer Cleveland, Charles Reid, George Davidson, Thomas Sorg, Truett DeGeare, and John Sweeten. James Curry of the Solid Waste Management Office reviewed the legal portions of the report.