

ANALYSIS OF A STUDY PREPARED BY JAMES C. BUCKLEY
OF AIR SERVICE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
CITY OF DALLAS FOR THE
DALLAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(1) Buckley's report appears to be written or beamed for its recipient - the Dallas Chamber of Commerce. Its major thesis as might be expected, considering the client for whom the study was made, is that Dallas needs more air service.

(2) Buckley contends Dallas needs new or improved air service with seventy-five communities in 1952 and will need new or further improved service with thirty-nine additional communities between 1952 and 1955, and between 1955 and 1960 will need new or further improved air service with fifty-five additional communities. Buckley maintains that only one-third of the required improvements in air service of Dallas can be made by existing carriers without further authorization from the Civil Aeronautics Board, and necessarily implies without expressing that the additional two-thirds of the required air service improvement must come from additional certification of existing carriers or the issuance of competitive certificates. To this end

he suggests that the City and the Chamber of Commerce co-operate with carriers to seek additional authorizations for service from the Civil Aeronautics Board.

(3) He recommends that his study be made available to other interested communities (presumably other terminals distant from Dallas), and that joint work be undertaken with the air carriers and the Civil Aeronautics Board to expand the air service pattern. He proposes that the community argue generally for expanded service rather than for or against any particular carrier, and that a more flexible non-stop operation be sponsored for feeder or local carriers, and that Dallas thereby achieve in effect substantially greater non-stop service. This last proposal, if realized, would give feeder air carriers an incentive to minimize or abandon the local service they were conceived to promote and to compete with trunk carriers, whose operations they are theoretically supposed to complement.

(4) Buckley suggests immediate attention not only to present alleged deficiencies but those which he prospects for 1955 due to the length of time required to process route applications. He specifies that a similar

survey be made every three years to insure continuous, current evaluation and to give the City prepared material for participation in route proceedings before the C.A.B.

(5) He also recommends that the development of airport facilities be coordinated with developing air traffic.

(6) Buckley seeks to justify Dallas's alleged need of additional air service by a number of pages of statistical reference as to bank deposits and credits, postal receipts, value of manufactures, wholesale and retail sales, utility consumption, motor vehicle registration, purchasing power, trade publications, hotel registrations, petroleum, cotton, banking and insurance industries and similar commercial and industrial indicia, which is typical of municipal sponsored exhibits in route development proceedings.

(7) Buckley contends Dallas should, in addition to present non-stop service with Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco and Washington, have additional non-stop service with Atlanta, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Philadelphia and St. Louis in 1952 and between 1952 and 1955 should have such service with Cincinnati and between 1955 and 1960 should have such service with

Akron, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Miami, Milwaukee and Pittsburgh. Limited non-stop service is recommended with a number of other cities for 1952 such as Akron, Baltimore, Boston, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Omaha and Pittsburgh, in addition to present service with Birmingham, Miami, Phoenix and San Diego. Limited non-stop service is recommended with Columbus, Ohio, Dayton, Des Moines, Jacksonville, Seattle, Toledo and Topeka between 1952 and 1955, and with Buffalo, Hartford, Joplin, Louisville, Montgomery, Peoria and Rochester between 1955 and 1960.

(8) Extensive additions of both regional and local non-stop and limited non-stop service is recommended to practically every major city in the region and in the State of Texas.

(9) Buckley avoids the air ferry question between Fort Worth and Dallas by saying it will need special consideration after the opening of Greater Fort Worth International Airport. This is the only reference in this particular study which even suggests the implications of Fort Worth as an air traffic center.

(10) Perhaps the most provocative portion of Buckley's report is that dealing with competitive air service. He says, "One of the most glaring deficiencies in the Dallas air service pattern is the absence of effectively competitive air service with the bulk of the cities with which it has a major community of interest. Although competitive service is authorized between Dallas and Chicago, no such service is authorized either to the West Coast with which Dallas has a strong community of interest, or to the commercial, governmental and industrial centers on the North Atlantic Coast. Yet Dallas generates almost as many air passengers and one-half again as many air passenger miles, with Los Angeles and San Francisco together, as it does with Chicago. Its air passengers with New York alone are ten per cent greater than with Chicago, and its air passenger miles, twice as great."

The foregoing paragraph is simply a long way of saying in Buckley's opinion that American Airlines should receive competition on its historic East - West routes in and out of Dallas from either or both Braniff and Eastern. This language of Buckley's will doubtless be seized upon

by future ambitious route applications of Braniff, Eastern and other carriers.

(11) The report is unrealistic in that it gives no consideration to the following factors:

(a) The increased cost and potential load factor loss of the competitive air service it recommends between Dallas and numerous major points.

(b) The cost and availability of facilities at Love Field for such competitive service.

(c) The general over-all effect on national civilian aviation of such competitive service.

(d) The existing saturation of air traffic at Love Field.

(e) The extension of the historical trend of larger and faster aircraft with greater cruising ranges.

(f) No consideration is given to the large amount of Dallas traffic which is actually now being siphoned from the Fort Worth area, pending completion of Greater Fort Worth International Airport, and which presently artificially inflates Dallas air traffic volume statistics.

(g) It ignores the possibility that much of the additional service it recommends will actually be available to residents of Dallas through the Greater Fort Worth International Airport.

Page #7

The Buckley report states that Dallas is "the nation's outstanding non-resort air traffic generating center", and that Dallas's needs are "best served by originating and terminating schedules rather than by transit schedules on national, regional or local air routes". The report contends that there has been "little substantial improvement in air service available at Dallas since August of 1949". It cites that Dallas has experienced no net increase in the number of communities with which it had non-stop air service in 1949, and that there are three less communities with which Dallas has single plane limited stop air service and only four additional communities with which Dallas has single plane multi-stop air service.