

Report of C. F. Horne  
Administrator of Civil Aeronautics  
Airports Advisory Committee  
Kansas City, Missouri  
March 10, 1952

I, and appropriate members of my staff, have carefully reviewed and considered the recommendations of the Airports Advisory Committee contained in your report of January 7, 1952. Having participated in the discussions with you on the items contained in your report, I was able to anticipate to some extent your recommendations. I am, however, pleased to again commend the committee for its farsightedness and independence in its recommendations. As a whole, I feel that your report is constructive and forceful, both from the standpoint of recommendations for improvement and as a basis for study on subjects vitally important to the aviation industry.

I have approved for the agenda of this meeting possibly more items than we can fully consider but, because of their close relation to other items to be considered by the Committee, they seem to me appropriate at this time. I have also forwarded to you prior to this meeting some off-agenda items on which I am seeking your advice and counsel. There will be many other items brought up for discussion and which we will discuss with you as the meeting progresses.

Referring to your report in the numerical order in which you submitted your recommendations, I will briefly comment at this time.

RECOMMENDATION 1. Military Use Agreements at Civil Airports - At the request of the Chairman of the Airport Use Panel, a legal working group, composed of representatives of the CAA, Air Force, Corps of Engineers, and the Navy Department, was appointed to draft a form of joint airport use agreement. This form together with exhibits were submitted to the Airport Use Panel on February 12, 1952.

This form was prepared using as a basis the Task Group "D" Report of the National Security Resources Board. It varies from this report in some instances. However, it is felt that it is an equitable agreement. If this proposed form is adopted by the Airport Use Panel, it is contemplated that it will be used at airports where there exists a document or agreement with the owner and the United States of America. In addition, it is felt that it could be anticipated that in many instances this agreement may be changed due to local conditions and such changes will have to be made in the agreement. It is further anticipated that upon adoption of any proposed use agreement it will have the active support and approval of the CAA. A copy of the proposed agreement together with exhibits was forwarded to you. No doubt you will want to discuss this joint use agreement later at this meeting.

RECOMMENDATION 2. Effectiveness of the Airport Use Panel - I am pleased to advise you that since your last meeting, better coordination has been effected in Washington, particularly as it relates to the military and Naval establishments contacting local political subdivisions and civic organizations relative to the use of an airport.

The Airport Use Panel members are advised in advance of any actual survey to be made of an airport for military or Naval use. We, in the Civil Aeronautics Administration, have in turn advised our representatives to be present and to participate in these surveys and discussions relative to the use of the airport.

The Airport Use Panel has also adopted a policy, "General Policies for Implementing the Current National Defense Effort as it Affects the Civil Airport Structure".

I believe that the Panel is now recognized as a more effective tool in

working out problems relating to military usage of civil airports.

RECOMMENDATION 3 - Federal Legislation for Airport Zoning and  
RECOMMENDATION 7 - Federal Participation in the Removal of Obstructions

With regard to these two recommendations, your Committee stated that in its opinion the proposed bill to remove obstructions to air navigation and prevent future obstructions to air navigation, which was drafted by this office at the request of your predecessor, is "too broad" and therefore would be objectionable to the States and their political subdivisions. Your Committee apparently believes this to be true both with respect to the prevention of obstructions, whether the latter is accompanied by acquisition of property rights or by Federal airport zoning. For this reason, you recommended the matter be given further study, presumably by the CAA.

While it is undoubtedly true that there would be some State and local opposition to Federal zoning, it is believed that many States and political subdivisions would welcome the use of Federal funds to acquire property interests needed either to protect or to clear airport approaches. Moreover, it is believed that the draft bill goes about as far as is feasible to avoid State and local opposition by carefully limiting the regulatory authority granted and particularly by providing (in Section 1305) that the regulatory and acquisition authority granted may be exercised "only to the extent the Secretary determined that the States and Territories, or the political subdivisions thereof, have not adequately used the criteria established in Section 1303 by preventing and removing physical obstructions to air navigation".

The question as to how much State and local opposition there would be is one that can be determined only by requesting the comments and suggestions of the States and their political subdivisions and of aviation interests in

the various States. Steps in this direction have already been taken by requesting the comments and suggestions of the Airports Advisory Committee. However, it is believed that it might be advisable to submit the matter to the Air Coordinating Committee with the request that it be considered by the ACC advisory committee on which the NASAO and the airlines are represented. In addition, it is pointed out that if desired a public hearing could be held by the CAA on the question whether the CAA should propose any legislation such as the draft bill.

RECOMMENDATION 4 - Need for Supplemental Airport to Serve the Washington Area - This recommendation in essence approves the planning for the supplemental airport which had been done up to the middle of September, 1951.

I wish to express my thanks for the time and consideration that the Committee gave to this matter. I welcome any additional advice or comment from this Committee or its members on CAA plans for Burke and will keep you advised regarding such plans.

RECOMMENDATION 5 - Studies on "General Aviation" - The University of Oklahoma study, together with Mr. Burke's recommendations, were submitted to each member of the Aviation Development Advisory Committee (ADAC). The subject was discussed at the ADAC meeting and recommendations were made by that committee to me. Their recommendations have been distributed to you.

RECOMMENDATION 6 - General Aviation's Role in Civil Defense - The Office of Aviation Development has, for several months, worked with various segments of industry, and particularly with the Emergency Aviation Council which prepared a model state plan to be used by the various states in

formulating their state plans. This plan was approved by the CAA and the Federal Civil Defense Administration and was then dispatched to the Governors and State Directors of the various states with a letter of transmittal showing how general aviation could be used in civil defense.

As a result of months of study and work, there have been a number of meetings held throughout the United States with the various State Directors and others involved, assisting them in the implementation of the plan.

**RECOMMENDATION 8 - Current Maintenance Problems at Surplus Airports -**

The Committee recommended that the CAA make a survey at surplus airports with the objective of releasing grantees from the responsibility of maintaining and operating surplus airport property facilities beyond those which are required to serve civil aviation in the foreseeable future. In addition, the Committee recommended that an opportunity be given to the military departments to acquire a lease or enter into a contractual agreement with the grantee to assist in perpetuating facilities felt to be in excess of civil needs and which would be desirable or essential for potential military use. Under date of January 1952 the Department of Commerce issued a bulletin titled "Defense Functions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration". This bulletin was a part of the "Final Report to the Preparedness Subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on Armed Services". Under item C - Airports Program Defense Functions, paragraph 4 reads as follows:

"Supervising compliance with agreements by local public agencies operating surplus airports to insure that these airports will be in a state of readiness if needed by the Military Services; also, working with civil airport managers to insure maximum readiness and availability of civil airports for military operations."

It may be seen from the above policy of the Department of Commerce that

it would not appear feasible for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to instigate a program which would result in the CAA not requiring the continuance of compliance with certain agreements with the United States which require that the owners maintain and operate airport facilities. While it is realized that there are numerous locations where civil needs do not require all of the airport facilities which are available, it is realized that the communities have agreed with the United States to maintain and operate all of those facilities and that the United States also has the right to use those facilities during time of national emergency under varying conditions. It would hardly seem proper for the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to foster non-compliance with these contracts at this time. However, it is realized that there are a great number of locations where the local communities are not in a financial condition to maintain and operate airport facilities far beyond those which are required for civil aviation and also there does not seem to be any apparent military need for these facilities. In instances of this kind it is the policy of the CAA, when requested by the airport owners, to make an investigation of the local situation and to determine what facilities are needed for civil aviation with the possibility in mind of allowing the owners to maintain and operate only those facilities which are needed. When these conditions are found to exist, and where the military departments have determined no apparent military need beyond the civil need exists at the particular location, airport owners have been relieved of the requirements of maintenance and operation on those areas of the airport beyond that needed for civil aviation.

RECOMMENDATION 9 - Costs for Obstruction Lighting - It is our opinion that the Federal Airport Act permits the inclusion in a project of the obstruction lighting of any obstruction to the landing or take-off of aircraft at a public airport. This conclusion is inescapable in view of the

fact that the Act contains provisions defining the "airport development" that may be included in a project as including the "lighting of airport hazards" (Section 2(a) (3) ) and defines "airport hazard" to mean "any structure or object of natural growth located on or in the vicinity of a public airport...which obstructs the air space required for the flight of aircraft in landing or take-off at such airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or take-off of aircraft" (Section 2(a) (4) ).

In view of the above, we can see no need for any legislation such as that recommended by the Committee in recommendation (9).

**RECOMMENDATION 10 - Need for a Supplemental Federal-aid Airport Appropriation.** This item recommended that the CAA "advocate and pursue a course aimed at procuring supplemental Federal-aid Airport appropriations in the interest of future development for airports vital to the national defense and economy and particularly those to be used jointly by civil and military users.

We have proceeded with the steps leading toward a request for a supplemental appropriation on this matter. Our Regional reports show projects for 1952 totaling more than \$53,000,000 and additional projects which could be undertaken in 1953 and 1954 of approximately \$27,000,000 and \$23,000,000 respectively. A formal request for inclusion of the supplemental program is being prepared for presentation to the Secretary of Commerce. This covers a program of \$25,000,000, \$23,000,000 for continental United States and \$2,000,000 for the territories.

**RECOMMENDATION 11 - Noise Abatement Program** - It is noted that CAA has established a National Aviation Noise Reduction Committee. This appears to be a direct attack on the problem.

As regards the technical research problem involved in the actual

reduction of the noise level of aircraft and components, i.e., engine exhaust and propeller noise, reciprocating or turbo-prop engines, this would appear to be a useful area for action by NACA on a continuing basis, with future attention to noise created by jet power plants.

It seems obvious that, pending actual scientific advances in the elimination of noise, the most useful line of attack would be concentrated on establishing preferential use of runways and patterns which would to the greatest practicable degree remote the path of aircraft from areas of concentrated population, thus also serving the problem of insuring greater safety for the areas overflow.

RECOMMENDATION 12 - Categories of Use for Civil Airports - On December 7, 1951, I submitted to the Airport Use Panel of the Air Coordinating Committee a "Plan for Utilization of Civil Airports". In transmitting this plan to the Airport Use Panel I expressed a desire for "A complete plan for an airport system to handle the maximum requirements of military and civil aviation within the foreseeable future should be established by joint study by civil and military aviation authorities; and one part should be a plan for utilization of civil airports." As a preliminary step for the development of such a plan, the CAA prepared a list of four categories of large airports throughout the United States. I described these four categories as follows:

List No. 1 includes major air terminals which are the hubs of our air transport system. At these locations essential traffic is already high, and will increase during our preparedness program. Many of them also provide major maintenance bases for the scheduled airlines. The list reflects locations where military traffic should be kept at a minimum, and detailed plans should be made now so that essential military traffic in these areas will be handled in the future at other airports to the greatest extent possible.

List No. 2 includes certain airports which have a large volume of essential civil traffic, and at which only limited increases in the present military traffic, should be planned. Considerable thought should be given to the volume, and the types of military traffic which should use these airports. Also, at any location to be included in List No. 2 where extensive military requirements exist or can be foreseen, studies should be directed toward utilization of other airports.

List No. 3 includes airports where essential civil aviation activities should be carried on, but the expected volume of such traffic will be relatively small. At such locations military traffic can be accommodated on a joint-use basis with little or no limitations as regards volume or type.

List No. 4 includes major airports where, in time of emergency, exclusive military occupancy is considered feasible, and also those military and naval airfields in which the Defense Department has a continuing long range exclusive requirement.

On December 10, 1951, this plan for utilization of civil airports was distributed to the Airport Use Panel emphasizing that the Panel Members be prepared at the earliest practicable date to discuss the contents and merits of your proposal.

I have been advised that at subsequent meetings of the Airport Use Panel the plan has been discussed but nothing has crystallized to date. However, the Panel intends to keep this on the agenda as a high priority item because they believe that continuation of the development of civil airports at high priority locations will assist the military effort because of their logistic support to an all-out defense effort. I intend to keep you advised of the developments relating to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 13 - CAA's Information Program - We heartily concur in

this recommendation as set forth in the Airports Advisory Committee report. We are making improvements in our organization and are analyzing what we can do better. Funds are and will be tight in '52 and '53, but we will keep trying.

RECOMMENDATION 14- Runway Markings - In accordance with Recommendation 14, and recommendations of the flight operational groups primarily concerned with runway marking - Air Transport Association, International Air Transport Association, and Air Line Pilots Association - an amendment to TSO-N10 adding an optional centerline on the true center of the runway has been added on an interim basis. However, to be compatible with the recommendations of the operational groups as they relate to centerlines for all-weather marking systems, the optional centerline adopted is a dashed line - one to three feet wide - composed of segments 100 feet long and separated by blank spaces 100 feet long.

After a careful review of various runway marking proposals, this centerline showed up as the most promising with the following advantages:

- (1) Dashed line generally appears continuous on normal approach path.
- (2) Dashed line saves one-half amount of paint.
- (3) Dashed line adds texture (much as waves provide texture to glassy water).
- (4) Dashed line provides some indication of rolling speed.
- (5) Dashed line compatible with promising all-weather marking system.
- (6) As stated above, this centerline, as part of an all-weather marking system, has the required support of the operational groups - ATA, IATA, ALPA and others.

The TSO-N10 amendment also incorporates the Airports Advisory Committee recommendation to increase the taxiway holding point marker to 200 ft. from the nearest edge of the intersected taxiway or runway.

An active program of evaluating all-weather runway marking systems is

under way in the CAA Runway Marking Evaluation Committee, which will report in the near future on the progress of this work.

The optional centerline adopted above will remain on an interim basis pending the results of this Committee and coordination with the Military.

RECOMMENDATION 15 - Predetermination of Labor Rates - Since the last meeting of the Airports Advisory Committee numerous conferences have been held with Labor Department representatives relative to the Department of Labor's administration of labor legislation in regard to the Federal Airport Act and to the regulations which they have issued in connection therewith. We have been unable to influence the Department of Labor's thinking relative to the determination of minimum rates of wages which we feel should be made for use on contracts covering construction considered to be of a similar character to runway construction and other landing area development. While the Committee recommended that if the desired results could not be obtained by conferences with the Labor Department, legislation be proposed which would make the labor provisions of the Federal Airport Act similar to those of the Federal Highway Act, we do not feel that it would be proper for this Administration at this time to propose such legislation. While it is realized that the present administration of the labor regulations is costing both the Federal Government and the sponsors considerably more than is necessary, we do not feel that CAA is the proper organization to instigate proposed legislation to change this condition, but that if it is desired by the sponsors of airport projects they should make their desires known to the Congress.

In regard to the last sentence of this recommendation, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has revised its regulations in order to comply with new regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor, issued pursuant to

Reorganization Plan 14-1950, which divides the responsibility for administration between the sponsor of Federal-aid airport projects and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. In addition, we have asked for additional funds under a supplemental request to furnish the additional personnel needed by the CAA to carry out this function. This procedure was considered the most economical way to accomplish the requirement.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to approve projects under the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170, as amended) for airport development needed for or to be used to serve a military purpose during war or national emergency if the Secretary determines that such airport development is also needed to serve a civil need during or at the expiration of such war or national emergency. Such projects otherwise shall be subject to the same terms, conditions and requirements as other projects under the Federal Airport Act, except that the sponsor need not be required to control the airport or to operate and maintain it as a public civil airport during time of war or national emergency, if such control is in the United States and if such operation and maintenance are inconsistent with military needs or operations on the airport.

## STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

"To facilitate the development of civil airports for military purposes, and for other purposes."

Most civil airports in the United States are constructed and improved by local public agencies with Federal assistance in the form of grants-in-aid of a percentage (usually 50 per cent) of the project costs, under the program established by the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170, as amended). The program is administered, and construction projects are supervised, by the Secretary of Commerce. To qualify for a grant the project must contribute to the integrated national system of civil airports envisioned as the long-range goal of the program. The project sponsor must give assurance that the airport "will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination." The program is thus limited to airport development of direct benefit to civil aviation.

Many civil airports constructed or developed under this Federal-Aid Airport Program have been taken over in whole or in part for military use for the duration of the present national emergency. Frequently the Department of Defense finds it necessary to further improve these airports for military purposes. Although many of such improvements may be of ultimate benefit to civil aviation, there is often insufficient present civil need for them to support a grant-in-aid by the Secretary of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act. Moreover, where the military agency has taken possession of the airport, the airport owner is not in a position to enter into the agreement required by the Act that the airport will be operated as a public civil airport. Thus, in most such instances, the Secretary of Commerce has no authority to participate in the development of the airport.

In many cases the improvements required by the military are merely additions to Federal Airport Act approved, but uncompleted, civil projects. In almost all other cases the work to be done is additional to construction previously accomplished under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce. Under existing law, the military improvement must be handled by the Department of Defense. The result is a wasteful and confusing overlapping of activity by two Federal Departments; the Department of Commerce supervising the part of the project required for civil aviation and the Department of Defense handling, with different personnel, procedures, and, often, contract terms, the military phase of the same total project.

Obviously, there would be great savings in both time and money if only one department handled all Federal developmental activity at any one airport. In our opinion, the Department of Commerce is in the best position to handle this work at civil airports. The personnel of this Department are familiar with the engineering and other problems involved in the development and operation of civil airports, and can make certain

that the military improvements will be of maximum civil utility. The Department of Commerce in most cases is supervising, or has recently supervised, some construction at these civil airports, and its employees are familiar with all special local problems. They have worked closely on a continuing basis with the officials of the airports. In practically all cases, the airport is the subject of a grant agreement, a surplus airport property deed, or other contract with the United States, which governs the manner in which the airport will be operated, maintained, and further developed. Under existing law the Department of Commerce is the only Federal department responsible for supervising and enforcing compliance with the terms of these grants, contracts, and deeds.

The National Security Resources Board Task Force, which recently completed the airport phase of the Air Transport Mobilization Survey, recommended that, in the interest of efficiency, military improvements to civil airports should be accomplished under the supervision of the Department of Commerce (Final Report, NSRB Air Transport Mobilization Survey, Task Group D -- Airports, June 20, 1951, Subject II, pages 6 and 7). A copy of the National Security Resources Board Task Group's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation on the subject is annexed.

The legislation which we propose will facilitate handling of these military projects at civil airports by this Department.

Under existing law, the military departments can transfer funds to the Department of Commerce for military construction at civil airports. However, additional legislation is necessary to assure that this work will be accomplished upon the best possible terms to the Federal Government. It is our belief that many local public agencies are willing and able to pay a portion of the costs where the military work will enhance the value of the airport for civil uses. Legislative authority is required to permit this Department to enter into grant agreements which would permit such sharing of the cost of this military work, similar to the grant-in-aid agreements under the Federal Airport Act. In any event, whether the local agency contributes to the cost or not, savings should result if the construction is handled similarly to Federal Airport Act projects, by construction contract awarded and supervised by the airport owner with the assistance and advice of the Department of Commerce. In those instances in which the military work is additional to an existing civil project, there would be no need for two separate sets of plans, specifications, and other contract documents. In all cases, the military would have the advantage of the relatively low contract prices which normally obtain for Federal Airport Act projects.

Civil airports occupied by the military cannot qualify for grants under the Federal Airport Act, since there can be no present assurance that

the airport will be available as a public civil airport. This is so, even where the airport owner is willing to pay its share of the project costs for benefits which will accrue only after the termination of the national emergency. Legislation is required to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make grants-in-aid for projects of ultimate benefit to civil aviation at civil airports temporarily occupied by the military. Obviously, it is in the interest of the Federal Government that necessary improvements be made to airports used by the military at an expense to the United States of approximately 50 per cent of the cost.

The attached draft bill would provide the legislation which is required.

Section 1 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer to the Secretary of Commerce such funds as are necessary to meet military needs for the expansion, alteration, or other improvement of non-Federal public airports which are to be used by a military agency for military operations jointly with civil users of the airport. It would further grant contracting authority to the Secretary of Commerce to permit sharing of the cost of the improvement by the airport owner and to require the most favorable terms and conditions, considering the needs of both military and civil aviation.

Section 2 of the proposed bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to approve projects under the Federal Airport Act for airport development to serve a military purpose during time of war or national emergency which the Secretary determines will also serve a civil need either during or at the expiration of the war or national emergency. The Secretary would be further authorized to approve projects at airports temporarily occupied by the military.

This proposed legislation would not involve any additional expense to the Government. On the contrary, by preventing duplication of activity by two Federal Departments, there will be a substantial reduction in both administrative expense and actual construction costs. As pointed out above, this legislation would assist in the implementation of the attached recommendation of the National Security Resources Board Task Force.

UNCLASSIFIED

- 6 -

Report 1/15/51  
Enclosure, page 3

II. Subject: COORDINATION OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

A. FINDINGS:

1. It was found that the CAA has placed over 2000 projects for airport development and improvement at civil airports in the past four years.
2. It was found that the CAA has been collaborating with local political subdivisions, state aeronautical commissions and the aviation industry as a whole in developing master plans for civil airports.
3. It appears that the transfer of funds for the military's share for the accomplishment of work at civil airports could be accomplished under Section 601 of the Economy Act and the transfer of such funds for the military's share by the utilization of standard government form 1080. The military would spell out the type of work and the specifications for work at the time of transfer of funds. The CAA would be the contracting officer for work at civil airports so specified by the military.

B. CONCLUSIONS:

1. It is felt satisfactory and expeditious action can be attained at civil airports through the utilization of the CAA's technical skills and contract procedures for military construction at civil airports.
2. It is concluded that at many civil airports work will be in progress for both civil and military needs. Therefore, it is believed that one Federal agency should administer such work at these airports.
3. It is concluded that the CAA should make every effort with owning agencies of civil airports to bring them up to civil requirements as listed in the current National Airport Plan. This should only be accomplished after the project has obtained clearance from the committee mentioned in Recommendation I.

(Intent: An existing airport has a runway of 4000 ft. - National Airport Plan states civil requirements 5000 ft. The CAA would participate with owning agency under the Federal Airport Act on a 50 - 50 basis. If military requirements at the airport are 6000 ft., the military should pay 100% for the 1000 additional feet. This type of construction work should definitely be handled by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.)

UNCLASSIFIED

Report 1/15/51

- 7 -

Enclosure, page 4

C. RECOMMENDATION:

1. At the discretion of the appropriate department concerned the accomplishment of the department's share for airport construction at certain civil airports should, where the best interest of the government will be served, be accomplished through the transfer of military funds to the CAA for administration by CAA to accomplish the desired improvements.