

1947

CAA - State Aviation Officials, Third Region Air Clinic, March 19-20, 1947

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.smu.edu/jalc>

Recommended Citation

CAA - State Aviation Officials, Third Region Air Clinic, March 19-20, 1947, 14 J. AIR L. & COM. 215 (1947)
<https://scholar.smu.edu/jalc/vol14/iss2/6>

This Current Legislation and Decisions is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at SMU Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Air Law and Commerce by an authorized administrator of SMU Scholar. For more information, please visit <http://digitalrepository.smu.edu>.

STATE AND LOCAL

Department Editor: Madeline C. Dinu*

CAA — STATE AVIATION OFFICIALS, THIRD REGION AIR CLINIC,
MARCH 19-20, 1947

WHEN one returns home from an aviation clinic the first questions asked are: "What did you do?", "What was accomplished?" The CAA State Aviation Officials Third Region Air Clinic held at Chicago on March 19 and 20 was no exception. This reporting purports to answer these questions.

In the past, Regional meetings of the State Aviation Officials have been held during the year to discuss and solve problems of immediate importance. From these Regional meetings matters requiring policy determination and matters of concern to the entire nation have been brought to the annual meetings of the State Aviation Officials.

The coordination and cooperation developed during the past several years between federal and state aviation officials brought about the holding of a jointly sponsored meeting for the Third CAA Region at Chicago on March 19 and 20. Mr. George W. Vest, CAA Regional Administrator, and Mr. Charles E. Cox, Jr., Assistant to the CAA Regional Administrator, were the initiators, while President L. L. Schroeder (Minnesota) of the National Association of State Aviation Officials, and the Directors of Aeronautics of the other seven states — North Dakota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan and Kentucky — were the co-sponsors. In attendance were representatives of the aviation industry of the Region — aircraft operators, personal flying, airport managers, aviation educators, flying farmers — and members of the CAA Third Region staff, as well as Mr. George Burgess of CAA, Washington.

The agenda covered Airports, Air Safety, Aviation Education, Part 42, CAA Non-Scheduled Operations, G.I. Flight Training, Part 50, and Coast and Geodetic Survey Air Maps. Related phases were discussed pro and con in special meetings of smaller groups outside the program hours.

Twenty resolutions were submitted and all but one were adopted. Of special interest are the resolutions on aviation education, the federal airport program, air marking, and elimination of certain requirements for airman certificates. Space does not permit setting them out in full, and selecting several would do an injustice to the remaining resolutions. Copies of the resolutions may be obtained by writing Mr. Charles E. Cox, Assistant to the Regional Administrator, CAA, at Chicago.

The foregoing is what was done. Now as to what was accomplished. In these days of full and loaded work schedules, a meeting must give promise of some reasonable accomplishment to merit the time required away from one's home base. This Clinic justified the time devoted to it.

Both the federal airport program and aviation education are now emerging into great activity. The Clinic brought out the fact that correlation, coordination, and cooperation between the federal, state and industry is the only manner in which a healthy development of these subjects can be realized. Respect for each other, and rock bottom candor is, therefore, imperative!

The federal rules and regulations for the airport program and in par-

* Madeline C. Dinu, Member of the Michigan Bar, Legal Counsel to the Michigan Aeronautics Commission and to the NASAO.

ticular the rules on the method of paying the federal share of approved projects were found misleading. In one part they provide that the federal share will be deposited in an approved state depository, and in another paragraph, such federal funds will not be paid until the sponsor sends in receipted paid vouchers. This in practical effect would require a sponsor to advance 100% of the funds on a project up to a certain point, then await reimbursement from the Federal Government. Communities do not always have these resources, especially where limitations of airport bond issues and special tax levies operate to provide only the sponsor's 50% share. A detailed resolution on this point, Resolution No. 5, was adopted by the Clinic, with the hope that changes in the Rules will be made.

Another subject of urgent importance to airport sponsors discussed at the Clinic, and the basis of another Resolution, Resolution No. 8, was that of determination of minimum labor wage rates on projects. It was brought out that the Federal Airport Act provides for the Secretary of Labor to determine such rates; but that the CAA had stated such rates would be determined on each project separately, rather than using labor rates already determined by the Secretary of Labor in larger zone areas for the Federal Public Roads Program. The delay of some sixty days, reported to be required for such wage determinations before invitation for construction bids could be published, would seriously delay many airport projects in localities where the construction season is of short duration.

Another matter discussed at the Clinic was that State Aviation Officials had not been informed, until one state director read the recent Brewster Committee Interim Report, that an agreement had been entered into between the White House and the Civil Aeronautics Administration some time last August to the effect that only \$4,000,000 of federal funds would be spent on airport development during the first year of the Federal Aid Airport Program, namely, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947 out of the \$45,000,000 appropriated. The question was asked what justification is there for the CAA to encourage and promote the submission of projects by community-sponsors for which the CAA made tentative allocations of federal funds of some \$45,000,000 for the 1946-1947 program? Those sponsors were led to believe they would receive the federal share as allocated, but now with Congressional proposals to either divert the funds appropriated from the first year's airport program to navigational aids, or to use the bulk of appropriations for the second year's airport program for the larger Class IV, V and VI air terminals, what is to become of the community-sponsors of the smaller airports which have already spent their funds preparing projects based on strong federal promotion? The State Aviation Officials vigorously protested the misleading federal activities in the face of such an order, which can only result in the general public losing its hard-nurtured faith in all aviation activities.

Bringing such matters out in open discussion focused attention on critical problems confronting aviation officials. Thorough discussion, followed by action *now*, not in the remote future, showed that concerted action could accomplish what everyone heartily hoped for. The CAA personnel of the Third Region are, without exception, a most practical and cooperative federal group, doing their job sincerely. While they do not formulate general policies, their recommendations to headquarters should be given great weight. The state aviation directors and the aviation public in the Third Region are also aware of their strength in Congressional representation, to whom they state they will ultimately be forced to appeal if all other cooperative means fail. Putting the cards on the table on immediate aviation problems at the Chicago meeting in March, 1947, would sum up in a few words what was accomplished!

M. C. D.