



MEETING MEMORANDUM

Date: September 16, 2004

Meeting Date: June 23, 2004
Written By: Jason Whitten
Project: OSU Airport EA
Project No.: 0241-5795-00

Location of Meeting: OSU Airport Wind Building

Purpose of Meeting: Advisory Committee Meeting

Attended By:

Doug Hammon, OSU
Ernest Gubry, FAA (Phone)
Wes Butch, DLZ
Jason Whitten, DLZ
Xaviera Jessurun, Wyle Labs
Melissa Krygier, OSU
Mark Stelzer, OSU
Chris Mulholand, OSU
Dale Gelter, OSU
Michael St. Clair, OSU

Michael St. Clair, OSU
Gina Langen, OSU
Michelle Kranz, Worthington Attorney
Louis Goorey, Worthington
Dennis Hughes, Worthington
David Elder, Worthington
Mary Jo Cusaet, Riverlea
John Schmmidt, NW Civic Assc.
Bill Habig, MORPC
Barbara Cox, Dublin

Discussion:

I. Introduction and Purpose for Meeting

Doug Hammon introduced himself and briefly described the purpose of the meeting. He then introduced Wes Butch. Butch reiterated the purpose of the meeting.

II. Updated Description of Project to be Included in Environmental Assessment (EA)

Butch stated the following items will be included as part of the proposed project in the EA; runway 9L/27R and taxiway extension, construction of hangars on the south side, installation of ILS, and runway lighting. He also explained how construction of hangars and a corporate airpark on the north side of the airport would not be included as part of the project.

Dennis Hughes asked if older hangars on the south side would be removed to make way for the new ones. Hammon stated no there would be 50 additional hangars.

AC member asked when would construction on the north side start. Hammon stated construction would not begin for at least another 10-20 years. Butch added the EA only covers a 5-year timeframe. Therefore, the north side improvements are not included in the EA.

AC member asked what type of hangars would be constructed. Hammon answered 30-35 would be for

smaller aircraft and approximately 15 would be used for twins on up to corporate aircraft.

III. Noise Monitoring Results

Butch introduced Xaviera Jessurun from Wyle Labs to explain the results of the noise monitoring data. Jessurun explained the purpose of the noise monitoring was to report existing noise levels (aircraft and community levels) and calibrate the Integrated Noise Model (INM) that will be used to conduct the noise study. She stated that this data was for informational purposes only and the FAA would base any decisions on the noise model only. She explained the ways to measure noise (DNL, Lmax, SEL) and stated that FAA only uses DNL to determine impacts. Jessurun then stated that the monitoring provided the following information, overall DNL, aircraft DNL, and community only DNL. Jessurun explained how aircraft noise is taken out of the readings by examining the noise footprint that was recorded. Aircrafts leave a distinct footprint compared to a train car etc. Additionally, when a louder noise event is recorded the time can be noted and then it is compared to the radar data to determine if a plane flew over head at the same time as recorded on the data receiver.

Hughes asked if a time above contours model would be developed, as they would be helpful to the surrounding communities by showing graphically where the planes are in flight. Jessurun stated that it could be done but is not part of their scope for this project. Butch stated if it would be helpful we will look into the possibility of doing it.

IV. Input Data for INM Noise Model Analysis

Jessurun reiterated that the FAA decision would be based on DNL levels from the INM.

Hughes asked when would the input data be available. Jessurun stated the data would be made available sometime in July before the INM run. Jessurun explained that the forecast of operations was updated and that 2003 was the new base year.

Hughes asked how the 50 additional based aircraft was calculated. Hammon explained there are over 50 people on the waiting list at this point in time.

Hughes stated radar data that is to be used in the INM was not from a full year, it was only a snapshot and therefore in was inaccurate. Jessurun explained it was 10-day sample and it was accurate as it provides a picture of an average day at the airport and it is actual data of aircraft using the airport.

Hughes stated that radar data does not account for VFR traffic and that it is not counted. Jessurun stated that VFR is accounted for in the main tracts and annual operations. The annual operations include fleetmix, flight tracts, and operation type.

Michelle Kranz asked if we had information showing jets doing touch and go operations at night. Hughes added touch and goes at night are not accounted for and radar data could not be matched with event. Therefore complete data could nor be collected, only assumptions could be used. Jessurun stated that Port Columbus is not involved in touch and goes and that we do not have any information showing jet touch and goes. She added we will look into the situation and she would like to see any data they may have showing actual jet touch and goes. Hammon added that jet touch and goes are not legal at the airport.

Hughes asked if a 1.3 percent annual growth rate was used to predict future operations. Hammon explained that we used FAA's predicted forecast for each year. Hughes stated he thinks the future forecast are too high, as the growth percentage used by the FAA includes ultralights and sport utility aircraft which are increasing in popularity. Therefore, the growth percentage is too high for traditional aircraft. Butch stated we will look into the numbers and talk with the FAA.

Kranz asked if all jets have been tracked when the airport is not open and if we got the tracts from Port Columbus. Jessurun stated that the jets are accounted for and the information was collected from Port Columbus.

Kranz asked for an additional scenario to be run, which included all jets on the north runway on single tracts. Jessurun asked them to formally submit a request and she would look into it.

V. Questions Regarding EA Issues other than Noise

Butch stated we heard suggestions about INM and we would like these suggestions and any other in writing within 10 days. Butch then asked if there are any other questions regarding other EA issues. January's meeting summarized findings and in our view there are no significant impacts. Ernie Gubry added formal approval would not occur until after publication of the EA, and public and agency comments.

Kranz asked if any safety consideration was given to students in relation to the increased jet traffic. Hammon answered that the air traffic is separated very well at the airport and they have not seen any conflicts in the past when operations were higher at the airport. Butch added that this is part of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) approval process. Gubry added that the FAA is reviewing the ALP and they are conducting an air space study by each appropriate division with the FAA and they may have comments regarding any safety issues that arise. The entire FAA will weigh in on whether or not the ALP will be safe.

AC member asked if the streams were being rerouted. Butch stated the issues were being study and as per Ohio Environmental Protection Agency 's (OEPA) requirements QHEI and HHEI studies have been completed and the streams have been scored. The report is being sent out to OEPA for review and comments. In DLZ's opinion there is no impact and the formal findings would not be out until the EA is published. Hughes asked if the Army Corp of Engineers (Corp) would be involved. Butch stated the Corp would receive a copy of the EA for review and approval.

VI. Update of Schedule

Hammon provided an updated schedule. No questions or concerns were raised.

VII. Comments and Questions

Butch asked if there was any additional questions or concerns. No questions or concerns were raised.

Action Items

DLZ

- Dublin traffic

Wyle Labs

- Time above contours?
- Coordinate with Port Columbus regarding jet touch and goes
- Fix table for runway utilization percentages
- INM input files (CD) to Zoll/Hughes in July

OSU

- Clarify with WSA FAA growth percentage and assumptions
- Clarify with WSA 440 ops/aircraft, Where does the 440 come from?

The foregoing constitutes our understanding of matters discussed and conclusions reached. Please review these items and advise the undersigned, in writing and within five (5) business days, of any errors or omissions.

DLZ MICHIGAN, INC.

cc:

Wes Butch
Project Manager

jtw

M:\PROJ\0241\5795\00\Public Meetings\6-23-04 Advis Comm\MEETING MEMO 6-24-04.doc