John Glenn Columbus International Airport
Part 150 Noise Compatibility Update Study

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting 2

Date: Wednesday, April 8, 2020
Time: 10 A.M. to Noon
Location: Online video conference meeting (using Skype for Business)

Meeting Summary

Meeting Purpose

- Review and discuss the Preliminary Draft Noise Exposure Maps (NEMs)
- Discuss the Noise Compatibility Program (NCP)
- Review schedule and next steps
- To gather input and ask questions about the study

Welcome and Introduction

Justin Anderson, Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Project Manager, welcomed everyone for attending the online video conference Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting and thanked them for participating. Justin then turned the meeting over to Rob Adams, Principal-in-Charge, and Chris Sandfoss, Project Manager, both of Landrum and Brown.

Rob mentioned that due to circumstances surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic this TAC meeting was converted from an in-person to an online meeting. TAC members were previously emailed a PDF copy of the online presentation. Rob then discussed meeting logistics and provided visual instructions on how to use the online platform and chat feature, reviewed the meeting agenda and identified where the project is within the study process (slide 5).

Rob then gave an update to the study schedule (slide 6) and reminded everyone that the scheduled public meetings, that were to be held later that evening (on April 8 and Thursday, April 9) had been previously cancelled due to COVID-19. Meeting materials have been made available online (through the project website https://www.airportprojects.net/cmh-part150/) and comments will be accepted through May, 31.

Noise Monitoring

Chris provided an overview of the noise monitoring program. The purpose of this program is to validate and verify data that is input into the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) and obtain real-life noise measurements to help understand the overall noise environment in and around the airport. A three-person team collected noise data at 30 sites (for one hour each) around the airport during the week of November 11, 2019. The timing of the data collection focused on departures at

CMH (John Glenn Columbus International Airport). Sites were selected to provide a wide coverage within nearby residential areas and areas of noted noise complaint.

A map provided the visual location for each of the 30 data collections sites (slide 8), while a table listed detailed noise collection data (slides 9-10). Data included: ambient, aircraft noise levels, monitoring dates and times, flight events and loudest noise and aircraft. Chris mentioned that on average there were 11 to 12 aircraft observed during each one hour recording and some aircraft noise events included other community noise sources (i.e. intermittent car and truck traffic). This collected data is being further analyzed along with data from the 16 permanent noise monitors around CMH.

Existing Noise Contour

Chris then gave an overview and explanation of the Existing 2020 Baseline Noise Exposure Contour. The existing noise contour represents an annual-average day (1 year/365 days of operations) and utilized data that includes: number of aircraft operations, fleet types, runway use patterns and flight tracks. Future noise contours are based on a forecast of aviation activity (using existing data) on an annual-average day in 2025. Future noise contours also assume similar runway patters and no major changes to the fleet mix or destinations served. Chris also provided an explanation of the Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) and noted that 65 DNL is the national standard for all Federal agencies, as the threshold for impacts to noise sensitive land uses, which includes residences, places of worship, schools, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, and licensed day care facilities.

A visual map was provided showing the Existing 2020 Baseline Noise Exposure Contour (slide 14). Chris explained that the slide included the 75, 70, 65 and 60 DNL noise contour lines and that the 60 DNL was shown for informational purposes only. The slide also included the existing CMH sound insulation program boundary and the basemap was colored by general land use classifications (showing residential, commercial, industrial and other uses). A chart on the slide showed that there are no housing, residents or noise-sensitive facilities within the 65+ DNL existing noise contour (slide 15). Chris also noted that:

- East of the airport, the noise contour primarily reflects usage by aircraft arriving to the airport, resulting in thinner noise contours
- West of the airport, the noise contour primarily reflects usage of aircraft departing from the airport, resulting in wider and rounder noise contours
- Contour shape and size also reflects a greater use of runway 10R/28L
- The 60 DNL contour does not represent a noise impact under Federal land use compatibility guidelines. There are approximately 3,300 residences and 19 noise-sensitive facilities (schools, daycares, and churches) within the 60-65 DNL existing (2020) baseline noise contour

Questions

At this point, Chris paused for the following questions from TAC members:

Tony Celebreeze (City of Columbus) *referenced the "type of events" from the noise monitoring table and asked why some of the 30 noise monitoring data collection sites only show departures or arrivals, while others show both?* ***Chris Sandfoss (L&B)*** *replied that this was based on aircraft operation flow, east or west arrivals, and that during the measurement period some sites only received noise from arrival operations and some sites only received noise from departure operations. Whereas some sites received noise from both arrivals and departures at locations where operations took-off or landed in one direction but were required to circle back to go the other way (i.e. downwind leg) He also mentioned that the 16 permanent noise monitors collect all arrival and departure noise levels.*

Alfonso Hooper (Brittany Hills Civic Association) *asked what happened to the noise monitoring system at former South Milton Elementary school, and why he does not receive noise updates anymore?* ***Chris Sandfoss (L&B)*** *replied that he believes the monitor is still at that location and monitoring noise.*

Alfonso Hooper (Brittany Hills Civic Association) *replied that there is still significant noise at night and what can be done? He would like to receive monitoring notices and would like to see more homes in the area receive sound insulation.* ***Chris Sandfoss (L&B)*** *responded the team can take a look at older reports, but since the 65 DNL noise contour has shrunk over time, the team does not anticipate any more residential sound insulation, as homes were previously eligible to receive.*

Justin Anderson (CRAA) *noted that there are more aircraft operations during the early morning and afternoon "banks" that may be noticeable to the west of the airport and CRAA has a noise hotline for these issues. He thanked Mr. Hooper for his comments and mentioned this is why this study is being conducted and the reason for the TAC involvement. He will look into whether reports can be mailed.*

Tiffany White (North Central Area Commission) *asked how the team was determining noise data as data from slides 10-11 show the loudest noise event decibels were above 65 DNL? She also asked how the team concluded to not recommend more residential sound insulation?* ***Chris Sandfoss (L&B)*** *reviewed slides 10 and 11, showing the noise data collection results and explained that the data showed peak (Lmax) noise levels that may exceed 65 decibels; however, the DNL metric is an average of these peak levels and non-peak levels. This average is then used to calculate the existing 65 DNL noise contour. There are currently no new noise-sensitive facilities within the 65 DNL noise contour so funding for additional noise insulation is not recommended.*

Forecast of Aviation Activity

Rob provided an overview forecast of aviation activity at CMH. A graph showed actual operations through 2019 with projected operations growing from 134,999 to

150,140 in 2025 (slide 18). Daily operations currently average at 369 and are forecasted to increase to 411 (in 2025). Rob noted that current impacts of the COVID-19 outbreak occurred after the forecast was prepared. The graph includes a recession event in 2020 for modeling purposes, as most economists projected some sort of recession to occur sometime between 2019 and 2025. Rob also noted that demand for flight operations has increased steadily by 65 percent throughout the last 50 years, even during many unplanned events like the 1970's oil embargo, labor strikes in the 1980's, wars and other economic recessions. During these events demand had a "v" shaped dip, showing the decline and rise of operations. Impacts of the COVID-19 outbreak would be expected to cause a temporary decrease in flight activity and that flight activity would eventually return. Therefore, it is reasonable to continue to use the current forecast for planning purposes.

Future Noise Contour

Chris gave an overview and explanation of the Future 2025 Noise Exposure Contour and showed several slides containing maps. These visual maps included the Future 2025 Baseline Noise Exposure Contour (slide 19) and a comparison map overlapping both the Existing 2020 and Future 2025 noise contours (slide 20). Scaled maps showing more details were also provided (slides 21-26).

A chart showed two housing units, six residents and one noise-sensitive facility within the 65 DNL of the Future 2025 Noise Exposure Contour (slide 27). Chris also noted that:

- The future noise contour reflects conditions expected in the future with no noise abatement procedures other than what is already implemented
- The future noise contour serves as the basis for recommending and evaluating any new noise abatement procedures
- There is an increase in size of the future noise contour compared to the existing noise contour due to the forecast increase in aircraft operations at CMH
- The future noise contour retains a similar shape because no major changes in runway use or flight tracks are expected within the study area
- There are two residences and one noise-sensitive facility within the 65 DNL of the Future (2025) noise contour because the residences were previously sound insulated or built in a new subdivision that was constructed after previous noise contours were published.
- The 60 DNL contour does not represent a noise impact under Federal land use compatibility guidelines. There are approximately 4,400 residences and 29 noise-sensitive facilities (schools, daycares, and churches) within the 60-65 DNL of the future noise contour

Questions

At this point, Chris paused for the following questions from TAC members:

Michelle Pounds (Greenview Estates) *mentioned that there appears to be a shift of the noise contour to the west of CMH and asked if any residential homes will be able to utilize the noise insulation program.* ***Chris Sandfoss (L&B)*** *concurred that the 65 DNL would be expected to increase in size due to the forecasted increase in aircraft operations. He noted that the 65 DNL is still smaller than it has been in the past and that there are only two residential units, one in Columbus and one in Gahanna within the 65 DNL of the Future (2025) Noise Exposure Contour.* Over time noise contours have shrunk significantly and can be attributed to redirection of most cargo deliveries to Rickenbacker International Airport, changes in flight operations and quieter airplanes. Chris noted that there were approximately 740 housing units within the 65 DNL of the previous future noise exposure contour developed in 2007.

Matt Brown (Franklin County) *commented: Thank you to the CRAA for including Franklin County in this study and for continuing to be proactive in reducing noise impacts in the communities around the airport. I have to exit for another meeting but wanted to raise one point. It looks like there are an additional 1,100 residences and 10 noise-sensitive land uses within the 60-65 DNL under the forecasted model. I recognize that outside of the 65 DNL does not represent a noise impact under Federal guidelines but I encourage the CRAA to look into possible sound insulation programming in the 60-65 DNL. I am assuming sound insulation programs can have additional benefits for homes such as improving energy efficiency. There may be a way to partner with other public agencies that have compatible goals. Thank you again and I look forward to future discussions.*

Noise Compatibility Program

Chris reviewed the four types of noise compatibility program measures (noise abatement measures, corrective land use measures, preventative land use measures, and program management measures). Based on the results of the noise contour modeling, it is unlikely that the study would recommend new noise abatement or corrective land use measures, as there aren't any impacts within the 65 DNL contour. For preventative land use measures, CMH will continue to inform and notify officials and the public on noise matters. This includes working with existing municipalities and jurisdictions through proper zoning and prevention of new noise sensitive development in or near the 65 DNL contour. Implementation measures include continued management of the Noise Compatibility Program (NCP), periodic reviews and permanent coordination and monitoring of the 16 permanent noise monitors around CMH.

Group Comments/Discussion

Alfonso Hooper (Brittany Hills Civic Association) *mentioned that when they originally studied the Brittany Hill neighborhood for noise insulation only about half*

of the homes were recommended, while an entire neighborhood, adjacent to an airport in Kentucky, was provided with noise insulation features. How are these decisions being made at CMH? Why would there be a difference? ***Rob Adams (L&B)*** *replied that 65 DNL contours doesn't follow jurisdictional or even neighborhood boundaries and there are limits when larger neighborhoods are adjacent to a 65 DNL contour (only residences identified as significantly impacted per the Federal guidelines would receive a noise reduction benefit).* ***Justin Anderson (CRAA)*** *stated that he can discuss this more offline with Mr. Hooper and CMH airport staff.*

Alfonso Hooper (Brittany Hills Civic Association) *asked how does a community get their own independent noise study, instead of this airport study?* ***Rob Adams (L&B)*** *replied that it is very rare for other independent studies to occur, but a city or county can apply for funding for this type of study (though there are very few occurrences/examples of this happening). The best bet is to talk with your elected officials.* ***Alfonso Hooper (Brittany Hills Civic Association)*** *replied "thank you!"*

Justin Anderson (CRAA) addressed *the TAC by thanking the surrounding communities for their planning efforts in mitigating noise sensitive uses. He also reiterated that it is the Airport's intention of being a good neighbor.*

Alfonso Hooper (Brittany Hills Civic Association) *asked if could receive noise monitoring notices for the noise monitoring system at the former South Milton Elementary school.* ***Justin Anderson (CRAA)*** *replied that he can discuss this more offline with CMH Airport staff.*

Next Steps/Conclusion

Chris and Justin then reviewed the next steps (shown below) before ending the meeting.

- Planned public meetings for April 8/9 have been cancelled but all information is available on the project website for review and comment by May 31 (https://www.airportprojects.net/cmh-part150/)
- Request that TAC members notify their constituents about reviewing the project information on the project website
- Social media imagery and language is available (contact Marie Keister at mkeister@engagepublicaffairs.com) to notify constituents about the online project information
- Contact CRAA Project Manager, Justin Anderson with comments or questions at 614-239-6152 or janderson@columbusairports.com
- Next TAC Meeting – Summer/Fall 2020

Meeting Participants

There were 32 participants at the meeting:

Voda Layne	*Air Canada Express*

Ken Copley	*Airline Pilots Association (ALPA)*
Kyle Lewis	*AOPA*
Alfonso Hooper	*Brittany Hills Civic Association*
Tony Celebrezze	*City of Columbus*
Rory McGuiness	*City of Columbus Department of Development*
Justin Anderson	*Columbus Regional Airport Authority*
Denny Casey	*Columbus Regional Airport Authority*
Kristen Easterday	*Columbus Regional Airport Authority*
Joe Hermann	*Columbus Regional Airport Authority*
Mark Kelby	*Columbus Regional Airport Authority*
Tom McCarthy	*Columbus Regional Airport Authority*
Sarah McQuaide	*Columbus Regional Airport Authority*
Mark Grennell	*Federal Aviation Administration - District Office (Detroit)*
Matt Brown	*Franklin County*
Akila Alston	*Greenview Estates*
Michelle Pounds	*Greenview Estates*
Mike Anderson	*Jefferson Twp.*
Robert Adams	*Landrum and Brown*
Jesse Baker	*Landrum and Brown*
Chris Sandfoss	*Landrum and Brown*
Chris Lottridge	*Limited Brands*
Dina Lopez	*Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission*
Paige Kroner	*National Business Aviation Association*
Gib Harris	*Nationwide Insurance*
Artie Clark	*NetJets*
Carl Lee	*North Central Area Commission*
Wallace McLean	*North Central Area Commission*
Tiffany White	*North Central Area Commission*
James Bryant	*ODOT Office of Aviation*
Jeff Talbert	*Signature Flight Support*
R Lemons	*No information provided*

Other attendees:

Nick Hoffman	*MurphyEpson Inc.*
Marie Keister	*Engage Public Affairs*