#### Appendix A – Agency Coordination

This appendix contains copies of the coordination materials for this EA. Copies of the following documentation are included:

• Initial coordination letters sent to resource agencies

Copies of exhibits included with and referenced in these letters are included following all letters. Note that coordination with the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office is included in Appendix C, coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is included in Appendix D, and coordination with the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service is included in Appendix F.

- Copies of agency responses
- Agency distribution of the Draft EA (to be included in the Final EA)
- Agency comments on the Draft EA (to be included in the Final EA)
- Reponses to agency comments (to be included in the Final EA)

This page intentionally left blank

**Agency Coordination Letters** 

This page intentionally left blank



August 13, 2020

Mr. Kenneth Westlake Deputy Director NEPA Implementation Section U.S. EPA Region 5 77 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, IL 60604

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Westlake,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



A Wetland and Waters of the US Delineation has been conducted in accordance with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) guidance. The site contains both jurisdictional and isolated wetlands. There are ten wetlands and six streams within the Project Site that would be impacted. Additional coordination will be conducted to obtain the necessary permits per Section 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

Mr. James K. Joseph Regional Administrator Federal Emergency Management Agency 536 South Clark Street 6th Floor Chicago, IL 60605

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Joseph,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



According to Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Project Site is not located within a designated floodplain as shown on **Exhibit 3**, *Floodplain Map*.

The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Sandos his

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

Mike Pettigrew, Administrator Environmental Services Section Ohio Department of Natural Resources 2045 Morse Road Building E-2 Columbus, OH 43229

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Pettigrew,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



A Wetland and Waters of the US Delineation has been conducted in accordance with the US Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) guidance. There are 10 wetlands and six streams within the Project Site that would be impacted. The Proposed Action is expected to impact approximately 64 acres of wooded areas as shown in **Exhibit 3**. An approximately 10-acre wooded area would be avoided by the development.

A list of threatened and endangered species that may be present at the project site, obtained from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Ohio Division of Natural Resources (ODNR) records, is shown in **Attachment A**, **Table 1**. An initial habitat survey was conducted at the site in October 2019. That survey identified suitable habitat for the Indiana bat and the northern long-eared bat. No other State or Federal protected species or habitat has been identified at the site.

A passive acoustic survey was conducted in July 2020 to confirm absence or presence of Indiana bats and/or northern long-eared bats. The results of that survey determined that no Indiana bats or northern long-eared bats were found to be present within the project site. Therefore, it is not expected that these species would be adversely affected. The results of that survey are included in **Attachment B**.

The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

This Sandos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

Ms. Laurie A. Stevenson Director Ohio Environmental Protection Agency 50 West Town Street Suite 700 Columbus, OH 43215

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Ms. Stevenson,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



A Wetland and Waters of the US Delineation has been conducted in accordance with the US Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) guidance. The site contains both jurisdictional and isolated wetlands. There are ten wetlands and six streams within the Project Site that would be impacted. Additional coordination will be conducted to obtain the necessary permits per Section 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

James Bryant Aviation Administrator Ohio Department of Transportation Office of Aviation 2829 W. Dublin-Granville Road Columbus, OH 43235

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Bryant,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

Lydia Mihalik Director Ohio Development Services Agency 77 S. High Street, 28th Floor Columbus, OH 43215

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Ms. Mihalik,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

David Jacob National Park Service Environmental Planning and Compliance Branch Curtis Building 601 Riverfront Drive Omaha, NE 68102

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Jacob,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

Thomas H. Leach Field Office Director U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 200 North High St., 7th Floor Columbus, OH 43215

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Leach,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

Timothy Hill Administrator Ohio Department of Transportation Office of Environmental Services 1980 West Broad Street Mail Stop 4170 Columbus, OH 43223

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Hill,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

Kerstin Carr Director of Planning & Sustainability Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission 111 Liberty Street Suite 100 Columbus. OH 43215

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Dr. Carr,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

James Schimmer Director Franklin County Economic Development and Planning 150 South Front Street FSL Suite 10 Columbus, OH 43215

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Schimmer,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

Tim McGinnis Director Pickaway County Planning and Development 139 West Franklin Street Circleville, OH 43113

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. McGinnis,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority



August 13, 2020

Mitch Blackford District 6 Deputy Director Ohio Department of Transportation 400 E. William Street Delaware, OH 43015

#### Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Blackford,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.



The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

his Saufos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority





LCK Cargo Campus EA

Z 🕸

**Proposed Action** 

2





#### Agency Responses to Coordination Letters

This page intentionally left blank


UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

September 8, 2020

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF: Mail Code RM-19J

Chris Sandfoss, Managing Consultant Landrum & Brown 4445 Lake Forest Drive, Suite 700 Cincinnati, Ohio 45242

# Re: Scoping Comments for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Cargo Campus Development Project, Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio

Dear Mr. Sandfoss:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency received the request for comments to inform development of a Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the project referenced above. Our comments are provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA Implementing Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead agency under NEPA, and the Columbus Regional Airport Authority is the project proponent.

The Proposed Action includes developing an approximately 330-acre site with several commercial cargo and warehouse structures and extending Rickenbacker Parkway. Please find EPA's scoping recommendations within the enclosed (1) Detailed Scoping Comments and (2) Construction Emission Control Checklist. We offer comments to assist the project team in efficiently and effectively protecting natural resources and human health.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. When the NEPA document becomes available, please send an electronic copy to Jen Tyler, the lead reviewer for this project, at tyler.jennifer@epa.gov. Ms. Tyler is also available at 312-886-6394.

Sincerely,

Kenneth A. Westlake Deputy Director Office of Tribal and Multi-media Programs

Enclosures: (1) Detailed Scoping Comments, (2) Construction Emission Control Checklist

CC Via Email: Ernest Gubry, FAA – Detroit Office Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority

# ENCLOSURE 1: SCOPING COMMENTS FOR THE RICKENBACKER GLOBAL LOGISTICS PARK CARGO CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, FRANKLIN AND PICKAWAY COUNTIES, OHIO

# **Project Description**

The scoping request states that the proposed facilities would not cause an increase in aircraft operations nor result in fleet changes because the new warehouse facilities (1) would not be dependent upon air travel and (2) would have no access to the airfield. It is, however, unclear if the presence of the proposed 4.2 million new square feet of bulk distribution warehouse space might increase demands for flights at the airport and induce changes to the frequency at which cargo planes use the airport. In addition, the distribution of goods from the new cargo campus, via truck or rail, would result in environmental impacts, which should be discussed in the NEPA document to inform project decision-making. A complete project description that clearly connects proposed physical changes to any operational changes would enable a clear analysis of impacts.

# **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Describe and visually depict the project footprint, including all staging areas and access roads.
- Describe how the new warehouses would receive and distribute goods. Consider likely patterns of truck trips and associated community impacts.
- Describe potential changes to Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK) operations that could result from the proposed project. Consider the potential for new demands for cargo planes into and out of LCK. If the proposed project is likely to induce changes at LCK, then consider the associated health and environmental implications related to air quality, noise, and environmental justice.
- If the proposed project would not impact air cargo traffic, then provide the rationale for locating it adjacent to LCK.

# Air Quality

The proposed project would result in emissions from construction equipment. Temporary construction emissions have the potential to impact human health, especially in sensitive populations, such as elderly people, children, and those with impaired respiratory systems. It's unclear whether long-term LCK operational emissions could potentially change because of this project; changes would depend on how the new cargo campus impacts flight demands on the airport. Further, the cargo campus would likely increase truck traffic, and associated emissions, from the arrival and distribution of goods.

# **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Discuss the project area's attainment status under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and describe applicable Conformity requirements under the Clean Air Act Section 176(c). If you'd like to discuss the Conformity analysis with EPA while developing the NEPA document, please notify Jen Tyler at tyler.jennifer@epa.gov.
- Discuss potential emissions sources from the construction phase of the proposed project. Consider: truck trips, demolition, and use of construction equipment.
- Identify and commit to specific measures to reduce construction emissions. Options include: (1) requiring dust suppressant strategies, such as use of tarps and watering soils, (2) limiting idling time for construction trucks and heavy equipment, and (3) soliciting bids that require zero-emission technologies or advanced emission control

systems. See additional best practices in the enclosed Construction Emission Control Checklist.

- Assess potential project-induced changes to annual operational emissions at LCK. Consider potential changes to the types and quantity of aircraft that could use LCK after the new cargo campus is operational.
- Consider the long-term emissions from trucks serving the cargo campus. Consider numbers of trips, types of trucks, and communities that may be impacted.
- Discuss whether emissions (associated with construction, any induced changes to airport operations, and operation of the cargo campus including truck trips) could impact nearby people. If so, consider potential health effects, including childhood asthma and other respiratory illnesses.
- Consider measures to reduce operational emissions from the cargo campus, such as requiring, incentivizing, or otherwise promoting the use trucks with cleaner engine technologies.

## **Children's Health and Safety**

Executive Order 13045 on Children's Health and Safety directs each federal agency to make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children and to ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address these risks.

## **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

Require construction contractors to establish material hauling routes away from places where children live, learn, and play, to the extent feasible. Consider homes, schools, daycare centers, and playgrounds. For operational emissions, partnering with local authorities to designate truck routes away from such areas. In additional to air quality benefits, careful routing may protect children from vehicle-pedestrian accidents.

### **Contamination**

Past uses of the project area, including use as a U.S. Air Force firing range, have the potential to leave behind hazardous materials. The proposed project would require earthwork activity. For the safety of the public and project construction workers, it is important to investigate possible contamination in the construction area upfront. Investigating and addressing potential challenges early in the process can avoid future project delays or accidental exposures or releases.

### **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Disclose the study area used for the analysis of soil and groundwater contamination and provide a rationale to support the study area boundary.
- Consider performing a Phase I site assessment. This includes background and historical investigations and preliminary property inspections. For guidance, see ASTM International Standard E1527-13, "Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process." Include a map in the NEPA document indicating any potential areas of concern and discuss findings.
- If the Phase I site assessment indicates potential contamination, consider conducting a Phase II assessment. Phase II assessments include sampling activities to identify the types and concentrations of contaminants and the areas of contamination. If Phase II assessments are conducted, summarize findings in the NEPA document.

- Describe any plans for future soil and groundwater testing in the NEPA document.
- If sampling is deemed necessary by FAA, then coordinate sampling plans with the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency; summarize coordination in the NEPA document.
- Describe how contaminated soils would be handled and stored on-site, if applicable. Include details on covering materials for protection from wind and rain.

# **Environmental Justice (EJ) and Community Impacts**

Executive Order 12898 directs federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations. EPA's EJSCREEN<sup>1</sup> is a publicly available mapping tool designed to screen for potential impacts to communities living with or vulnerable to EJ concerns.

# **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Describe existing community characteristics and potential community impacts.
- Identify low income and/or minority populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If present, compare percentages of low income and/or minority residents that would be affected to an appropriate reference community to determine whether the project could have disproportionately high and adverse effects. Include clear maps and summary tables.
- Provide specific measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate any anticipated adverse impacts to communities, if needed. For example, consider minimizing construction emissions and routing trucks to avoid impacts.

# **Noise Impacts**

The proposed project may or may not alter noise levels in the surrounding area. EPA's website explains that there are direct links between noise and health.<sup>2</sup> Upfront assessment of noise impacts could inform alternative selection and mitigation measures, if needed.

# **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Assess noise impacts from both project construction and long-term operations.
- Compare noise levels between the no-action alternative and all action alternatives.
- Consider whether any schools, medical facilities, nursing homes, or other facilities with sensitive populations would experience an increase in noise levels.
- Consider opportunities to minimize and mitigate increases in noise levels, if applicable. For example, if the project would have permanent adverse noise impacts, then consider insulation and window treatments at affected buildings and modifying flight patterns, among other opportunities.

# Aquatic Resources

The scoping request explains that the project team conducted a Wetland and Waters of the U.S. (Waters) Delineation in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers guidance. As proposed, the project would impact ten wetlands and six streams. To inform project decision making, the NEPA document should assess impacts to Waters, describe efforts to avoid,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> EPA's EJSCREEN Environmental Justice and Mapping Tool, available at: https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/clean-air-act-title-iv-noise-pollution

minimize, and mitigate impacts, and detail plans for complying with the Clean Water Act (CWA).

# **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Describe the quality, size, and location of aquatic resources present within or adjacent to the proposed project, and state whether they may be impacted.
- Include a robust discussion on the CWA Section 401 water quality certification and Section 404 permitting requirements for dredging and filling of Waters.
- Discuss efforts that the project team has taken or will take to first avoid and then minimize potential impacts to Waters, in line with the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines.
- Discuss how cost, logistical, or technological constraints preclude avoidance and minimization of any known impacts to Waters.
- Discuss proposed mitigation types, ratios, and potential locations. Include mitigation sequencing per the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines and describe how mitigation would comply with the 2008 Mitigation Rule.

# **Threatened and Endangered Species Impacts**

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) directs all federal agencies to ensure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry-out does not jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species or proposed or designated critical habitat. Implementing regulations found at 50 CFR Part 402 specify how federal agencies are to fulfill their ESA Section 7 consultation requirements.

# **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Use the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) "Information for Planning and Conservation" tool to obtain a list of trust resources in the project area. The list would include species that are threatened or endangered under ESA, candidate species for listing, critical habitat, and migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.<sup>3</sup>
- Determine whether the proposed action may affect trust resources. If trust resources may be affected, engage in consultation with FWS. Document coordination and formal consultation in the NEPA document with the goal of aligning NEPA and ESA Section 7 consultation processes.
- Coordinate with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources to determine whether any state-listed species could be impacted by the proposed project, and document coordination.
- Consider voluntarily mitigating for tree losses, if any, by planting trees nearby, safely away from the airfield safety zone.

# Native and Invasive Plant Species

Executive Order 13112 on Invasive Species calls for the restoration of native plant and tree species. The proposed project could introduce non-native invasive plant species. Early recognition and control of infestations is essential to stopping the spread of invasive plants and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> FWS Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) tool is available at: https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/

avoiding future widespread use of herbicides, which could have adverse impacts on biodiversity and water quality.

# **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Describe how the project would meet the requirements of Executive Order 13112.
- Revegetate all disturbed green spaces after the project is complete. Use native species and pollinator friendly plants whenever feasible, with consideration of airport-specific needs to not attract wildlife.

# **Climate Resiliency**

The National Climate Assessment<sup>4</sup> finds that in the Midwest, extreme heat, heavy downpours, and flooding will affect infrastructure.

# **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Include a discussion of reasonably foreseeable effects that changes in the climate may have on the project area and the proposed project, including its long-term infrastructure. This could help inform the development of measures to improve the resilience of the proposed project.
- Consider resiliency and adaptation measures or plans to ensure that the proposed facilities would maintain their structural integrity and safe operating conditions under changing heat and precipitation conditions. For example, consider recent trends and anticipated future frequencies of severe precipitation events when sizing stormwater control features. Green infrastructure features, such as permeable pavements where applicable, may also help manage stormwater without attracting wildlife. See EPA's Adaptation Resource Center<sup>5</sup> for assistance.

# **Energy Efficiency & Environmental Best Practices**

Energy efficient design and material selection could reduce operations costs and promote a highquality workspace, while also better protecting the environment.

# **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

- Consider best practices for energy efficiency and sustainable building design for the new warehouses. Examples include south-facing skylights and windows, motion-sensored lighting, and use of Energy Star certified products. Consider incorporating solar power into the project design. Given the proximity to the project to the airport, consider FAA's Technical Guidance for Evaluating and Selecting Solar Technologies on Airports.<sup>6</sup>
- Consider Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and other green building programs, as well as designing for net-zero energy usage. In addition to reducing the overall environmental footprint, green building certification programs promote health by encouraging practices that protect indoor air quality.
- Consider incorporating electric vehicle charging stations in new parking areas.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> U.S. Global Change Research Program, 2017 Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume 1, available at: https://www.globalchange.gov/browse/reports

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> EPA's Climate Adaptation Resource Center, available at: https://www.epa.gov/arc-x

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> FAA's "Technical Guidance for Evaluating and Selecting Solar Technologies on Airports" is available at: https://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/

# Appendix B – Biological Resources

This appendix contains copies of the coordination materials related to the analysis of biological resources and Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation.

This page intentionally left blank

# Agency Coordination Letter and Acoustic Bat Survey Report

This page intentionally left blank



**Administration** 

Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

September 10, 2020

Ms. Patrice Ashfield Field Office Supervisor U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services 4625 Morse Road Suite 104 Columbus, OH 43230

# Re: Section 7 Consultation for Proposed Cargo Campus Development Project at Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Ms. Ashfield:

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action) at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action. The FAA is requesting your concurrence with the assessment and determination of potential effects of the Proposed Action on Federally listed threatened and endangered species, as described in the enclosed attachments, in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

Based on the enclosed information, the FAA is prepared to make a determination that the Proposed Action is "Not Likely to Adversely Affect" Federally-listed threatened or endangered species. I am seeking your concurrence with this determination and any other comments you may have on the project. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Ernest P. Gubry

Ernest P. Gubry

**EXHIBITS** 





LCK Cargo Campus EA

Z 🕸

**Proposed Action** 

2



ATTACHMENT A PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DETERMINATION

#### Project Description

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial bulk cargo distribution warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, Project Site, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, Proposed Action, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of on-site stormwater mitigation areas.

The Project Site is surrounded by commercial and aviation land uses to the north and west and a former golf course to the south. Project site features include undeveloped land that is leased for agriculture, a former golf course clubhouse, and a former U.S. Air Force firing range.

The Proposed Action, when fully operational, would include bulk distribution warehouse facilities that are not dependent upon air travel. As such, the facilities would have no access to the airfield. Therefore, the proposed facilities would not cause an increase or decrease in aircraft operations and would not result in changes to the aircraft fleet at LCK.

A Wetland and Waters of the US Delineation has been conducted in accordance with the US Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) guidance. There are 10 wetlands and six streams within the Project Site that would be impacted. The Proposed Action is expected to impact approximately 64 acres of wooded areas as shown in **Exhibit 3**. An approximately 10-acre wooded area would be avoided by the development.

#### Federally Threatened and Endangered Species

A list of threatened and endangered species that may be present at the project site, obtained from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Ohio Division of Natural Resources (ODNR) records, is shown in **Table 1**.

# Table 1 STATE AND FEDERAL THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
American bittern	Botaurus lentiginosus		Е
American black duck	Anas rubripes		SI
American coot	Fulica americana		SC
Badger	Taxidea taxus		SC
Barn owl	Tyto alba		Т
Bell's vireo	Vireo bellii		SI
Big brown bat	Eptesicus fuscus		SC
Bigeye shiner	Notropis boops		E
Bison	Bison		Х
Black bear	Ursus americanus		E
Black sandshell	Ligumia recta		Т
Black-billed Cuckoo	Coccyzus erythropthalmus		SC
Blackburnian warbler	Setophaga fusca		SI
Black-crowned night-heron	Nycticorax		Т
Blacknose shiner	Notropis heterolepis		Х
Blue catfish	Ictalurus furcatus		SC
Blue sucker	Cycleptus elongatus		Т
Bobolink	Dolichonyx oryzivorus		SC
Brown creeper	Certhia americana		SI
Butterfly mussel	Ellipsaria lineolata		E
Cattle egret	Bubulcus ibis		E
Cerulean warbler	Setophaga cerulea		SC
Clubshell mussel	Pleurobema clava	E	E
Common gallinule	Gallinula galeata		SC
Common gray fox	Urocyon cinereoargenteus		SC
Common nighthawk	Chordeiles minor		SC
Creek heelsplitter	Lasmigona compressa		SC
Dark-eyed Junco	Junco hyemalis		SI
Deer mouse	Peromyscus maniculatus		SC
Deertoe mussel	Truncilla truncata		SC
Eastern cricket frog	Acris crepitans		SC
Eastern whip-poor-will	Antrostomus vociferus		SC
Ebonyshell mussel	Reginaia ebenus		E
Elephant-ear	Elliptio crassidens		E
Elktoe mussel	Alasmidonta marginata		SC
Ermine	Mustela erminea		SC
Evening bat	Nycticeius humeralis		SI
Fanshell mussel	Cyprogenia stegaria		E

# Table 1, (Continued) STATE AND FEDERAL THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Fawnsfoot mussel	Truncilla donaciformis		Т
Four-toed salamander	Hemidactylium scutatum		SC
Golden-crowned kinglet	Regulus satrapa		SI
Golden-winged warbler	Vermivora chrysoptera		SI
Goldeye	Hiodon alosoides		Е
Grasshopper sparrow	Ammodramus savannarum		SC
Great egret	Ardea alba		SC
Green-winged teal	Anas crecca		SI
Henslow's sparrow	Ammodramus henslowii		SC
Hermit thrush	Catharus guttatus		SI
Hoary bat	Lasiurus cinereus		SC
Indiana bat	Myotis sodalis	E	E
lowa darter	Etheostoma exile		Е
Kidneyshell mussel	Ptychobranchus fasciolaris		SC
Lake chubsucker	Erimyzon sucetta		Т
Lark sparrow	Chondestes grammacus		E
Least bittern	Ixobrychus exilis		Т
Least darter	Etheostoma microperca		SC
Least flycatcher	Empidonax minimus		SI
Little brown bat	Myotis lucifugus		SC
Loggerhead Shrike	Lanius Iudovicianus		E
Longhead darter	Percina macrocephata		Х
Longsolid	Fusconaia subrotunda		E
Magnolia warbler	Setophaga magnolia		SI
Mucket	Actinonaias ligamentina		Х
Muskellunge	Esox masquinongy		SC
Nashville warbler	Oreothlypis ruficapilla		SI
none	Agroperina lutosa		SC
none	Chimarra socia		E
Northern bobwhite	Colinus virginianus		SC
Northern brook lamprey	Ichthyomyzon fossor		E
Northern harrier	Circus hudsonius		E
Northern long-eared bat	Myotis septentrionalis	Т	Т
Northern madtom	Noturus stigmosus		E
Northern riffleshell mussel	Epioblasma torulosa rangiana	E	
Northern shoveler	Anas clypeata		SI
Northern waterthrush	Parkesia noveboracensis		SI
Ohio pigtoe mussel	Pleurobema cordatum		Е

# Table 1, (Continued) STATE AND FEDERAL THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Ouachita Map Turtle	Graptemys ouachitensis		SC
Paddlefish	Polyodon spathula		Т
Pink Mucket mussel	Lampsilis abrupta		Е
Plains Clubtail	Gomphus externus		Е
Pocketbook mussel	Lampsilis ovata		Е
Pondhorn	Uniomerus tetralasmus		Т
Popeye Shiner	Notropis ariommus		E
Precious underwing moth	Catocala pretiosa		SC
Prothonotary Warbler	Protonotaria citrea		SC
Purple Cat's Paw mussel	Epioblasma obliquata	Е	E
Purple Wartyback mussel	Cyclonaias tuberculata		SC
Pyramid Pigtoe mussel	Pleurobema rubrum		E
Rabbitsfoot mussel	Quadrula cylindrica	Т	E
Rayed Bean mussel	Villosa fabalis	E	E
Red Bat	Lasiurus borealis		SC
Red-breasted Nuthatch	Sitta canadensis		SI
Redhead	Aythya americana		SI
Red-headed Woodpecker	Melanerpes erythrocephalus		SC
Rough Pigtoe	Pleurobema plenum		Х
Round Pigtoe	Pleurobema sintoxia		SC
Ruddy Duck	Oxyura jamaicensis		SI
Running Buffalo Clover	Trifolium stoloniferum	E	
Salamander Mussel	Simpsonaias ambigua		SC
Sandhill Crane	Grus canadensis		Т
Scioto Madtom	Noturus trautmani	E	E
Sedge Wren	Cistothorus platensis		SC
Sharp-shinned Hawk	Accipiter striatus		SC
Shortnose Gar	Lepisosteus platostomus		E
Shovelnose Sturgeon	Scaphirhynchus platorynchus		E
Slender Clearwing	Hemaris gracilis		SI
Smoky Shrew	Sorex fumeus		SC
Smooth Greensnake	Opheodrys vernalis		E
Snowshoe Hare	Lepus americanus		SC
Snuffbox	Epioblasma triquetra	E	E
Sora Rail	Porzana carolina		SC
Southern Bog Lemming	Synaptomys cooperi		SC
Spotted Darter	Etheostoma maculatum		E
Star-nosed Mole	Condylura cristata		SC

# Table 1, (Continued) STATE AND FEDERAL THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Threehorn Wartyback	Obliquaria reflexa		Т
Tippecanoe Darter	Etheostoma tippecanoe		Т
Tonguetied Minnow	Exoglossum laurae		E
Tri-colored Bat	Perimyotis subflavus		SC
Two-spotted Skipper	Euphyes bimacula		SC
Upland Sandpiper	Bartramia longicauda		E
Veery	Catharus fuscescens		SI
Vesper Sparrow	Pooecetes gramineus		SC
Virginia Rail	Rallus limicola		SC
Washboard	Megalonaias nervosa		E
Wavy-rayed Lampmussel	Lampsilis fasciola		SC
Western Creek Chubsucker	Erimyzon claviformis		SC
Wilson's Snipe	Gallinago delicata		SI
Winter Wren	Troglodytes hiemalis		SI
Woodland Vole	Microtus pinetorum		SC
Yellow-bellied Sapsucker	Sphyrapicus varius		SI
Yellow-crowned Night-heron	Nyctanassa violacea		SI

**E** = Endangered: A native species or subspecies threatened with extirpation from the state. The danger may result from one or more causes, such as habitat loss, pollution, predation, interspecific competition, or disease.

- T = Threatened: A species or subspecies whose survival in Ohio is not in immediate jeopardy, but to which a threat exists. Continued or increased stress will result in its becoming endangered.
- SC = Species of Concern: A species or subspecies which might become threatened in Ohio under continued or increased stress. Also, a species or subspecies for which there is some concern, but for which information is insufficient to permit an adequate status evaluation. This category may contain species designated as a furbearer or game species, but whose statewide population is dependent on the quality and/or quantity of habitat and is not adversely impacted by regulated harvest.
- SI = Special Interest: A species that occurs periodically and is capable of breeding in Ohio. It is at the edge of a larger, contiguous range with viable population(s) within the core of its range. These species have no federal endangered or threatened status, are at low breeding densities in the state, and have not been recently released to enhance Ohio's wildlife diversity. With the exception of efforts to conserve occupied areas, minimal management efforts will be directed for these species because it is unlikely to result in significant increases in their populations within the state.
- X = Extirpated: A species or subspecies that occurred in Ohio at the time of European settlement and that has since disappeared from the state.
- Source: US Fish & Wildlife Service, Midwest Region Endangered Species, Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio, Online at: https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/lists/ohio-cty.html and Ohio Department of Natural Resources, State Listed Wildlife Species By County, Online at: https://ohiodnr.gov/wps/portal/gov/odnr-core/documents/wildlife-documents/state-listed-wildlifecounty, Accessed: July 22, 2020.

A review of the USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPAC) database was conducted within the proposed project site. That search indicated that the following species are known or expected to be on or near the project area.

- Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis)
- Clubshell (Pleurobema clava)
- Northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis)
- Northern riffleshell (Epioblasma torulosa rangiana)
- Rabbitsfoot mussel (Quadrula cylindrica)
- Rayed bean mussel (Villosa fabalis)
- Running buffalo clover (Trifolium stoloniferum)
- Scioto madtom (Noturus trautmani)
- Snuffbox (Epioblasma triquetra).

The Proposed Action would impact approximately 64 acres of wooded areas that are potentially suitable summer habitat for the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat as shown in **Exhibit 3**. An initial habitat survey was conducted at the site in October 2019. That survey identified suitable habitat for the Indiana bat and the northern long-eared bat. No other State or Federal protected species or habitat has been identified at the site.

A passive acoustic survey was conducted in July 2020 to confirm absence or presence of Indiana bats and/or northern long-eared bats. The results of that survey determined that no Indiana bats or northern long-eared bats were found to be present within the project site. The results of that survey are included in Attachment B.

#### **Determination of Effects**

#### Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat

Based on the results of the passive acoustic survey, which identified no Indiana bats or northern long eared bats within the site of the Proposed Action, the FAA has concluded that the Proposed Action warrants a determination of **Not Likely to Adversely Affect** for the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*).

#### Other Federally Listed Species

No other Federally endangered, threatened, or candidate species or critical habitat has been identified within the site of the Proposed Action. Therefore, the FAA has concluded that the Proposed Action warrants a determination of **No Affect** for the clubshell (*Pleurobema clava*), northern riffleshell (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*), rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrical*), rayed bean (*Villosa fabalis*), Running buffalo clover (Trifolium stoloniferum), Scioto madtom (*Noturus trautmani*), and the snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*).

ATTACHMENT B ACOUSTIC BAT SURVEY REPORT

# Acoustic Bat Survey LCK Cargo Campus Development Area Franklin & Pickaway Counties, Ohio



Prepared for: The Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) July 2020





# <u>TranSystems Phase 2 Acoustic Survey Results</u> <u>Columbus Regional Airport Authority</u> <u>LCK Cargo Campus Development Area</u>

### **Project Description**

The Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) proposes to develop the 330- acre property known as the Cargo Campus Development Area located around the Rickenbacker International Airport in Franklin and Pickaway Counties. The area will be developed with multiple bulk distribution warehouses and the necessary infrastructure to support these warehouses. Suitable wooded habitat for the endangered Indiana bat and Northern Long-eared bat would be impacted by the project. Based on current guidance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), a summer acoustic bat survey is proposed to be conducted on the project site to determine the presence or absence of endangered bat species

### Previous Habitat Assessment

The initial habitat assessment for the project was completed in October, 2019 by Jessica Deeds and Brian Metz, Environmental Scientists. There are four plots of land within the study area that were deemed to have suitable habitat for both the Indiana bat and Northern Long-eared bat, totaling approximately 63.27 acres. The habitat was assessed using the USFWS April 2019 Range-Wide Indiana Bat Summer Survey Guidance (USFWS, 2019). For the Indiana bat, the guidance defines suitable habitat as including forests and woodlots containing potential roosts (i.e. live trees, and/or snags greater than 5" dbh (diameter at breast height) that have exfoliating bark, cracks, crevices, and/or hollows) as well as linear features such as fencerows, riparian forests, and other wooded corridors. For the Northern long-eared bat, the guidance defines suitable habitat as areas that include forests and woodlots containing potential roosts (i.e. live trees and/or snags greater than 3" dbh that have exfoliating bark, cracks, crevices, and/or cavities) as well as linear features such as fencerows, riparian forests, and other wooded corridors. The guidance defines maternity roost trees as having the following characteristics: live or standing dead trees or snags over 16" diameter at breast height (dbh) with exfoliating, peeling or loose bark, split trunks and/or branches, or cavities. These trees must be part of a forested area or within a fence row of trees at least two trees wide or connected to a travel corridor or larger forested area.

Based on the October 2019 field assessment and the likelihood of this project resulting in an adverse effect to suitable Indiana Bat habitat, a Passive Acoustic Survey Plan was developed and approved by the USFWS. The acoustic survey followed the USFWS March 2020 Range-Wide Indiana Bat Summer Survey Guidance (USFWS, 2020).

### **Acoustic Detector**

### **Detector Specifications & Weatherproofing**

Two acoustic detectors were used in this study, both Titley Scientific Anabat SD2 meters. These detectors were equipped with a directional Hi frequency microphone attached to a 5 meter microphone extension cable. The microphone was weatherproofed using a 45-degree polyvinyl chloride (PVC) elbow that was two inches in diameter. This PVC elbow was attached to a connector and affixed to 12-foot tall pole. The microphone was then attached to the 5 meter long extension cable that was fed into a weatherproofed box that contained the Anabat SD2 meter.



#### **Detector Settings**

Acoustic Bat Survey July 28, 2020

The sensitivity of the detector was determined in the field nightly. For both survey locations, the sensitivity of the detector was set at a sensitivity of 5. An audio and data division ratio of 8 was selected. The detector was checked each night for proper functioning. This was performed by producing ultrasound (finger rubs) in front of the microphone at the survey start and survey finish.

### Site Characteristics

One large tract of suitable wooded habitat was broken down into two respective detector locations. Each detector location was sampled for two consecutive nights with two AnaBat meters, resulting in eight total detector nights of sampling. Each location is described below.

#### Location 1

Location 1 was surveyed for two consecutive nights, July 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020 from 8:30 PM to 6:30 AM. Two detectors were deployed in this location for both survey nights. One detector was placed along the north eastern edge of the plot, with the microphone facing west. The second detector was placed along the western limits of the survey plot, with the microphone facing northeast. This location can be found on the east side of Firing Range Road (closed to thru traffic). The habitat surrounding the detector can be described as vacant agricultural land to the north, south, and west and a wooded stream corridor connected to a larger wooded plot to the east.

Vegetation within the 300-feet radius of the acoustic detectors is best described as herbaceous ground cover in a vacant agricultural field. This area provided the best opportunity for low clutter, ensuring high call quality. While Firing Range Road is closed to thru traffic, it is currently being utilized as a construction route for the Rickenbacker Airport Runway. Various dump trucks, heavy equipment, and personal vehicles were observed utilizing the road during detector deployment. Based on general construction work days, it was assumed that during the hours of data collection for the acoustic survey the road was not being utilized and did not contribute to any excessive noise or disturbances within the survey area.

### Location 2

Location 2 was surveyed for two consecutive nights, July 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>, 2020 from 8:30PM to 6:30AM. Two detectors were deployed in this location for both survey nights. One detector was placed in the southeast corner of a vacant agricultural field behind the Rickenbacker Firing Range with the microphone oriented to the northwest. The second detector was placed further north in the same agricultural field, along the eastern side of the field adjacent to a wooded lot with the microphone oriented to the west. The habitat surrounding both detectors can be described as vacant agricultural land to the north, west, and south and a wooded stream corridor to the east followed by a large wooded lot. The Rickenbacker firing range is also located to the south of the detector locations.

Vegetation within the 300-feet radius of the acoustic detectors is best described as herbaceous ground cover in a vacant agricultural field. This area provided the best opportunity for low clutter, ensuring high call quality. While Firing Range Road is closed to thru traffic, it is currently being utilized as a construction route for the Rickenbacker Airport Runway. Various dump trucks, heavy equipment, and personal vehicles were observed utilizing the road during detector deployment. Based on general construction work days, it was assumed that during the hours of data collection for the acoustic survey the road was not being utilized and did not contribute to any excessive noise or disturbances within the survey area.



#### Table 1: GPS Location

GPS Coordinates of Survey Location				
Survey Location	Latitude	Longitude		
Location 1 Meter 1	39.798720°W	-82.923591°N		
Location 1 Meter 2	39.800176°W	-82.922218°N		
Location 2 Meter 1	39.797868°W	-82.922866°N		
Location 2 Meter 2	39.798828°W	-82.923072°N		

#### Results

#### Call Analysis Summary

The bat calls were processed through two auto identification programs, BCID East (Bat Call Identification) ran with the Ohio species list and EchoClass V3.1 ran with species set 1. The results of the analysis are listed below in Tables 2-17.

Discrepancies in identifiable call numbers as well as species are expected between the two auto-identification programs. Within Location 1 (surveyed on nights 1 and 2), the auto-identification software BCID identified a total of 637 calls from seven different species while the EchoClass software identified a total of 553 calls from seven different species. The only discrepancy in species identified was observed on Survey Night 2 from Meter 2 where BCID identified a Little Brown Bat and EchoClass identified a Gray Bat. Both of these bat species belong to the *myotis* family; although, neither are high-frequency nor are they endangered species. High-frequency calls can be defined as those calls that have a frequency of 35 kilo-hertz or above. Each bat species has calls that resonate at different frequencies. Both the Indiana Bat call and the Northern long-eared bat call have a typical frequency of 40 kHz. It should be noted that call frequency rates can vary from the characteristic value based on how far away the bat is from the detection meter.

Within Location 2 (surveyed on nights 3 and 4), the auto-identification software BCID identified a total of 660 calls from six different species while the EchoClass software identified a total of 543 calls from four different species. The two species BCID identified that EchoClass did not include the Evening Bat and the Tri-Colored Bat. Both instances of identification of these two bat species occurred on Survey Night 3 only.

No high-frequency *myotis* calls were detected on any of the four survey nights in either location. While calls from the Little Brown Bat and the Gray Bat were detected during survey nights, these calls are not within the same frequency range as the Indiana Bat or Northern long-eared bat. The characteristic frequency of the Little Brown bat is generally higher than 45 kHz while the Gray bat tends to have call frequencies at 47 kHz and above. Based on the USFWS 2020 Range-Wide Indiana Bat Survey Guidelines, the presence of the Indiana or Northern long-eared bat is considered unlikely and no further studies are required.

Maximum likelihood probability, MLE(p), values are presented for both EchoClass and BCID data sets. The MLE(p) number represents the probability that a species is falsely identified at a site on a given night, given the error rates for identification. A low MLE(p) value indicates that a species is likely present at the site and was correctly identified. This value cannot be considered a "complete" statistic. It takes into account species percentages, group percentages, total



number of pulses present, and other variables. Based on the different methods that EchoClass and BCID employ to identify species present, a difference in MLE(p) values is expected for each species between the two programs.

### Location 1

Location 1 is a vacant agricultural field located on the east side of Firing Range Road. Two points within this location were surveyed on the evenings of July 15<sup>th</sup> and July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020. Sunset for these days was 8:57 PM and sunrise was 6:15 AM. On July 15<sup>th</sup>, the maximum temperature was 88°F with maximum wind speeds recorded at 8 mph from the south and no precipitation. On July 16<sup>th</sup>, the maximum temperature was 88°F with maximum wind speeds recorded at 18 mph from the south and no precipitation.

#### Meter 1 Survey Night 1

Data was collected within Location 1 with two acoustic meters and was processed using two auto identification programs, BCID East and EchoClass V3.1. During the first survey night, July 15<sup>th</sup>, BCID identified 55 calls with five identifiable species while EchoClass identified 57 calls with four identifiable species from the data collected with Meter 1. Table 2 below shows the results of the BCID analysis for Meter 1 and Table 3 shows the results of the EchoClass analysis for Meter 1. Neither identification program identified high-frequency *myotis* calls.

BCID Identification Summary for Meter 1; Site 1; Night 1 (Surveyed 07/15/2020)						
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)	
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	19	35.0%	Low	0.000001	
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	27	49.0%	Low	0.000001	
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat		1.8%	IVIIO	0.22512	
Lasiurus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	5	9.1%	Low	0.000017	
Nycticeius humeralis (NYHU)	Evening bat	3	5.5%	Mid	0.000267	

#### Table 2: BCID Summary for Location 1 Meter 1 (07/15/2020)

 Table 3: EchoClass Summary for Location 1 Meter 1 (07/15/2020)

EchoClass Identification Summary Results for Meter 1; Site 1; Night 1 (Surveyed 07/15/2020)						
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)	
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	33	57.9%	Low	0	
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	9	15.8%	Low	0.9983	
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	10	17.5%	Mid	0.0559	
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	5	8.8%	Low	0.9984	



#### Meter 2 Survey Night 1

Data collected with Meter 2 on July 15<sup>th</sup>, also located within the boundaries of Location 1 was analyzed using the same two auto identification programs. The BCID East program identified 281 calls composed of 7 species while the EchoClass program identified 236 calls composed of 6 species. The BCID analysis program identified one call belonging to the *myotis* species; however, the call was identified as a Little Brown Bat, which is not an endangered species.

Tables 4 and 5 below show the summary data from Meter 2 collected on Night 1 and analyzed with the BCID East and EchoClass programs.

#### Table 4: BCID Summary for Location 1 Meter 2 (07/15/2020)

BCID Identification Summary for Meter 2; Site 1; Night 1 (Surveyed 07/15/2020)							
Species Name	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	170	59.8%	Low	0.000001		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	49	17.3%	Low	0.000001		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	7	2.5%	Mid	0.000001		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	49	17.3%	Low	0.000001		
Myotis lucifugus (MYLU)	Little Brown bat	1	0.4%	Myotis	0.001938		
Nycticeius humeralis (NYHU)	Evening bat	4	1.4%	Mid	0.002178		
Perimyotis subflavus (PESU)	Tri-colored bat	1	0.4%	Mid	0.097344		

#### Table 5: EchoClass Summary for Location 1 Meter 2 (07/15/2020)

EchoClass Identification Summary Results for Meter 2; Site 1; Night 1 (Surveyed 07/15/2020)					
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	126	53.3%	Low	0
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	8	3.4%	Low	0.9989
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	56	23.7%	Mid	0
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	40	16.9%	Low	0.9981
Nycticeius humeralis (NYHU)	Evening bat	2	0.85%	Mid	0.9991
Perimyotis subflavus (PESU)	Tri-colored bat	4	1.7%	Mid	0



### Meter 1 Survey Night 2

During the second survey night of Location 1 Meter 1, July 16<sup>th</sup>, BCID identified 64 calls from five identifiable species while EchoClass identified 52 calls from four identifiable species. Tables 6 and 7 below shows the results of the BCID and the EchoClass analysis for Meter 1 from survey night 2. Neither identification program identified high-frequency *myotis* calls.

#### Table 6: BCID Summary for Location 1 Meter 1 (07/16/2020)

BCID Identification Summary for Meter 1; Site 1; Night 2 (Surveyed 07/16/2020)					
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	28	43.8%	Low	0.000001
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	27	42.2%	Low	0.000001
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	1	1.6%	Mid	0.366601
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	3	4.7%	Low	0.003592
Nycticeius humeralis (NYHU)	Evening bat	5	7.8%	Mid	0.000001

#### Table 7: EchoClass Summary for Location 1 Meter 1 (07/16/2020)

EchoClass Identification Summary Results for Meter 1; Site 1; Night 2 (Surveyed 07/16/2020)						
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)	
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	32	61.5%	Low	0	
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	3	5.8%	Low	0.9985	
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	11	21.2%	Mid	0.0109	
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	6	11.5%	Low	0.9985	

### Meter 2 Survey Night 2

During the second survey night of Location 1 Meter 2, July 16<sup>th</sup>, BCID identified 237 calls from seven identifiable species while EchoClass identified 208 calls from seven identifiable species. Tables 8 and 9 below show the results of the BCID and the EchoClass analysis for Meter 2 from survey night 2. The BCID program identified one *myotis* call from the Little Brown Bat (non-endangered species) while the EchoClass program identified one *myotis* call from the Gray Bat (non-endangered species).



BCID Identification Summary for Meter 2; Site 1; Night 2 (Surveyed 07/16/2020)						
Species Name	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)	
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	98	41.4%	Low	0.000001	
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	39	16.5%	Low	0.000001	
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	51	21.5%	Mid	0.000001	
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	22	9.3%	Low	0.000001	
Myotis lucifugus (MYLU)	Little Brown bat	1	0.4%	Myotis	0.008694	
Nycticeius humeralis (NYHU)	Evening bat	23	9.7%	Mid	0.000001	
Perimyotis subflavus (PESU)	Tri-colored bat	3	1.3%	Mid	0.046587	

#### Table 8: BCID Summary for Location 1 Meter 2 (07/16/2020)

#### Table 9: EchoClass Summary for Location 1 Meter 2 (07/16/2020)

EchoClass Identification Summary Results for Meter 2; Site 1; Night 2 (Surveyed 07/16/2020)							
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	68	32.7%	Low	0		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	14	6.7%	Low	0.9984		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	103	49.5%	Mid	0		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	12	5.8%	Low	0.9986		
Myotis grisescens (MYGR)	Gray Bat	1	0.5%	Myotis	1		
Nycticeius humeralis (NYHU)	Evening bat	6	2.9%	Mid	0.999		
Perimyotis subflavus (PESU)	Tri-colored bat	4	1.9%	Mid	0		

#### Location 2

Location 2 is a vacant agricultural field located on the east side of Firing Range Road. Location 2 is situated closer to the Rickenbacker Firing Range than Location 1. Two points within this location were surveyed on the evenings of July 20<sup>th</sup> and July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2020. Sunset for these days was 8:53 PM and sunrise was 6:20 AM. On July 20<sup>th</sup>, the maximum temperature was 87°F with maximum wind speeds recorded at 10 mph from the south/ southwest and no precipitation. On July 21<sup>st</sup>, the maximum temperature was 89°F with maximum wind speeds recorded at 14 mph from the north/northwest and no precipitation.

Data collected on Survey Nights 3 and 4 within Location 2 was analyzed using two auto identification programs, BCID East and EchoClass V3.1. Results of the data analysis can be found below.



#### Meter 1 Survey Night 3

During the third survey night, July 20<sup>th</sup>, BCID identified 254 calls from six different species while EchoClass identified 285 calls from four different species. Tables 10 and 11 below show the summary results of the BCID and EchoClass analysis. Neither identification program identified high-frequency *myotis* calls.

BCID Identification Summary for Meter 1; Site 2; Night 3 (Surveyed 07/20/2020)							
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	197	77.3%	Low	0.000001		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	48	18.8%	Low	0.000001		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	2	0.8%	Mid	0.016011		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	4	1.6%	Low	0.001797		
Nycticeius humeralis (NYHU)	Evening bat	2	0.8%	Mid	0.012093		
Perimyotis subflavus (PESU)	Tri-colored bat	1	0.4%	Mid	0.027716		

#### Table 10: BCID Summary for Location 2 Meter 1 (07/20/2020)

#### Table 11: EchoClass Summary for Location 2 Meter 1 (07/20/2020)

EchoClass Identification Summary Results for Meter 1; Site 2; Night 3 (Surveyed 07/20/2020)							
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	191	51.9%	Low	0		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	7	2.5%	Low	0.9968		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	85	29.8%	Mid	0		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	2	0.7%	Low	0.997		

### Meter 2 Survey Night 3

During the third survey night, July 20<sup>th</sup>, BCID identified 254 calls from six different species while EchoClass identified 111 calls from four different species. Tables 12 and 13 below show the summary results of the BCID and EchoClass analysis. Neither identification program identified high-frequency *myotis* calls.



BCID Identification Summary for Meter 2; Site 2; Night 3 (Surveyed 07/20/2020)							
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	197	77.3%	Low	0.000001		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	48	18.8%	Low	0.000001		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	2	0.8%	Mid	0.016011		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	4	1.6%	Low	0.001797		
Nycticeius humeralis (NYHU)	Evening bat	2	0.8%	Mid	0.012093		
Perimyotis subflavus (PESU)	Tri-colored bat	1	0.4%	Mid	0.027716		

#### Table 12: BCID Summary for Location 2 Meter 2 (07/20/2020)

#### Table 13: EchoClass Summary for Location 2 Meter 2 (07/20/2020)

EchoClass Identification Summary Results for Meter 2; Site 2; Night 3 (Surveyed 07/20/2020)							
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	71	63.9%	Low	0		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	18	16.2%	Low	0.9976		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	8	7.2%	Mid	0.9976		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	14	12.6%	Low	0.9978		

### Meter 1 Survey Night 4

During the fourth survey night, July 21<sup>st</sup>, BCID identified 78 calls from four different species while EchoClass identified 80 calls from four different species. Tables 14 and 15 below show the summary results of the BCID and EchoClass analysis. Neither identification program identified high-frequency *myotis* calls.

#### Table 14: BCID Summary for Location 2 Meter 1 (07/21/2020)

BCID Identification Summary for Meter 1; Site 2; Night 4 (Surveyed 07/21/2020)							
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	45	57.7%	Low	0.000001		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	5	6.4%	Low	0.000001		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	6	7.7%	Mid	0.016011		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	22	28.2%	Low	0.001797		



EchoClass Identification Summary Results for Meter 1; Site 2; Night 4 (Surveyed 07/21/2020)							
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Total Calls Species Percent Group		MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	43	53.8%	Low	0		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	6	7.5%	Low	0.9967		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	18	22.5%	Mid	0		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	13	16.3%	Low	0.997		

#### Table 15: EchoClass Summary for Location 2 Meter 1 (07/21/2020)

#### Meter 2 Survey Night 4

During the fourth survey night, July 21<sup>st</sup>, BCID identified 74 calls from four different species while EchoClass identified 67 calls from four different species. Tables 16 and 17 below show the summary results of the BCID and EchoClass analysis. Neither identification program identified high-frequency *myotis* calls.

#### Table 16: BCID Summary for Location 2 Meter 2 (07/21/2020)

BCID Identification Summary for Meter 2; Site 2; Night 4 (Surveyed 07/21/2020)							
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	41	55.4%	Low	0.000001		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	10	13.5%	Low	0.000001		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	4	5.4%	Mid	0.000001		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	19	25.7%	Low	0.000001		

#### Table 17: EchoClass Summary for Location 2 Meter 2 (07/21/2020)

EchoClass Identification Summary Results for Meter 2; Site 2; Night 4 (Surveyed 07/21/2020)							
Species	Common Name	Total Calls	Species Percent	Group	MLE(p)		
Eptesicus fuscus (EPFU)	Big Brown bat	40	59.7%	Low	0		
Lasionycteris noctivagans (LANO)	Silver-haired bat	2	2.9%	Low	0.9968		
Lasiurus borealis (LABO)	Eastern Red bat	14	20.9%	Mid	0		
Lasiurus cinereus cinereus (LACI)	Hoary bat	11	16.4%	Low	0.997		



Acoustic Bat Survey July 28, 2020

#### Conclusions

Data collected at two locations with each location being surveyed for two consecutive monitoring nights, totaling eight survey nights. Data collected was analyzed using BCID East and EchoClass V3.1 auto-identification programs. A total of seven (7) different species were identified by the software. Neither BCID nor EchoClass identified high-frequency calls belonging to the Indiana Bat or the Northern Long-eared bat. One *myotis* call was identified by BCID as belonging to the Little Brown Bat (a common Ohio Species) on Survey Night 1 and one call was identified on Survey Night 2. The EchoClass Software also identified a single call as belonging to the *myotis* species Gray Bat; however, this is likely a miss-identification and should be classified as belonging to the Little Brown Bat. All other calls were determined to belong in the low to mid-range frequencies. Only high frequency calls are of concern when surveying for the endangered Indiana Bat (*Myotis sodalis*) or the Northern Long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*). No unknown high frequency calls were collected during the four survey nights.



Acoustic Bat Survey July 28, 2020

# Surveyors

Brian S. Metz, Senior Environmental Scientist, B.S. Environmental Science, 1998

Jessica L. Deeds, Environmental Scientist, M.S. Environmental Studies, 2012.


Acoustic Bat Survey July 28, 2020

#### References

Allen, Ryan. Bat Call Identification, Inc. BCID Eastern USA User Manual, 2019.

Britzke, Eric. EchoClass Acoustic ID Program Version 3.1. United States Army Corps of Engineers Research and Development Center. 2013.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 2020. <u>2020 Range-Wide Indiana Bat Summer Survey Guidelines</u>, March, 2020.

## **APPENDICES**

# Appendix A Figures







## Appendix B Photographs



Meter 1 into vacant







## Appendix C Resumes

#### **Project Team Resume**

#### Jessica L. Deeds, MS Environmental Scientist

Jessica holds a Master of Science in Environmental Studies for Ohio University's Voinovich School of Leadership and public Affairs. Specializing in aquatic biology, environmental studies, and acid mine drainage, Jessica currently serves as an environmental scientist on projects throughout Ohio. Jessica has participated in various state aquatic resource surveys for various government organizations, while continuing to develop her training and expertise.

In years previous to working with TranSystems, Jessica worked as a graduate assistant on the Sunday Creek Watershed Group in Glouster, OH evaluating the effects of acid mine drainage and modeling the potential biological recovery of the stream. She served as a biological intern responsible for completion of coal mining permit application, including chemical and biological sampling and data analysis. Jessica also has experience in wetland delineation.

#### US 54 Kellogg Avenue and 1-35 Road Improvement Project Wichita, Sedgwick County, Kansas

Jessica completed an acoustic bat survey was completed for the US 54 (Kellogg Avenue) and I-35 (KTA) Road Improvements Project located in Wichita, Sedgwick County, Kansas.

#### **Columbiana County Acoustic Bat Survey**

Jessica conducted an acoustic bat survey on a tract of land being developed for a roadway project in Columbiana County that was known to contain bat roosting and maternity roost trees. Jessica performed the necessary field work including data collection at two locations on consecutive nights which was analyzed using auto identification software packages which identified four different species, as well as completing a report including data collected, analyzed, and final findings.

#### Acoustic Bat Survey for the BNSF MP 14.0 LS 7100 Embankment Stabilization Project Shawnee, Kansa

Jessica conducted an acoustic bat survey for the bank stabilization project for BNSF along the north and south bank of Mill Creek from approximately BNSF Mile Post (MP) 13.82 to 14.02. The project area is located in Johnson County, Kansas which was recently added to the white nose-syndrome buffer zone map. Jessica performed the necessary field work as well as data analysis and report writing.

#### Education

M.S., Environmental Studies, Ohio University, Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs, 2013

B.S., Biological Sciences, Ohio University School of Arts and Sciences, 2011

#### Certifications

- Ohio Department of Natural Resources Wild Animal Permit #17-216
- Ohio Department of Health Asbestos Hazard Evaluation Specialist, Certification #ES35919

### Years of Experience 9

### Years with TranSystems 7

#### **Project Team Resume**

#### PIK-CR36-0.57- Bat Emergence Survey for Emergency Culvert Replacement

Jessica served as Environmental Scientist and performed a bat emergence survey for 6 positively identified roost trees in Pike County, Ohio. Jessica performed the emergence survey in coordination with USFWS as well as coordinated with the Pike County Engineer to ensure that the respective trees were removed the following day so that no bat species were harmed.

#### CLE-TR252-Clepper Lane Extension Acoustic Survey

Jessica served as Environmental Scientist and performed an acoustic survey for ODOT District 8 for the development of local road network along the south side of State Route 32 in Clermont County as part of the eastern corridor Segment IVa project. Jessica developed an acoustic survey plan which was approved by the USFWS as well as performing the necessary fieldwork including data collection at three locations on consecutive nights which was analyzed using auto identification software packages, results analysis, and report completion with final findings.

#### DEL-CR124-0.00:Home Road Acoustic Bat Survey

Jessica served as Environmental Scientist and completed a Phase 2 Study Plan as well as performed an acoustic bat survey for the Delaware County Engineer as part of the reconstruction of the Home Road bridge over the Olentangy River, a known bat flight corridor. Jessica collected data from two locations within the project area on two consecutive nights. Data was then analyzed using auto-identification programs. Jessica then completed a results analysis and final report.

#### Training

- Asbestos Building Inspector Initial Course- InService Training Network, 2015
- Asbestos Management Planner Initial Course- InService Training Network, 2015
- 38 Hour Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Training- Richard Chinn Environmental Training, Inc., 2014
- ▶ 16 Hour Wetland Permitting Training- Richard Chinn Environmental, Inc., 2014
- Wildlife Acoustics Techniques Training, Connersville, Indiana- Titley Scientific, 2014
- Advanced Acoustic Analysis Training, Connersville, Indiana- Titley Scientific, 2014
- Ohio Environmental Site Assessment Training- Ohio Department of Transportation, 2014
- Ecological Training- Ohio Department of Transportation, 2018
- Waterway Permits Prequalification Training- Ohio Department of Transportation, 2018

### Agency Response to Coordination Letter

From:Ohio, FW3 <ohio@fws.gov>Sent:Monday, September 21, 2020 10:51 AMTo:Chris SandfossCc:Mark Kelby; Ernest.Gubry@faa.govSubject:CRAA Air Cargo Campus, Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Dev., Franklin & Pickaway



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Ecological Services Office 4625 Morse Road, Suite 104 Columbus, Ohio 43230 (614) 416-8993 / Fax (614) 416-8994



TAILS# 03E15000-2020-TA-1500

Dear Mr. Sandfoss,

We have received your recent correspondence requesting information about the subject proposal. There are no Federal wilderness areas, wildlife refuges or designated critical habitat within the vicinity of the project area.

FEDERALLY LISTED, PROPOSED, AND CANDIDATE SPECIES COMMENTS: Due to the project, type, size, and location, we do not anticipate adverse effects to federally endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species. Should the project design change, or during the term of this action, additional information on listed or proposed species or their critical habitat become available, or if new information reveals effects of the action that were not previously considered, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should be initiated to assess any potential impacts.

If you have questions, or if we can be of further assistance in this matter, please contact our office at (614) 416-8993 or <u>ohio@fws.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Patrice Ashfield Ohio Field Office Supervisor

## Appendix C – Historical, Archaeological, Architectural, and Cultural Resources

This appendix contains copies of the coordination materials related to the analysis of cultural resources and National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultation. This appendix contains the following documentation:

- Letter from FAA to SHPO requesting Section 106 Consultation (dated September 23, 2020)
- Letters from FAA to Native American Tribes (dated September 23, 2020) requesting input and invitation to participate in the Section 106 process in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and Executive Order 13175
- Section 106 Coordination Materials (Attachments A F) including with above listed letters
  - o Attachment A: Project Information and Determination
  - Attachment B: Exhibits
  - Attachment C: Previous Coordination
  - Attachment D: OHPO Section 106 Review Project Summary Form and Supporting Information, August 3, 2020
  - Attachment E: Draft OHI Forms, May 2019 and June 2020
  - Attachment F: Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio; September 8, 2020
- Letter from SHPO to FAA with concurrence of finding of 'no effect on historic properties' (dated October 26, 2020)
- Response from Native American Tribe

Letter from FAA to SHPO requesting Section 106 Consultation (dated September 23, 2020)



Federal Aviation Administration Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

September 23, 2020

Ms. Diana Welling Department Head and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Resource Protection & Review State Historic Preservation Office Ohio History Connection 800 E. 17th Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43211

## Re: Section 106 Coordination for Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Ms. Welling:

This letter is being sent in accordance with 36 CFR part 800 which governs Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) to inform you that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) intend to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the proposed Cargo Campus Development and enabling projects (the Proposed Action) at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP). The RGLP Cargo Campus is a 330-acre site located south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK or Airport) in Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio. The Proposed Action constitutes an "undertaking" per 36 CFR part 800. The FAA is the lead Federal agency and as such the EA will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, FAA Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions, and the FAA's Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions. Based on a review of past documentation and information prepared by Landrum & Brown and ASC Group, the FAA is prepared to make a determination of "no historic properties affected" for this undertaking. As part of the early coordination process for this EA and pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4, we are respectfully seeking comments on the identification of the APE and determination of no historic properties affected.

I am respectfully requesting that your office review the following documentation that is enclosed with this letter and provide any comments.

- Attachment A: Project Information and Determination
- Attachment B: Exhibits
- Attachment C: Previous Coordination
- Attachment D: OHPO Section 106 Review Project Summary Form and Supporting Information, August 3, 2020
- Attachment E: Draft OHI Forms, May 2019 and June 2020

• Attachment F: Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio; September 8, 2020

We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (734) 229-2905 or by email at Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Cincinnati, OH 45242

Or email to csandfoss@landrum-brown.com

Your prompt response would be appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Ernest P. Cuby

Ernest P. Gubry

Enclosures: Attachments A-F

cc: Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority Chris Sandfoss, Landrum & Brown Letters from FAA to Native American Tribes (dated September 23, 2020)



#### Federal Aviation Administration

Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

September 23, 2020

John Raymond Johnson Governor Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma 2025 South Gordon Cooper Drive Shawnee, OK 74801

#### Re: Invitation for Government-to-Government Tribal Consultation for Section 106 Coordination for Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Johnson:

This letter is being sent in accordance with 36 CFR part 800 which governs Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) to inform you that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) intend to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the proposed Cargo Campus Development and enabling projects (the Proposed Project) at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP). The RGLP Cargo Campus is a 330-acre site located south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK or Airport) in Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio.

The Proposed Project constitutes an "undertaking" per 36 CFR part 800. The FAA is the lead Federal agency and as such the EA will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, FAA Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions, and the FAA's Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the southeast of LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;

- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.

The Project Site is surrounded by commercial and aviation land uses to the north and west and a former golf course to the south. Project site features include undeveloped land that is leased for agriculture, a former golf course clubhouse, and a former U.S. Air Force firing range.

The FAA has identified your tribe as potentially having an interest in the project area. Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2)(B)(ii), the FAA is seeking input on properties of cultural or religious significance that may be affected by the undertaking, and inviting you to participate in government-to-government consultation in the Section 106 consultation process.

I am respectfully requesting that you review the following documentation that is enclosed with this letter and provide any comments.

- Attachment A: Project Information and Determination
- Attachment B: Exhibits
- Attachment C: Previous Coordination
- Attachment D: OHPO Section 106 Review Project Summary Form and Supporting Information, August 3, 2020
- Attachment E: Draft OHI Forms, May 2019 and June 2020
- Attachment F: Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio; September 8, 2020

Please notify me if you wish to participate in this Section 106 consultation and provide any comments on the undertaking within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If you have any questions, please contact me at (734) 229-2905 or by email at Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Ernest Gubry Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

Your prompt response would be appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

P. Cuby

Ernest P. Gubry

Enclosures: Attachments A - F



Federal Aviation Administration Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

September 23, 2020

Glenna J. Wallace Chief Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma 127 West Oneida Seneca, MO 64865

#### Re: Invitation for Government-to-Government Tribal Consultation for Section 106 Coordination for Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Ms. Wallace:

This letter is being sent in accordance with 36 CFR part 800 which governs Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) to inform you that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) intend to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the proposed Cargo Campus Development and enabling projects (the Proposed Project) at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP). The RGLP Cargo Campus is a 330-acre site located south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK or Airport) in Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio.

The Proposed Project constitutes an "undertaking" per 36 CFR part 800. The FAA is the lead Federal agency and as such the EA will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, FAA Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions, and the FAA's Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the southeast of LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;

- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.

The Project Site is surrounded by commercial and aviation land uses to the north and west and a former golf course to the south. Project site features include undeveloped land that is leased for agriculture, a former golf course clubhouse, and a former U.S. Air Force firing range.

The FAA has identified your tribe as potentially having an interest in the project area. Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2)(B)(ii), the FAA is seeking input on properties of cultural or religious significance that may be affected by the undertaking, and inviting you to participate in government-to-government consultation in the Section 106 consultation process.

I am respectfully requesting that you review the following documentation that is enclosed with this letter and provide any comments.

- Attachment A: Project Information and Determination
- Attachment B: Exhibits
- Attachment C: Previous Coordination
- Attachment D: OHPO Section 106 Review Project Summary Form and Supporting Information, August 3, 2020
- Attachment E: Draft OHI Forms, May 2019 and June 2020
- Attachment F: Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio; September 8, 2020

Please notify me if you wish to participate in this Section 106 consultation and provide any comments on the undertaking within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If you have any questions, please contact me at (734) 229-2905 or by email at Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Ernest Gubry Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

Your prompt response would be appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

P. Couly

Ernest P. Gubry

Enclosures: Attachments A - F



#### Federal Aviation Administration

Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

September 23, 2020

Benjamin J. Barnes Chief Shawnee Tribe 29 South Highway 69A Miami, OK 74354

#### Re: Invitation for Government-to-Government Tribal Consultation for Section 106 Coordination for Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Barnes:

This letter is being sent in accordance with 36 CFR part 800 which governs Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) to inform you that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) intend to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the proposed Cargo Campus Development and enabling projects (the Proposed Project) at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP). The RGLP Cargo Campus is a 330-acre site located south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK or Airport) in Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio.

The Proposed Project constitutes an "undertaking" per 36 CFR part 800. The FAA is the lead Federal agency and as such the EA will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, FAA Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions, and the FAA's Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the southeast of LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;

- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.

The Project Site is surrounded by commercial and aviation land uses to the north and west and a former golf course to the south. Project site features include undeveloped land that is leased for agriculture, a former golf course clubhouse, and a former U.S. Air Force firing range.

The FAA has identified your tribe as potentially having an interest in the project area. Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2)(B)(ii), the FAA is seeking input on properties of cultural or religious significance that may be affected by the undertaking, and inviting you to participate in government-to-government consultation in the Section 106 consultation process.

I am respectfully requesting that you review the following documentation that is enclosed with this letter and provide any comments.

- Attachment A: Project Information and Determination
- Attachment B: Exhibits
- Attachment C: Previous Coordination
- Attachment D: OHPO Section 106 Review Project Summary Form and Supporting Information, August 3, 2020
- Attachment E: Draft OHI Forms, May 2019 and June 2020
- Attachment F: Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio; September 8, 2020

Please notify me if you wish to participate in this Section 106 consultation and provide any comments on the undertaking within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If you have any questions, please contact me at (734) 229-2905 or by email at Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Ernest Gubry Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

Your prompt response would be appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

P. Couly

Ernest P. Gubry

Enclosures: Attachments A - F



Federal Aviation Administration Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

September 23, 2020

Diane Hunter Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Miami Tribe of Oklahoma 3410 P Street NW Miami, OK 74354

#### Re: Invitation for Government-to-Government Tribal Consultation for Section 106 Coordination for Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Ms. Hunter:

This letter is being sent in accordance with 36 CFR part 800 which governs Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) to inform you that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) intend to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the proposed Cargo Campus Development and enabling projects (the Proposed Project) at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP). The RGLP Cargo Campus is a 330-acre site located south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK or Airport) in Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio.

The Proposed Project constitutes an "undertaking" per 36 CFR part 800. The FAA is the lead Federal agency and as such the EA will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, FAA Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions, and the FAA's Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the southeast of LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;

- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.

The Project Site is surrounded by commercial and aviation land uses to the north and west and a former golf course to the south. Project site features include undeveloped land that is leased for agriculture, a former golf course clubhouse, and a former U.S. Air Force firing range.

The FAA has identified your tribe as potentially having an interest in the project area. Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2)(B)(ii), the FAA is seeking input on properties of cultural or religious significance that may be affected by the undertaking, and inviting you to participate in government-to-government consultation in the Section 106 consultation process.

I am respectfully requesting your review of the following documentation that is enclosed with this letter and provide any comments.

- Attachment A: Project Information and Determination
- Attachment B: Exhibits
- Attachment C: Previous Coordination
- Attachment D: OHPO Section 106 Review Project Summary Form and Supporting Information, August 3, 2020
- Attachment E: Draft OHI Forms, May 2019 and June 2020
- Attachment F: Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio; September 8, 2020

Please notify me if you wish to participate in this Section 106 consultation and provide any comments on the undertaking within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If you have any questions, please contact me at (734) 229-2905 or by email at Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Ernest Gubry Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

Your prompt response would be appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

P. Culy

Ernest P. Gubry

Enclosures: Attachments A - F

Section 106 Coordination Materials Included with Previous Letters (Attachments A – F)
## SECTION 106 COORDINATION MATERIALS FOR THE PROPOSED CARGO CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT AT THE RICKENBACKER GLOBAL LOGISTICS PARK, RICKENBACKER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, FRANKLIN AND PICKAWAY COUNTIES, OHIO

## **ATTACHMENTS A - F**

Prepared by:



The Landrum & Brown Team 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, Ohio 45242 ATTACHMENT A PROJECT INFORMATION AND DETERMINATION

#### PROJECT INFORMATION AND DETERMINATION

#### Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

#### **Description of the Undertaking**

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, in **Attachment B**, *Exhibits*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the southeast of LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.

The Project Site is surrounded by commercial and aviation land uses to the north and west and a former golf course to the south. Project site features include undeveloped land that is leased for agriculture, a former golf course clubhouse, and a former U.S. Air Force firing range. The Proposed Action, when fully operational, would include bulk distribution warehouse facilities that are not dependent upon air travel. As such, the facilities would have no access to the airfield. Therefore, the proposed facilities would not cause an increase or decrease in aircraft operations and would not result in changes to the aircraft fleet at LCK.

The project is being proposed by the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) to provide additional revenue and to accommodate the demand for commercial/industrial facilities within the Columbus Region. The project would require Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) consent to converting airport-dedicated property to non-aeronautical, revenue-producing purposes. Therefore, the FAA is the lead Federal agency.

#### Area of Potential Effects

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) was determined based on the areas of potential direct impacts (Direct APE) from the Proposed Action, as well as the limit of potential indirect impacts (Indirect APE) related to traffic, viewshed, and setting. Both APEs are shown on **Exhibit 3**, *Area of Potential Effects*. The Direct APE was determined by identifying the areas where ground disturbance and/or construction activities would occur. The Indirect APE includes the Direct APE, as well as an expanded area that would have views of the proposed development and potential increases in surface vehicle traffic.

#### **Identification of Historic Properties**

Efforts were made to identify historic properties or archaeological sites within the APEs. This effort included researching past environmental documents at the Project Site. A Phase I cultural resources survey for historical, architectural, archaeological and cultural resources was completed within the Project Site. The area included in that survey is shown on Exhibit 4, Previous, Cultural Resource Surveys. This survey area includes the Direct APE for this undertaking. The investigation included background research, fieldwork and analysis. The report, entitled Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Industrial Development Opportunity Areas 3 and 4 at Rickenbacker International Airport in Hamilton and Madison Townships, Franklin County and Harrison and Madison Townships Pickaway County, Ohio (authored by Hillen et al in 2005), was submitted to the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) for review and comment in 2005. The cultural resources investigation identified 35 archaeological sites and 16 buildings within the survey area. In a letter from the OHPO dated June 5, 2005, it was noted that one archaeological site, 33-PI-757, was recommended for additional Phase II surveying; and the other properties were determined to not meet the criteria for listing on National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). A Phase II survey was conducted for site 33-PI-757 in 2007 and submitted to the OHPO for review. In a letter dated June 3, 2008, it was noted that site 33-PI-757 does not meet the criteria for listing on NRHP. Copies of these determination letters are included in Attachment C, Previous Coordination. Other Phase I surveys have been completed to the south of the Direct APE by Hillen and Bankowitz (2004) and Sewell et al. (2019). A review of the Ohio History Connection Online Mapping System found no properties listed as eligible for the NRHP within the Direct or Indirect APE.

A Section 106 Review Project Summary Form was completed for this project and is included as **Attachment D**, *OHPO Section 106 Review - Project Summary Form and Supporting Information*. The Indirect APE for this undertaking includes areas further east that were not included in the previous cultural resources survey. As shown on Exhibit 3, there are several residential and agricultural properties within the Indirect APE. A review of these properties was conducted in June 2020. That review determined that four structures fifty years old or greater are located within the Indirect APE that had not been previously surveyed. Therefore, a NRHP eligibility evaluation was conducted for these four properties. These properties were inventoried as FRA-10925-24, FRA-10926-24, FRA-10927-24, FRA-10928-24. Three other properties had been inventoried in 2019 as PIC-757-4, PIC-758-4, and PIC-759-4 and were recommended as not eligible for the NRHP (Sewell et al., 2019). Copies of completed Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) Forms for these properties are included in **Attachment E**, *Draft OHI Forms*. OHI Forms for FRA-10925-24, FRA-10926-24, FRA-10928-24 have been prepared by ASC Group for this project and will be submitted to the OHPO for review. OHI Forms for PIC-757-4, PIC-758-4, and PIC-759-4 were prepared by Lawhon and Associates and were submitted to OHPO in 2019.

As shown on Exhibit 4, there is a small area within the Direct APE that has not been previously surveyed for archaeological resources. This area is an approximately 9.1-acre area just south of the archaeological site 33PI757 that was surveyed by Hillen and Gibbs in 2007. This 9.1-acre site was the location of the former Landings at Rickenbacker Golf Course clubhouse. This property was acquired by the CRAA in 2015. Since this additional 9.1 acres had not been previously surveyed and appears to include land that is previously undisturbed, a Phase I Cultural Resources Survey was conducted within this site. This survey found no significant resources that would be potentially eligible for the NRHP. A copy of the Phase I Cultural Resources Survey is included in **Attachment F**, *Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio.* 

#### **Determination of Effects**

The undertaking would cause ground disturbance for site grading, excavation, and construction of the bulk distribution warehouses and associated roadways, utilities, and stormwater facilities. The undertaking would also cause visual changes and has the potential to cause changes in surface vehicle traffic levels. Based on past archaeological surveying and a review of above-ground structures within the APE, there are no historic resources located within the APE. *Therefore, FAA has determined that there are No Historic Properties Affected for this undertaking*.

ATTACHMENT B EXHIBITS





LCK Cargo Campus EA

Z 🕸

**Proposed Action** 

2





ATTACHMENT C PREVIOUS COORDINATION This page intentionally left blank



June 2, 2005

Andrew M. Schneider Transystems Corporation 5747 Perimeter Drive, Suite 240 Dublin, Ohio 43017

Dear Mr. Schneider:

This is in response to your letter of April 19, 2005 transmitting "Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Industrial Development Opportunity Areas 3 and 4 at Rickenbacker International Airport in Hamilton and Madison Townships, Franklin County and Harrison and Madison Townships, Pickaway County, Ohio" by Luella Beth Hillen, Rachel Bankowitz, and Donald Miller. Our comments are submitted in accordance with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (36 CFR 800).

Surface collection, inspection and shovel testing of the project area resulted in the identification of 35 archaeological sites (33 FR 2476-2484, 33 PI 757-782) and 16 buildings and structures associated with the Rickenbacker Air Base. Based on the information presented we concur that Phase II testing of 33 PI 757 is necessary in order to evaluate its National Register eligibility.

It is our opinion that the collected evidence suggests that the remaining properties do not meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. These include 33 PI 758-782, 33 FR 2476-2484, and Architectural Locations 1-17. No further coordination is needed in regard to these properties unless the historic properties are accidentally discovered.

We look forward to the results of the Phase II investigation. If you have any questions please contact me at (614) 298-2043 or jouinlan@ohiohistory.org.

Sincerely, soul i Gunta

Julie Quinlan, Program Reviews Manager Resource Protection and Review

Reference 107646

OHIO HISTORICAL SOCIETY *Ohio Historic Preservation Office* 567 East Hudson Street, Columbus, Ohio 43211-1030 ph: 614.298,2000 fx: 614.298.2037 www.ohiohistory.org This page intentionally left blank



## RECEIVED

June 3, 2008



Andrew Schneider Transystems Corporation 5747 Perimeter Drive, Suite 240 Dublin, OH 43017

Re: Rickenbacker International Airport IDO-4, Site 33-PI-757 Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio

Dear Mr. Schneider,

This is in response to correspondence from your office dated September 4, 2007 (received September 6) transmitting the report titled "Phase II Evaluation of 33-PI-757 in Industrial Development Opportunity Area 4 at Rickenbacker International Airport in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio" by Luella Beth Hillen, April 25, 2007. The comments of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) are submitted in accordance with provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 [36 CFR 800]), the Federal Aviation Administration serves as the federal agency.

The project involves internal restructuring of access to approximately 735 acres of land within Rickenbacker International Airport to support plans for industrial development (Industrial Development Opportunity Areas 3 and 4 (IDO - 3 and 4)). Archaeological survey of these two development areas resulted in the identification of 52 cultural resources. The archaeologists recommended Phase II archaeological investigations of site 33-PI-757 to complete its National Register eligibility evaluation. The Phase II testing at site 33-PI-757 included surface collection, excavation units, and strip blocks. A modest assemblage of prehistoric artifacts was recovered from a plowzone context. No subplowzone features were identified. Based on the information presented in the report, we concur with the findings that archaeological site 33-PI-757 doesn't meet National Register eligibility requirements and that there will be no historic properties affected by the proposed undertaking. No further coordination with this office is necessary for this project unless there is a change in the scope of work. In addition, if new or additional properties are discovered, this office should be notified [36 CFR 800.13].

Any questions concerning this matter should be addressed to David Snyder at (614) 298-2000, between the hours of 8 am. to 5 pm. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

David Snyder, Ph.D., RPA, Archaeology Reviews Manager Resource Protection and Review

DMS/ds (OHPO Serial Number 1015217, 107646)

**OHIO HISTORICAL SOCIETY** 

Ohio Historic Preservation Office 567 East Hudson Street, Columbus, Ohio 43211-1030 ph: 614.298.2000 fx: 614.298.2037 www.ohiohistory.org This page intentionally left blank

ATTACHMENT D OHPO SECTION 106 REVIEW - PROJECT SUMMARY FORM AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION



## OHIO HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE: RESOURCE PROTECTION AND REVIEW

### Section 106 Review - Project Summary Form

## For projects requiring a license from the Federal Communications Commission, please use FCC Forms 620 or 621. <u>DO NOT USE THIS FORM</u>.

### SECTION 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

All contact information provided must include the name, address and phone number of the person listed. Email addresses should also be included, if available. Please refer to the Instructions or contact an OHPO reviewer (mailto: Section106@ohiohistory.org) if you need help completing this Form. Unless otherwise requested, we will contact the person submitting this Form with questions or comments about this project.

Date: August 3, 2020

Name/Affiliation of person submitting form: Douglas Terpstra/ASC Group, Inc.

Mailing Address: 800 Freeway Drive North, Suite 101, Columbus, Ohio 43229

Phone/Fax/Email: 614-268-2514 x3556/dterpstra@ascgroup.net

### A. Project Info:

 This Form provides information about: New Project Submittal: YES

Additional information relating to previously submitted project: NO

OHPO/RPR Serial Number from previous submission:

2. Project Name (if applicable): Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus EA

 Internal tracking or reference number used by Federal Agency, consultant, and/or applicant to identify this project (if applicable): N/A

- B. Project Address or vicinity: Rickenbacker International Airport (vicinity of Groveport, Ohio)
- C. City/Township: Madison townships
- D. County: Franklin and Pickaway counties
- E. Federal Agency and Agency Contact. If you do not know the federal agency involved in your project, please contact the party asking you to apply for Section 106 Review, not OHPO, for this information. HUD Entitlement Communities acting under delegated environmental review authority should list their own contact information. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Mr. Ernest Gubry FAA, Detroit Airports District Office 11677 South Wayne Road, Suite 107 Romulus, MI 48174-1412
- F. Type of Federal Assistance. List all known federal sources of federal funding, approvals, and permits to avoid repeated reviews.

FAA consent to converting airport-dedicated property to non-aeronautical,

revenue-producing purposes.

- G. State Agency and Contact Person (if applicable): N/A
- H. Type of State Assistance: N/A
- Is this project being submitted at the direction of a state agency **solely** under Ohio Revised Code 149.53 or at the direction of a State Agency? Answering yes to this question means that you are sure that <u>no</u> federal funding, permits or approvals will be used for any part of your project, and that you are seeking comments only under ORC 149.53.

NO

J. Public Involvement- Describe how the public has been/will be informed about this project and its potential to affect historic properties. Please summarize how they will have an opportunity to provide comments about any effects to historic properties. (This step is required for all projects under 36 CFR § 800.2):

The project is undergoing an Environmental Assessment and will include an opportunity for agency and public comment in accordance with FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B.

K. Please list other consulting parties that you have contacted/will contact about this project, such as Indian Tribes, Certified Local Governments, local officials, property owners, or preservation groups. (See 36 CFR § 800.2 for more information about involving other consulting parties). Please summarize how they will have an opportunity to provide comments:

The project is undergoing an Environmental Assessment and will include an opportunity for agency and public comment in accordance with FAA Orders 1050.1F

#### SECTION 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS (APE)

Provide a description of your project, its site, and geographical information. You will also describe your project's Area of Potential Effects (APE). Please refer to the Instructions or contact an OHPO reviewer if you need help with developing the APE or completing this form.

For challenging projects, provide as much information as possible in all sections, and then check the box in Section 5.A. to ask OHPO to offer preliminary comments or make recommendations about how to proceed with your project consultation. This is recommended if your project involves effects to significant historic properties or if there may be challenging procedural issues related to your project. Please note that providing information to complete all Sections will still be required and that asking OHPO for preliminary comments may tend to delay completion of the review process for some projects.

- A. Does this project involve any Ground-Disturbing activity: YES (If **Yes**, you must complete all of Section 2.A. If **No**, proceed directly to Section 2. B.)
  - 1. General description of width, length and depth of proposed ground disturbing activity: *Please see attached narrative text for Section 2, Parts A1-A4.*
  - 2. Narrative description of previous land use and past ground disturbances, if known: *Please see attached narrative text for Section 2, Parts A1-A4.*
  - 3. Narrative description of current land use and conditions: *Please see attached narrative text for Section 2, Parts A1-A4.*
  - 4. Does the landowner know of any archaeological resources found on the property? YES If yes, please describe: *Please see attached narrative text for Section 2, Parts A1-A4.*
- B. Submit the exact project site location on a USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map for all projects. Map sections, photocopies of map sections, and online versions of USGS maps are acceptable as long as the location is clearly marked. Show the project's Area of Potential Effects (APE). It should be clearly distinguished from other features shown on the map:
  - 1. USGS Quad Map Name: Lockbourne
  - 2. Township/City/Village Name: Madison townships, Groveport vicinity
- C. Provide a street-level map indicating the location of the project site; road names must be identified and legible. Your map must show the exact location of the boundaries for the project site. Show the project's Area of Potential Effects (APE). It should be clearly distinguished from other features shown on the map:
- D. Provide a verbal description of the APE, including a discussion of how the APE will include areas with the potential for direct and indirect effects from the project. Explain the steps taken to identify the project's APE, and your justification for the specific boundaries chosen: *Please see attached narrative text for Section 2, Part D.*
- E. Provide a detailed description of the project. This is a critical part of your submission. Your description should be prepared for a cold reader who may not be an expert in this type of project. The information provided must help support your analysis of effects to historic properties, not other types of project impacts. Do not simply include copies of environmental documents or other types of specialized project reports. If there are multiple project

alternatives, you should include information about all alternatives that are still under active consideration: *Please see attached narrative text for Section 2, Part E.* 

#### **SECTION 3: IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES**

Describe whether there are historic properties located within your project APE. To make that determination, use information generated from your own Background Research and Field Survey. Then choose one of the following options to report your findings. Please refer to the Instructions and/or contact an OHPO reviewer if you are unsure about how to identify historic properties for your project.

If you read the Instructions and you're still confused as to which reporting option best fits your project, or you are not sure if your project needs a survey, you may choose to skip this section, but provide as much supporting documentation as possible in all other Sections, then check the box in Section 5.A. to request preliminary comments from OHPO. After reviewing the information provided, OHPO will then offer comments as to which reporting option is best suited to document historic properties for your project. Please note that providing information to complete this Section will still be required and that asking OHPO for preliminary comments may tend to delay completion of the review process for some projects.

#### **Recording the Results of Background Research and Field Survey:**

- A. Summary of discussions and/or consultation with OHPO about this project that demonstrates how the Agency Official and OHPO have agreed that no Field Survey was necessary for this project (typically due to extreme ground disturbance or other special circumstances). Please <u>attach copies</u> of emails/correspondence that document this agreement. You must explain how the project's potential to affect both archaeological and historic resources were considered.
- B. A table that includes the minimum information listed in the OHPO Section 106 Documentation Table (which is generally equivalent to the information found on an inventory form). This information must be printed and mailed with the Project Summary Form. To provide sufficient information to complete this Section, you must also include summary observations from your field survey, background research and eligibility determinations for each property that was evaluated in the project APE.
- C. OHI (Ohio Historic Inventory) or OAI (Ohio Archaeological Inventory) forms- New or updated inventory forms may be prepared using the OHI pdf form with data population capabilities, the Internet IForm, or typed on archival quality inventory forms. To provide sufficient information to complete this Section, you must include summary observations from your field survey and background research. You must also include eligibility determinations for each property that was evaluated in the project APE
- D. A historic or archaeological survey report prepared by a qualified consultant that meets professional standards. The survey report should meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Identification and OHPO Archaeological Guidelines. You may also include new inventory forms with your survey, or update previous inventory forms. To complete this section, your survey report must include summary observations from your field survey, background research and eligibility determinations for each property that was evaluated within the APE.
- E. **Project Findings**. Based on the conclusions you reached in completing Section 3, please choose one finding for your project. There are (mark one): No Historic Properties Present in the APE: please see attached narrative text for Section 3 Literature Review and Field Survey results.

#### **SECTION 4: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

This information must be provided for all projects.

- A. Photographs must be keyed to a street-level map, and should be included as attachments to this application. Please label all forms, tables and CDs with the date of your submission and project name, as identified in Section 1. You must present enough documentation to clearly show existing conditions at your project site and convey details about the buildings, structures or sites that are described in your submission. Faxed or photocopied photographs are not acceptable. See Instructions for more info about photo submissions or 36 CFR § 800.11 for federal documentation standards.
  - 1. Provide photos of the entire project site and take photos to/from historic properties from/towards your project site to support your determination of effect in Section 5.
  - 2. Provide current photos of all buildings/structures/sites described.
- B. Project plan, specifications, site drawings and any other media presentation that conveys detailed information about your project and its potential to affect historic properties.
- C. Copies or summaries of any comments provided by consulting parties or the public.

#### **SECTION 5: DETERMINATION OF EFFECT**

- A. **Request Preliminary Comments.** For challenging projects, provide as much information as possible in previous sections and ask OHPO to offer preliminary comments or make recommendations about how to proceed with your project consultation. This is recommended if your project involves effects to significant historic properties, if the public has concerns about your project's potential to affect historic properties, or if there may be challenging procedural issues related to your project. Please be aware that providing information in all Sections will still be required and that asking OHPO for preliminary comments may tend to delay completion of the review process for some projects.
  - 1. We request preliminary comments from OHPO about this project: NO
  - 2. Please specify as clearly as possible the particular issues that you would like OHPO to examine for your project (for example- help with developing an APE, addressing the concerns of consulting parties, survey methodology, etc.):
- B. **Determination of Effect.** If you believe that you have gathered enough information to conclude the Section 106 process, you may be ready to make a determination of effect and ask OHPO for concurrence, while considering public comments. Please select and mark one of the following determinations, then explain the basis for your decision on an attached sheet of paper:
  - **No historic properties will be affected** based on 36 CFR § 800.4(d) (1). Please explain how you made this determination: *No historic properties have been identified within the APE.*

- **No Adverse Effect** [36 CFR § 800.5(b)] on historic properties. This finding cannot be used if there are no historic properties present in your project APE. Please explain why the Criteria of Adverse Effect, [36 CFR Part 800.5(a) (1)], were found not to be applicable for your project:
- Adverse Effect [36 CFR § 800.5(d) (2)] on historic properties. Please explain why the criteria of adverse effect, [36 CFR Part 800.5(a) (1)], were found to be applicable to your project. You may also include an explanation of how these adverse effects might be avoided, reduced or mitigated:

Please print and mail completed form and supporting documentation to:

State Historic Preservation Office Resource Protection and Review Department 800 E. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue Columbus, OH 43211-2474

# ATTACHMENT 1: SECTION 106 PROJECT SUMMARY FORM SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Section 106 Project Summary Form Supporting Information for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Franklin County and Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio

By

**Douglas Terpstra, MS** 



CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Section 106 Project Summary Form Supporting Information for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Franklin County and Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio

By

**Douglas Terpstra, MS** 

Submitted By: Douglas Terpstra Project Manager ASC Group, Inc. 800 Freeway Drive North, Suite 101 Columbus, Ohio 43229 614.268.2514

Submitted To: Chris Sandfoss Landrum & Brown 4445 Lake Forest Drive, Suite 700 Cincinnati, Ohio 45242 513.530.5333

Lead Agency: Federal Aviation Administration

August 3, 2020

#### **INTRODUCTION**

ASC Group, Inc., under contract with Landrum & Brown, has completed supplemental narrative text and supporting documentation to accompany the Section 106 Project Summary Form for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment. The project would be located on land that is owned by the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA). The project location is south of the Rickenbacker International Airport. Prior to its present designation, the airport served as Lockbourne Air Force Base (AFB). In 1980, the base was transferred to the Ohio Air National Guard and renamed the Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base. In 1984, 1,642.62 acres (of the original 4,371.07 acres) were conveyed to the Rickenbacker Port Authority (RPA), which renamed the site Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK) and established the passenger terminal. RPA merged with the Columbus Airport Authority in 2003, forming the CRAA, which currently owns and operates LCK. The project is located in Madison Township, Franklin County and Madison Township, Pickaway County in the southeastern portion of the CRAA property (Figure 1).

#### SHPO SECTION 106 PROJECT SUMMARY FORM, SECTION 2

#### PART A.

- 1. Ground disturbing activities likely will occur on most of the 330-acre project area. Width, length, and depth will vary according to the specific construction activity, but will include site preparation, construction of five commercial bulk distribution warehouses, road construction, utility line construction, and construction of stormwater mitigation areas. An approximately 13-acre wooded area to the southwest of London Lancaster Road will be preserved.
- 2. The land within the project area was farmland before the construction of Lockbourne AFB. Facilities related to Lockbourne AFB subsequently occupied some of the project area, including roadways, a firing range, munitions bunkers, portions of disused runways, and material storage (gravel, wood, etc.). The project area has previously undergone archaeological investigation (Hillen et al. 2005); the results of this survey are discussed in Section 3. The survey described the project area as a mix of agricultural fields, construction disturbance, wood lots, and wetlands.
- 3. Much of the land within the project area is unused, including grassland, wood lots, wetlands, and former areas of development. The munitions bunkers have been demolished, but roadways remain throughout the project area. The remainder of the project area has been in agricultural use in recent years.
- 4. Hillen et al. (2005) identified 32 archaeological sites within the project area (33PI757 to 33PI782 and 33FR2476 to 33FR2481). One site, 33PI757, underwent a Phase II survey (Hillen and Gibbs 2007). None of these sites were determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

#### PART D.

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the project follows the LCK fence line on the west, beyond which are the Airport runways. On the north, the APE boundary follows the northernmost leg of London Lancaster Road to the eastern property boundaries of the houses along the east side of that road. The APE follows the property line south to the north property line of houses facing south along London Lancaster Road, then follows a ridge line southeast to Air Base Road. From Air Base Road, the APE runs south to a tree line and then west along the tree line, through the now closed Landings at Rickenbacker Golf Course, and then to a line along Rickenbacker Parkway. The APE was determined based on sightlines toward the project area, primarily from the east (Figure 2 and Figure 3, Sheets 1–3; Plates 1–10). The land to the north, west, and south has been subjected to previous cultural resources investigations with no listed or eligible resources being identified. In addition, a complex of warehouses outside of the southwest corner of the project area are an existing visual intrusion to views from the west. Activities at LCK are already audible throughout most of the APE.

#### PART E.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of five commercial bulk distribution warehouses, as well as an extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located south of LCK. The Proposed Action includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3B and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouses totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.

### SHPO SECTION 106 PROJECT SUMMARY FORM, SECTION 3

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

A desktop literature review was conducted using the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office's (SHPO) Online Mapping System (OMS). The OMS provides information on the locations of NRHP-listed or eligible resources, Ohio Archaeological Inventory (OAI) and Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) resources, cemeteries, and previous cultural resources surveys. In addition, historic United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps were accessed through https://livingatlas.arcgis.com/topoexplorer/index.html.

Examination of the SHPO's OMS does not show the presence of any NRHP-listed or eligible resources within the APE.

Multiple previous cultural resource surveys have been conducted within or adjacent to the APE (Figure 4). Hillen et al. (2005) conducted a cultural resource survey of Industrial Development Opportunity (IDO) Areas 3 and 4 at LCK (Figure 4). The present project area occupies most of IDO Area 4 (IDO Area 3 is located on the west side of LCK). The archaeological survey identified 32 sites within IDO Area 4 (33PI757 to 33PI782 and 33FR2476 to 33FR2481). Of these sites, 33PI757, 33PI767, and 33PI770 were recommended for further testing if they could not be avoided. SHPO concurred that Phase II testing of 33PI757 was necessary in order to evaluate its eligibility for the NRHP (Letter from Julie Quinlan, SHPO, to Andrew Schneider, TranSystems, 2 June 2005). SHPO did not concur with the recommendations for further testing of the other two sites and concurred that the remaining archaeological sites are not eligible for the NRHP. Hillen and Gibbs (2007) conducted a Phase II evaluation of 33PI757 and recommended that the site is not eligible for the NRHP (Figure 4). The architectural history portion of this survey identified 16 buildings or structures more than 50 years of age in IDO Area 4 and within the present APE, all of which are related to former military activities at Lockbourne AFB. None of these resources were recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP. SHPO concurred with these recommendations. Schwarz (2008) completed an archaeology addendum to the IDO Area 4 survey; sites were recorded, but none were recommended as eligible or for further investigation (Figure 4).

Sewell et al. (2019) conducted a cultural resource survey for the proposed Pickaway County Industrial Park (Figure 4).<sup>1</sup> The project area for this survey is located south of the former golf course, but the APE extends north to include buildings along Air Base Road, including three in the present APE: PIC-757-4 through PIC-759-4 (see below). No history/architecture resources recorded in this survey were recommended as eligible for the NRHP.

Hillen and Bankowitz (2004) conducted a cultural resources survey for land south of Rickenbacker Parkway south of the present project's APE (Figure 4). This survey recorded PIC-678-3 in the OHI, but recommended the property as not eligible for the NRHP.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Sewell et al. (2019) report and associated OHI forms have not yet been added to the SHPO OMS. SHPO alerted ASC to this report when ASC requested OHI numbers following their field survey.

Bankowitz (2005) conducted a history/architecture photolog survey for the Norfolk-Southern Intermodal Facility (Figure 4). The APE extends south from the southwest corner of the present project's APE. No history/architecture resources within the vicinity of the present APE were recommended as eligible for the NRHP.

Leary and Haag (2006) conducted a cultural resources survey for a waterline along Ashville Pike south of the APE for the present project (Figure 4). No cultural resources were identified. Schneider and Taylor (2011) also conducted a Phase I archaeological survey that included, in part, Ashville Pike and portions of Rickenbacker Parkway south of the APE for the present project (Figure 4). The report did not identify any archaeological sites recommended eligible for the NRHP.

Although not depicted on Figure 4, several cultural resources surveys have been conducted for current and former military portions of Lockbourne AFB (Anderson and Marquart 1993; Gardner 2006; Hathaway et al. 2004; Rutter 2008). Rutter (2008) recommended FRA-9632-25 and FRA-9634-25 (both 1954 maintenance hangars) as eligible for the NRHP; the remaining properties in his survey, including FRA-9624-24 (located adjacent to the northwest corner of the present project's APE), were recommended as not eligible. SHPO concurred with these recommendations (Letter from David Snyder, SHPO, to Matt Nowakowski, National Guard Bureau, 23 August 2007). The other surveys did not identify any resources relating to the Airport's military history as eligible for the NRHP.

Examination of historic USGS topographic maps show that the APE has always had sparse aboveground development other than resources related to Lockbourne AFB. The 1925 East Columbus quadrangle (USGS 15' topographic map) shows buildings north, west, and south of the project area that were removed during the development of Lockbourne AFB beginning in the 1940s (Figure 5). East of the project area, three buildings are depicted at the south bend in London Lancaster Road, none of which are extant today. The three properties in the APE along Air Base Road that were recorded in the OHI by Sewell et al. (2019) are shown on this map, along with buildings further west that are no longer extant. The 1964 Lockbourne quadrangle (USGS 7.5' topographic map) shows roads, buildings, and structures associated with Lockbourne AFB located within the project area and within the APE west of the project area (Figure 6). Two farmsteads are depicted at the south bend in London Lancaster Road, neither of which is extant today, although the barn from one may now be part of a later property (see FRA-10927-24 below). No buildings

are depicted along the east side of London Lancaster Road or along the road extending east from its south bend. No additional properties were present along Air Base Road.

#### FIELD SURVEY

The areas that are within the APE within the project area or west and south of the project area have been subject to previous cultural resource surveys or are devoid of buildings and structures. ASC identified two areas for history/architecture field survey in the APE east of the project area: London Lancaster Road and Air Base Road<sup>2</sup>. A field survey was conducted on June 3, 2020. The properties to be surveyed were identified through examination of the Franklin County Auditor's website (http://property.franklincountyauditor.com/\_web/maps/mapadv.aspx) and the Pickaway County Auditor's website (https://pickaway.iviewauditor.com/Map.aspx).

The portion of the APE along London Lancaster Road adjacent to the northeast corner of the project area consists of agricultural fields west of the road and narrow and deep residential tracts on the east side of the road. Houses in this area date from the mid-1960s to the present, with the oldest extant building a small barn dating to 1950. Most of the houses in this area date to the early 1970s and later and are standard suburban house types, albeit on large approximately 5 acre lots. However, four properties with a house or outbuilding 50 years of age or older were recorded in the OHI: FRA-10925-24 through FRA-10928-24.

- FRA-10925-24 is a ranch house that dates to 1970 (Figure 3, Sheet 2; Plate 11). This is a nondescript and commonplace house type with no significance under Criteria A, B, or C. The house has modern replacement siding, windows, and doors. The house lacks significance and integrity and is recommended not eligible for the NRHP.
- FRA-10926-24 is a ranch house that dates to 1965 (Figure 3, Sheet 2; Plate 12). This is a nondescript and commonplace house type with no significance under Criteria A, B, or C. The house has modern replacement siding and additions. The house lacks significance and integrity and is recommended not eligible for the NRHP.
- FRA-10927-24 is a two-story side-gabled house that dates to 1971 (Figure 3, Sheets 2 and 3; Plate 13). This is a nondescript and commonplace house type with no significance under Criteria A, B, or C and was not yet 50 years old at the time of the field survey. This property also has a small barn built in 1950 that appears to survive from an earlier agricultural property. With a late-twentieth century suburban house, no other period outbuildings, and only a small area of pasture land, the barn has no significant associations with agricultural history under Criterion A, and barn is not a significant example of an agricultural outbuilding under Criterion C. The property lacks significance and is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP.
- FRA-10928-24 is a two-story gambrel roof house that dates to 1969 (Figure 3, Sheets 2 and 3; Plate 14). This is a nondescript and commonplace house type with no significance

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> ASC was unaware of the Sewell et al. (2019) survey until notified by SHPO when ASC requested OHI numbers after their field survey.

under Criteria A, B, or C. The house retains good integrity, but lacks significance and is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP.

The portion of the APE along Air Base Road adjacent to the southeastern corner of the project area is less developed, is more agricultural in character, and has houses from the late nineteenth century through the early twentieth century. One property, 5076 Air Base Road (PIC-757-4), is immediately adjacent to the project area. Two other properties are much further from the project area, but are on a hill slope above the surrounding land, which will give them much greater visibility of the project area than houses to the east. Sewell et al. (2019) inventoried these houses in the OHI as PIC-757-4 through PIC-759-4.

- PIC-757-4 is a one-and-one-half-story side-gabled vernacular house dating to ca. 1900 (Figure 3, Sheet 3; Plate 15). Although the house likely was built as a farmhouse, the property has only modern outbuildings remaining. The house has additions on its rear, has modern replacement siding and roofing, and has a mix of one-over-one and replacement windows. The house is not associated with events or trends important in history and is an unremarkable example of a small farmhouse with poor integrity. Sewell et al. (2019) recommended the house as not eligible for the NRHP.
- PIC-758-4 is a dormer front bungalow dating to 1923 (Figure 3, Sheet 3; Plate 16). The property has two metal-sided pole barns dating from 1940 and 1995. Another mid-twentieth century house on the same property, but under a different address, is east of the hill and outside of the APE boundary. The bungalow has a large two-story addition at its northeastern corner that has removed its integrity of design. The house is not associated with events or trends important in history and is an unremarkable example of a bungalow with poor integrity. Sewell et al. (2019) recommended the house as not eligible for the NRHP.
- PIC-759-4 is a former school building built in 1893 and now converted to a residence (Figure 3, Sheet 3; Plate 17). The building has undergone significant alterations, including a partial façade replacement, changes in fenestration, installation of modern replacement windows, and an addition on the rear. The building has too poor a level of integrity to convey historical or architectural significance. Sewell et al. (2019) recommended the building as not eligible for the NRHP.

The project area has previously been surveyed for both archaeological sites and history/architecture resources, and no such sites or resources have been identified as eligible for the NRHP. Much of the APE has previously been surveyed for history/architecture resources or contains no buildings or structures. None of these previous surveys have identified history/architecture resources eligible for the NRHP within the APE. The portion of the APE along London Lancaster Road has not previously been surveyed for history/architecture resources, and the present investigation did not identify any resources recommended as eligible for the NRHP. No further cultural resources investigation of the APE is recommended.

#### REFERENCES

Anderson, R. W., Jr., and A. M. Marquart

1993 Cultural and Historical Survey, Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, Franklin County – Columbus, Ohio. Energy Systems Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois. Submitted to the U.S. Air National Guard. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Bankowitz, Rachel

2005 Supplement to the Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Rickenbacker International Airport Intermodal Facility in Harrison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to TranSystems Corporation, Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Gardner, Jeffrey W.

2006 Intensive Phase I Archaeological Survey and Architectural Evaluation, Rickenbacker US Army Reserve Center (OH095/39865), Hamilton Township, Franklin County, Ohio. Brockington and Associates, Atlanta. Submitted to the US Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Hathaway, Susan G., Susan L. Bupp, and Christopher L. Bowen

2004 Cultural Resources Assessment of the Rickenbacker U.S. Army Reserve Center (OH095/39865), Columbus, Ohio. Parsons, Fairfax, Virginia. Submitted to the United States Army Reserve, 88<sup>th</sup> Regional Readiness Command, Fort Snelling, Minnesota. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Hillen, Luella Beth, and Rachel Bankowitz

2004 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Rickenbacker International Airport in Madison and Harrison Townships, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to TranSystems Corporation, Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Hillen, Luella Beth, and Kevin Gibbs

2007 Phase II Evaluation of 33P1757 in Industrial Development Opportunity Area 4 at Rickenbacker International Airport in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to TranSystems Corporation, Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Hillen, Luella Beth, Rachel Bankowitz, and Donald Miller

2005 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Industrial Development Opportunity Areas 3 and 4 at Rickenbacker International Airport in Hamilton and Madison Townships, Franklin County and Harrison and Madison Townships, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to TranSystems Corporation, Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Leary, Christopher G., and Crista Haag

2006 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Circa 1.1 Miles of New Waterline Alignment in Harrison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio: An Addendum to ASC Group, Inc.'s Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Rickenbacker International Airport Intermodal Facility. BHE Environmental, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio. Submitted to Earnhart Hill Regional Water & Sewer District, Circleville, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Rutter, William E.

2008 Cultural Resources Survey of the 121<sup>st</sup> Air Refueling Wing, Ohio Air National Guard, Rickenbacker International Airport, Columbus, Franklin County, Ohio. Submitted to the National Guard Bureau, Air National Guard Readiness Center NGB/A7CVN, Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Schneider, Andrew, and Amber Taylor

2011 Phase I Archaeology Reconnaissance Survey for the Pickaway East-West Connector (PID 83666) Harrison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. TranSystems Corporation, Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to the Ohio Department of Transportation and the Pickaway County Engineer's Office. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Schwarz, Kevin

2008 Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Industrial Development Opportunity Area 4 at Rickenbacker International Airport in Harrison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to TranSystems Corporation, Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Sewell, Andrew R., Brett A. Carmichael, and Justin P. Zink

2019 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Approximately 400 Acres (162 ha) for the Proposed Pickaway County Industrial Park in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. Lawhon & Associates, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to Hull & Associates, Inc., Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

FIGURES




This page intentionally left blank



Created by JVT; last saved: 7/9/2020 2:29:31 PM





Created by JVT; last saved: 7/9/2020 2:29:31 Ph









Created by JVT; last saved: 7/9/2020 2:33:15 PM



PLATES

This page intentionally left blank



Plate 1. View towards the project area from the northern end of APE along London Lancaster Road, looking southwest.



Plate 2. View towards the project area from London Lancaster Road, looking southwest.



Plate 3. View towards the project area from London Lancaster Road, looking southwest.



Plate 4. View towards the existing airport buildings visible from London Lancaster Road, looking northwest with zoom lens in field.



Plate 5. View of the existing mostly modern residential properties along the north-south leg of London Lancaster Road in the APE, looking southeast.



Plate 6. View towards the project area from east of the south curve in London Lancaster Road, looking west.



Plate 7. View towards the project area from the eastern edge of the APE along London Lancaster Road, looking west.



Plate 8. View along Air Base Road from within the eastern edge of the project area, looking west.



Plate 9. View towards the project area along Air Base Road, looking west.



Plate 10. View towards the project area along Air Base Road from the hillslope at the eastern edge of the APE, looking west.



Plate 11. FRA-10925-24, 3406 London Lancaster Road.



Plate 12. FRA-10926-24, 3422 London Lancaster Road.



Plate 13. FRA-10927-24, 3445 London Lancaster Road.



Plate 14. FRA-10928-24, 3584 London Lancaster Road.



Plate 15. PIC-757-4, 5076 Air Base Road.



Plate 16. PIC-758-4, 5484 Air Base Road.



Plate 17. PIC-759-4, 5487 Air Base Road.

This page intentionally left blank

ATTACHMENT E DRAFT OHI FORMS This page intentionally left blank



800 E. 17th Avenue Columbus, OH 43211 614/298-2000

# **OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY**

Draft Form - Not Reviewed by OHPO

Section 106/RPR Review:

RPR Number:

1. No. FRA1092524 NEV	A1092524 NEW 4. Present Name(s): Wells House				
2. County: Franklin	5. Hist	oric or Other Name(s):			
6. Specific Address or Location: 3406 London Lancaster Road		19a. Design Sources:	35. Plan Shape: L-shaped	2. C	
		20. Contractor or Builder:	36. Changes associated with 17/17b Dates:	ounty	
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number:		21. Building Type or Plan: Ranch	17. Original/Most significant construction	/: Fr	
Section 8		22. Original Use, if apparent:	17b. Some alteration	ınkli	
7. City or Village: Madison (Township of)		Single Dwelling	37. Window Type(s): Modern Replacements	in 4	
9. U.T.M. Reference		23. Present Use:		. Pre	
Quadrangle Name: Lockbourne		Single Dwelling	38. Building Dimensions: 70 x 38	esent	
Zone: 17 Easting: 335844 Northing: 4407798		4407798 24 Ownership: Private	39. Endangered? NO	or His	
		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known:	By What?	storie	
10. Classification: Building		Wells, Teresa M. 2406 London Langastar Road		c Na	
11. On National Register?	NO	Groveport, OH 43125	40. Chimney Placement: Gable end, exterior	me(s	
13. Part of Established Hist.	Dist? NO	26 Property Acreage: 5.01		): V	
15. Other Designation (NR of	r Local)	27. Other Surveys:	41. Distance from & Frontage on Road: D: 200 ft F: 200 ft	Vells H	
		28. No. of Stories: One story	51. Condition of Property: Excellent	ouse	
16. Thematic Associations:		20. Decement? No	52. Historic Outbuildings & Dependencies		
		30. Foundation Material: Unknown	Structure Type(s):		
17. Date(s) or Period:17b. Alteration Date(s):19702011		e(s): 31. Wall Construction: Balloon/western/platform frame	Detr(c)		
18. Style Class and Design:		22 D. (T.	Date(s):		
18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s):		32. Roof Type: Gable	Associated Activity:		
		Roof Material:			
		Aspnait sningle	53 Affiliated Inventory Number(s):		
19. Architect or Engineer:		34. Exterior Wall Material(s):	Historic (OHI):		
6		Aluminum or vinyl siding			
			Archaeological (OAI):		



8. Site Plan (location map) with North Arrow



47. Organization: ASC Group, Inc.

48. Date Recorded: **06/03/2020** 50. PIR Review Date:

#### 1. No. FRA1092524

4. Present Name(s): Wells House

2. County Franklin

5. Historic or Other Name(s):



Door Selection: Single off center Door Position: Flush Orientation: Lateral axis Symmetry: Other

#### Report Associated With Project:

Primary Author	Secondary Author(s)	Year	Title
Terpstra, Douglas		2020	Section 106 Project Summary Form for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, LCK Cargo Campus EA

#### 42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features

The house is an L-plan, gable-roof ranch house. The short leg of the L is a garage located at the north end of the west (front) wall. The garage bay is in the north wall of the garage and has a modern replacement garage door. The lower portion of the west wall of the garage is clad in brick veneer. An exterior brick chimney also is located at the north wall near the northeast corner of the house. A shed roof porch is located south of the garage and contains the front door; the door is a modern replacement.

#### 43. History and Significance

The surrounding area was rural and agricultural until the construction and operation of Lockbourne Air Force Base beginning in the 1940s. In the APE, development of the land along London Lancaster Road for residential lots did not begin until the mid-1960s, and the road did not see a significant number of houses until the mid-1970s. This house is an unremarkable and altered example of a ranch house.

#### 44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52)

Most of the lots along the road are narrow and deep, with the houses having a significant setback. Much of the land remains lawn or pasture, although most property owners are allowing trees to grow, generally around and in front of the houses. Land to the west and south consists of open agricultural fields. Buildings at Rickenbacker International Airport are visible to the northwest from some locations along London Lancaster Road, and airport activities are audible through much of the area.

#### 45. Sources of Information

Franklin County Auditor's website; 1964 Lockbourne, Ohio quadrangle (7.5 minute USGS topographical map)



800 E. 17th Avenue Columbus, OH 43211 614/298-2000

# **OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY**

Draft Form - Not Reviewed by OHPO

RPR Number:

Section 106/RPR Review:

1. No. FRA1092624 NEV	W 4. Present Name(s)	: Morse House DRAFI		
2. County: Franklin	5. Historic or Othe	r Name(s):		
6. Specific Address or Location: 3422 London Lancaster Road		19a. Design Sources:	35. Plan Shape: Rectangular	2. Cc
		20. Contractor or Builder:	36. Changes associated with 17/17b Dates:	unty
6a. Lot, Section or VMD N Section 8	lumber:	21. Building Type or Plan: Ranch	17. Original/Most significant construction	: Franl
7. City or Village: Madison (Township of)		22. Original Use, if apparent: Single Dwelling	37. Window Type(s):	klin 4
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name: Lockbo	burne	23. Present Use: Single Dwelling	38. Building Dimensions: 24 x 52	. Present
Zone: 17 Easting:	335819 Northing: 4407602	24. Ownership: Private	39. Endangered? NO By What?	or Histo
10. Classification: Building		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known: Morse, Brian L.	_,	ric N
11. On National Register?	NO	3422 London Lancaster Road Groveport, OH 43125	40. Chimney Placement: No chimney observed	ame(s)
13. Part of Established Hist.	Dist? NO	26. Property Acreage: 5.01		3
15. Other Designation (NR	or Local)	27. Other Surveys:	41. Distance from & Frontage on Road: D: 185 ft F: 200 ft	orse H
		28. No. of Stories: One story	51. Condition of Property: Good/Fair	ouse
16. Thematic Associations:		29. Basement? No 30. Foundation Material: Unknown	52. Historic Outbuildings & Dependencies <u>Structure Type</u> (s):	
17. Date(s) or Period: 17b. Alteration Date(s):   1965 1991   18. Style Class and Design: 1991		31. Wall Construction: Balloon/western/platform frame	Date(s):	
None 18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s):		32. Roof Type: Gable Roof Material: Asphalt shingle	Associated Activity:	
		33. No. of Bays: 4 Side Bays: 1	53. Affiliated Inventory Number(s):	
19. Architect or Engineer:		34. Exterior Wall Material(s): Aluminum or vinyl siding	Archaeological (OAI):	



8. Site Plan (location map) with North Arrow



6. Specific Address or Location: 3422 London Lancaster Road

47. Organization: ASC Group, Inc.

48. Date Recorded: **06/03/2020** 50. PIR Review Date:

#### 1. No. FRA1092624

4. Present Name(s): Morse House

2. County Franklin





Door Selection: Single off center Door Position: Flush Orientation: Lateral axis Symmetry: Bilateral asymmetry

#### Report Associated With Project:

Primary Author	Secondary Author(s)	Year	Title
Terpstra, Douglas		2020	Section 106 Project Summary Form for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, LCK Cargo Campus EA

#### 42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features

The house is a rectangular, gable roof ranch house. A gable-roof porch is located on the west (front) wall offset toward the south end of the house. The porch has a concrete deck, square posts, and iron railings. Within the porch is the front door and a triple set of one-over-one double hung sash windows. Two sets of paired one-over-one double hung sash windows are located in the façade north of the porch. A rear wing, set perpendicular to the main house, connects to a garage addition with a south-facing garage bay. A multipart glazed door is located between the garage bay and the main house.

#### 43. History and Significance

The surrounding area was rural and agricultural until the construction and operation of Lockbourne Air Force Base beginning in the 1940s. In the APE, development of the land along London Lancaster Road for residential lots did not begin until the mid-1960s, and the road did not see a significant number of houses until the mid-1970s. This house is an unremarkable and altered example of a ranch house.

#### 44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52)

Most of the lots along the road are narrow and deep, with the houses having a significant setback. Much of the land remains lawn or pasture, although most property owners are allowing trees to grow, generally around and in front of the houses. Land to the west and south consists of open agricultural fields. Buildings at Rickenbacker International Airport are visible to the northwest from some locations along London Lancaster Road, and airport activities are audible through much of the area. A fenced pasture is located at the front of this property. The property includes several stables and other outbuildings built in the 2000s.

#### 45. Sources of Information

Franklin County Auditor's website; 1964 Lockbourne, Ohio quadrangle (7.5 minute USGS topographical map)



800 E. 17th Avenue Columbus, OH 43211 614/298-2000

# **OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY**

Draft Form - Not Reviewed by OHPO

PR Number:

Section 106/RPR Review:

1. No. FRA1092724 NEW	4. Present Name(s)	Berliner House		
2. County: Franklin	5. Historic or Othe	r Name(s):	)	
6. Specific Address or Location: 3445 London Lancaster Road		19a. Design Sources:	35. Plan Shape: Rectangular	
		20. Contractor or Builder:	36. Changes associated with 17/17b Dates:	unty:
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number: Section 8		21. Building Type or Plan: Other House Type	17. Original/Most significant construction 17b.	Frank
7. City or Village: Madison (Township of)		22. Orginal Use, if apparent: Single Dwelling	37. Window Type(s): Modern Replacements	lin 4
9. U.T.M. Reference		23. Present Use:	Picture window	. Pre
Quadrangle Name: Lockbourne		Single Dwelling	38. Building Dimensions: 62 x 40	esent o
Zone: 17 Easting: 335810	Northing: 4407191	24. Ownership: Private	39. Endangered? NO By What?	r Histo
10. Classification: Building		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known: Berliner, Alan F. and Karen P.	,	ric N
11. On National Register? NO		3445 London Lancaster Road Groveport, OH 43125	40. Chimney Placement: Gable end, exterior	lame(s)
13. Part of Established Hist. Dist? NO		26. Property Acreage: 5.227		B
15. Other Designation (NR or Local)		27. Other Surveys:	41. Distance from & Frontage on Road: D: 100 ft F: 600 ft	erliner
		28. No. of Stories: Two story	51. Condition of Property: Excellent	Hou
16. Thematic Associations:		29. Basement? Yes 30. Foundation Material: Unknown	52. Historic Outbuildings & Dependencies Structure Type(s):	ISe
17. Date(s) or Period:   17b. Alteration Date(s):     1971   18. Style Class and Design:     None   18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s):		31. Wall Construction: Balloon/western/platform frame	Other Barn Date(s):	
		32. Roof Type: Gable Roof Material: Asphalt shingle	Associated Activity: Original/Most significant construction	
		33. No. of Bays: 5 Side Bays: 2	53. Affiliated Inventory Number(s):	
19. Architect or Engineer:		34. Exterior Wall Material(s): Aluminum or vinyl siding Brick	Historic (OHI): Archaeological (OAI):	



8. Site Plan (location map) with North Arrow



6. Specific Address or Location: 3445 London Lancaster Road

47. Organization: ASC Group, Inc.

48. Date Recorded: **06/03/2020** 50. PIR Review Date:

#### 1. No. FRA1092724

4. Present Name(s): Berliner House

2. County Franklin

5. Historic or Other Name(s):



Door Selection: Single centered

Door Position: Flush

Orientation: Lateral axis with lateral smaller extension Symmetry: Other

#### **Report Associated With Project:**

Primary Author	Secondary Author(s)	Year	Title
Terpstra, Douglas		2020	Section 106 Project Summary Form for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, LCK Cargo Campus EA

#### 42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features

The house is a two-story, side-gabled building, with a one-story garage wing on its west end. The house has brick veneer on the first floor, including the garage, and has modern replacement siding on the rest of the house. A shed-roof front porch extends across three bays of the façade from east of the garage. The porch has columnar posts. A picture window is located in the façade east of the porch. The front door is original, and the garage door is a modern replacement. An exterior brick chimney is located at the east wall. A wood deck is located at the second floor at the rear of the house.

#### 43. History and Significance

The surrounding area was rural and agricultural until the construction and operation of Lockbourne Air Force Base beginning in the 1940s. In the APE, development of the land along London Lancaster Road for residential lots did not begin until the mid-1960s, and the road did not see a significant number of houses until the mid-1970s. This house is an unremarkable example of a mid-twentieth century suburban house.

## 44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52)

Most of the lots along the road are narrow and deep, with the houses having a significant setback, although the few properties along the south side of the road have lots that are wide and shallow. Much of the land remains lawn or pasture, although most property owners are allowing trees to grow, generally around and in front of the houses. Land to the west and south consists of open agricultural fields. Buildings at Rickenbacker International Airport are visible to the northwest from some locations along London Lancaster Road, and airport activities are audible through much of the area. A small mid-twentieth century barn is located west of the house. The barn has a metal roof and board and batten siding. Lean-to extensions are located on either side. Fenced pastures are present west and south of the house.

#### 45. Sources of Information

Franklin County Auditor's website; 1964 Lockbourne, Ohio quadrangle (7.5 minute USGS topographical map)



800 E. 17th Avenue Columbus, OH 43211 614/298-2000

# **OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY**

DAFT

Draft Form - Not Reviewed by OHPO

RPR Number:

Section 106/RPR Review:

1. No. FRA1092824 NEW	4. Present Name(s	): Rinehart House		
2. County: Franklin	5. Historic or Othe	er Name(s):		
6. Specific Address or Location: 3584 London Lancaster Road		19a. Design Sources:	35. Plan Shape: Rectangular	
		20. Contractor or Builder:	36. Changes associated with 17/17b Dates:	unty
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number	:	21. Building Type or Plan: Other House Type	17. Original/Most significant construction	r: Fra
Section 8		22. Original Use, if apparent:	17b. Some alteration	ankl
7. City or Village: Madison (Township of)		Single Dwelling	37. Window Type(s): 1 over 1	ы. Б
9. U.T.M. Reference		23. Present Use:		. Pr
Quadrangle Name: Lockbourne		Single Dwelling	38. Building Dimensions: 28 x 73	esent
Zone: 17 Easting: 33611	2 Northing: 4407240	24. Ownershin: Private	39. Endangered? NO	or His
		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known:	By What?	toric
10. Classification: Building		Rinehart, Leonard G. and Cherry L.		c Na
11. On National Register? NO		Groveport, OH 43125	40. Chimney Placement: Gable end, exterior	me(s
13. Part of Established Hist. Dist?	NO	26. Property Acreage: 11.545		); R
15. Other Designation (NR or Loca	al)	27. Other Surveys:	41. Distance from & Frontage on Road: D: 200 ft F: 1500 ft	inehar
		28. No. of Stories: Two story	51. Condition of Property: Good/Fair	t Ho
16. Thematic Associations:		20 Basement? Ves	52. Historic Outbuildings & Dependencies	use
		30. Foundation Material: Unknown	Structure Type(s):	
17. Date(s) or Period: 17 1969	b. Alteration Date(s): 1978	31. Wall Construction: Balloon/western/nlatform frame		
18. Style Class and Design:			$\underline{\text{Date}(s)}$ :	
None 18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s):		32. Roof Type: Gambrel	Associated Activity:	
		Roof Material:	Associated Activity.	
		Asphalt shingle		
		33. No. of Bays: 3 Side Bays: 2	53. Affiliated Inventory Number(s): Historic (OHI):	
19. Architect or Engineer:		34. Exterior Wall Material(s): Clapboard or weatherboard		
		· ·	Archaeological (OAI):	Í



8. Site Plan (location map) with North Arrow



47. Organization: ASC Group, Inc.

48. Date Recorded: **06/03/2020** 50. PIR Review Date:

#### 1. No. FRA1092824

4. Present Name(s): Rinehart House

2. County Franklin

5. Historic or Other Name(s):



Door Selection: Single centered Door Position: Flush Orientation: Lateral axis Symmetry: Other

#### Report Associated With Project:

Primary Author	Secondary Author(s)	Year	Title
Terpstra, Douglas		2020	Section 106 Project Summary Form for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, LCK Cargo Campus EA

#### 42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features

The house is two stories with a gambrel roof. A one-story section at the east wall links the house to a two-bay front-gabled garage. The house has a balanced three-bay façade with a central doorway. The front door is original; the garage doors are modern replacements. Gabled dormers are located in the front roof slope. The section connecting to the garage has a recessed porch on its front side with a second doorway. An exterior brick chimney is located in the west wall.

### 43. History and Significance

The surrounding area was rural and agricultural until the construction and operation of Lockbourne Air Force Base beginning in the 1940s. In the APE, development of the land along London Lancaster Road for residential lots did not begin until the mid-1960s, and the road did not see a significant number of houses until the mid-1970s. This house is an unremarkable example of a mid-twentieth century suburban house.

#### 44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52)

Most of the lots along the road are narrow and deep, with the houses having a significant setback, although this property has a large amount of land extending west of the house to the northward bend in London Lancaster Road. The land in this area is an open meadow. The east end of the property, with the house and outbuildings, is laid in lawn with scattered trees. A mid-1970s pole barn north of the house has a concrete block foundation, board-and-batten siding, and a metal roof. A shed located near this barn has vertical board siding and a metal roof. Open agricultural fields still dominate the character of the surrounding area.

#### 45. Sources of Information

Franklin County Auditor's website; 1964 Lockbourne, Ohio quadrangle (7.5 minute USGS topographical map)



800 E. 17th Avenue Columbus, OH 43211 614/298-2000

# **OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY**

Section 106/RPR Review: Reviewed

RPR Number: 2018PIC43670

1. No. PIC0075704 NEW	4. Present Name(s): Burgoon Farm				
2. County: Pickaway	5. Historic or Other	Name(s):			
6. Specific Address or Location: 5076 Airbase Road		19a. Design Sources: unknown	35. Plan Shape: Rectangular	2. Co Pick	
		20. Contractor or Builder: unknown	36. Changes associated with 17/17b Dates:	ounty awa	
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number:		21. Building Type or Plan: Other House Type	17. Original/Most significant construction	< .:	
		22. Original Use, if apparent:	17b. Some alteration		
7. City or Village: Madison (Township of)		Single Dweining	37. Window Type(s): 1 over 1	4	
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name: Lockbourne		23. Present Use: Single Dwelling	Modern Replacements 38. Building Dimensions: 25' wide x 51' deep	. Present o	
Zone: 17 Easting: 335667	Northing: 4406304	24. Ownership: Private	39. Endangered? NO By What?	r Histo	
10. Classification: Building		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known: BURGOON, DAVID L & BRENDA			
11. On National Register? NO		5076 Airbase Road Ashville, OH 43103	40. Chimney Placement: No chimney observed	ame(s)	
13. Part of Established Hist. Dist? 1	NO	26. Property Acreage: 1		): Bu	
15. Other Designation (NR or Local	)	27. Other Surveys: Determined ineligible	41. Distance from & Frontage on Road: 26' from 243' along ROW	ırgoon	
		28. No. of Stories: One and a half story	51. Condition of Property: Good/Fair	Far	
16. Thematic Associations: General Mixed Farm		29. Basement? Yes 30. Foundation Material: Concrete block	52. Historic Outbuildings & Dependencies	в	
17. Date(s) or Period: 17b. Alteration Date(s): c 1925 2003		31. Wall Construction: Balloon/western/alatform frame	AGRICULTURÁL OUTBUILDINGS		
18. Style Class and Design: None No acader	nic style - Vernacular	32. Roof Type:	<u>Date(s)</u> : c.1925-2015		
18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s):		Gable Roof Material: Metal	Associated Activity: Original/Most significant construction		
	.,	33. No. of Bays: 3 Side Bays: 6	53. Affiliated Inventory Number(s):		
19. Architect or Engineer: none		34. Exterior Wall Material(s): Aluminum or vinyl siding	Historic (OHI): Archaeological (OAI):		



8. Site Plan (location map) with North Arrow



6. Specific Address or Location: 5076 Airbase Road

47. Organization: Lawhon and Associates, Inc.

48. Date Recorded: **05/07/2019** 50. PIR Review Date: 1. No. PIC0075704

4. Present Name(s): Burgoon Farm

2. County Pickaway

way 5. Historic or Other Name(s):

Door Selection: Single off center Door Position: Flush Orientation: Lateral axis Symmetry: Bilateral asymmetry

#### Report Associated With Project:

Primary Author	Secondary Author(s)	Year	Title
Sewell, Andrew R.	Brett A. Carmichael, Justin P. Zink	2019	Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Approximately 400 Acres (162 ha) for the Proposed Pickaway County Industrial Park in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio

## 42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features

This simple, Vernacular 1.5-story, side-gabled house was built ca.1900 according to the Pickaway County Auditor, but it first appears on historic mapping in 1925; however, there is about a 50-year-gap between historical maps in which this house could have been built. It has been significantly remodeled and added to in the subsequent years. A 1-story cross-gable wing to the northern (rear) elevation is likely original, but it has been added to with a full-width shed roofed room and screen porch beyond. The entry is centered in the 3-bay façade, flanked by single 1/1 windows, aligned with small sliders above a full-width open porch and tight to the forward eave. The lateral elevations show a single bay in the gable-end, and three bays on the first story in the rearward wing. The chimney (if originally present) has been removed and the roof is clad in new standing seam metal. The cladding is aluminum and the rearward windows include newer vinyl and metal louvered replacements of various sizes.

#### 43. History and Significance

It does not appear that the property is associated with any persons or events significant in history. This altered example of a common type has low integrity.

# 44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52)

The parcel includes two modern outbuildings. An original barn appears to have been demolished.

45. Sources of Information -none-



800 E. 17th Avenue Columbus, OH 43211 614/298-2000

# **OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY**

Section 106/RPR Review: Reviewed

RPR Number: 2018PIC43670

1. No. PIC0075804 NEW	4. Present Name(s): Thompson Farm				
2. County: Pickaway	5. Historic or Other	Name(s):			
6. Specific Address or Location: 5484 Airbase Road		19a. Design Sources: unknown	35. Plan Shape: Rectangular		
		20. Contractor or Builder: unknown	36. Changes associated with 17/17b Dates:	ounty awar	
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number:		21. Building Type or Plan: Bungalow Dormer Front	17. Original/Most significant construction	< .:	
7 City or Village		22. Original Use, if apparent: Single Dwelling	17b.		
Madison (Township of)			37. Window Type(s): 4 over 1	4	
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name: Lockbourne		23. Present Use: Single Dwelling	38. Building Dimensions: 45' wide x 65' deep	. Present or	
Zone: 17 Easting: 336487	Northing: 4406237	24. Ownership: Private	39. Endangered? NO	Hist	
10. Classification: Building 11. On National Register? NO		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known: THOMPSON RANDALL K & THOMPSON CAM A	By What?		
		5484 Airbase Road GROVEPORT OH 43125	40. Chimney Placement: Off center within roo	me(s)	
13. Part of Established Hist. Dist? NO		26. Property Acreage: 59.47	surface	Th	
15. Other Designation (NR or Local)		27. Other Surveys: Determined ineligible	<ul><li>41. Distance from &amp; Frontage on Road:</li><li>38' from 28' along ROW</li></ul>	omps	
		28. No. of Stories: One and a half story	51. Condition of Property: Good/Fair	on Fa	
16. Thematic Associations: General Mixed Farm		29. Basement? Yes 30. Foundation Material: Brick bearing	52. Historic Outbuildings & Dependencies Structure Type(s):	rm	
17. Date(s) or Period:   17b. Alteration Date(s):     1923   18. Style Class and Design:     Element   Craftsman/Arts and Crafts     18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s):		31. Wall Construction: Brick bearing	AGRICULTURÁL OUTBUILDINGS		
		32. Roof Type: Gable Roof Material: Asphalt shingle	<u>Date(s):</u> 1940-2009 <u>Associated Activity:</u> Original/Most significant construction		
		33. No. of Bays: 3 Side Bays: 3	53. Affiliated Inventory Number(s):		
19. Architect or Engineer: none		34. Exterior Wall Material(s): Brick Stretcher or running bond	Archaeological (OAI):	•	



8. Site Plan (location map) with North Arrow



47. Organization: Lawhon and Associates, Inc.

48. Date Recorded: **05/07/2019** 50. PIR Review Date: 2. County Pickaway

kaway 5. Historic or Other Name(s):

Door Selection: Single centered Door Position: Flush Orientation: Lateral axis Symmetry: Bilateral symmetry

#### Report Associated With Project:

Γ	Primary Author	Secondary Author(s)	Year	Title
	Sewell, Andrew R.	Brett A. Carmichael, Justin P. Zink	2019	Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Approximately 400 Acres (162 ha) for the proposed Pickaway County Industrial Park in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio
Γ				

#### 42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features

This 1923 single family dwelling is a 1.5-story example of a Dormer Front Bungalow house type with elements of the Craftsman style (Foster 2004:350; McAlester 2009:453; Gordon 1992:138). Architectural elements include: a steeply pitched gable roof with the front slope of the roof extending down to form the roof of the porch, a front-facing gabled dormer, overhanging eaves, exposed rafter tails, an interior brick chimney, brick wall construction and foundation, and a full-width front porch with integrated brick posts and kneewalls. Alterations to the dwelling include replacement windows (in kind 4/1 vinyl sashes in the dormer), a shed porch addition (north), and a large gable wing addition to the rear (north). The forward facing shed dormer has two sets of triplet windows and is sided with cedar shake. The fenestration inside the porch shows a central entry with divided sidelights flanked by a ribbon of four windows to each side. The windows have three vertical panes in the top third and a large vertical single pane below.

#### 43. History and Significance

It does not appear that the property is associated with any persons or events significant in history. This altered example of a common type has low integrity.

# 44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52)

The parcel includes two modern outbuildings, as well as the residence (c. 1940?) and outbuilding (1973) at 5506 Airbase Road (PIC0076004).

45. Sources of Information -none-



800 E. 17th Avenue Columbus, OH 43211 614/298-2000

# **OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY**

Section 106/RPR Review: Reviewed

RPR Number: 2018PIC43670

1. No. PIC0075904NEW4. Present Name(s): Arnold House				
2. County: Pickaway 5. Historic or Othe		rr Name(s):		
6. Specific Address or Location: 5487 Airbase Rd		19a. Design Sources: unknown	35. Plan Shape: T-shaped	2. Co Pick
		20. Contractor or Builder: unknown	36. Changes associated with 17/17b Dates:	ounty away
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number:		21. Building Type or Plan: Other Building Type	17. Original/Most significant construction	< .:
7. City or Village: Madison (Township of)		22. Original Use, if apparent: School Single Dwelling	17b. Substantial alteration/addition 37. Window Type(s):	
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name: Lockbourne		23. Present Use: Single Dwelling	Modern Replacements 38. Building Dimensions: 38' wide x 28' deep	4. Present o
Zone: 17 Easting: 336494	Northing: 4406191	24. Ownership: Private	39. Endangered? NO	r Histo
10. Classification: Building		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known: ARNOLD JACKIE R 5487 AIRBASE RD	By What?	oric Nam
11. On Pational Register: NO		GROVEPORT OH 43125	40. Chimney Placement: No chimney observe	e(s):
13. Part of Established Hist. Dist? NO		26. Property Acreage: 1.5		An
15. Other Designation (NR or Local)		27. Other Surveys: Determined ineligible	<ul><li>41. Distance from &amp; Frontage on Road:</li><li>40' from 250' along ROW</li></ul>	nold F
		28. No. of Stories: Two story	51. Condition of Property: Good/Fair	louse
16. Thematic Associations: Public Education		29. Basement? Yes 30. Foundation Material: Brick bearing	52. Historic Outbuildings & Dependencies Structure Type(s): Other Barn	
17. Date(s) or Period:     17b       1893     201       18. Style Class and Design:     201	Alteration Date(s): th C	31. Wall Construction: Brick bearing	$\frac{\text{Date}(s)}{2010}$	
Element Neo-Classical Revival		32. Roof Type: Hip Roof Material: Asphalt shingle	Associated Activity: Original/Most significant construction	
		33. No. of Bays: 3 Side Bays: 2	53. Affiliated Inventory Number(s):	
19. Architect or Engineer: unknown		34. Exterior Wall Material(s): Brick Common or American bond	Archaeological (OAI):	$\frac{1}{2}$



8. Site Plan (location map) with North Arrow



6. Specific Address or Location: 5487 Airbase Rd

47. Organization: Lawhon and Associates, Inc.

48. Date Recorded: **05/07/2019** 50. PIR Review Date: 1. No. PIC0075904

4. Present Name(s): Arnold House

2. County Pickaway

5. Historic or Other Name(s):

Door Selection: Altered Door Position: Altered Orientation: Multiple facade orientation Symmetry: Bilateral symmetry

#### Report Associated With Project:

Primary Author	Secondary Author(s)	Year	Title
Sewell, Andrew R.	Brett A. Carmichael, Justin P. Zink	2019	Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Approximately 400 Acres (162 ha) for the proposed Pickaway County Industrial Park in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio

#### 42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features

This 1893 single family dwelling is a 2-story rectangular building with a T-plan and elements of Neoclassical styling (Foster 2004:294; McAlester 2009:343; Gordon 1992:99). Architectural elements include: a hipped roof with a full a colossal (gabled) front portico, symmetrical fenestration, a 3-bay façade with 2-bay lateral elevations, brick wall construction, and a cut limestone foundation. The building has had several alterations including: replacement windows (all), removal of original chimneys, replacement of original porch columns, replacement siding (vinyl and hardieboard) across most of the façade (north) and porch tympanum, removal of all classical orders, and a 1-story rear addition (south). There is a school indicated on the 1871 map near this location, but on the north side of what became Airbase Road. The1925 USGS map shows a school on the south side of the road, which indicates that the original school was likely replaced. However, in 1955, the building is shown as an empty square, which typically indicates a large outbuilding, but may instead indicate that the building was abandoned. It is possible this building is the old school. While it is not listed on the *Old Ohio Schools* website in the Pickaway County section, there are several district schools that have the same basic form as this building (Turner 2019).

#### 43. History and Significance

It does not appear that the property is associated with any persons or events significant in history. This highly altered example of a relatively common type has very low integrity.

#### 44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52)

The parcel includes a modern pole barn (2010) which may serve as automotive repair business space.

45. Sources of Information

-none-
ATTACHMENT F PHASE I ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY: ADDENDUM FOR THE RICKENBACKER GLOBAL LOGISTICS PARK, CARGO CAMPUS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT IN MADISON TOWNSHIP, PICKAWAY COUNTY, OHIO

# Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio

By

Dawn Walter Gagliano, MA



CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio

By

Dawn Walter Gagliano, MA

Submitted By: Kevin Schwarz Project Manager ASC Group, Inc. 800 Freeway Drive North, Suite 101 Columbus, Ohio 43229 614.268.2514

Submitted To: Chris Sandfoss Landrum & Brown, Inc. 4445 Lake Forest Drive, Suite 700 Cincinnati, Ohio 45242 513.530.5333

Lead Agency: Federal Aviation Administration

September 8, 2020

# ABSTRACT

ASC Group, Inc., under contract with Landrum & Brown, Inc. has completed an addendum Phase I archaeological survey to accompany the Section 106 Project Summary Form for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment project in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio in July 2020. A 3.6 hectare (ha) [9.1 acre (ac)] parcel was investigated as part of the addendum Phase I survey.

There are various disturbances in the southern and eastern parts of this parcel, including disturbance associated with a golf course clubhouse and a driving range, which has been demolished prior to Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) ownership. Also, the golf course landscaping introduced some disturbance, including the construction of a pond. The parcel includes the former Landings at Rickenbacker Golf Course that was privately owned and operated before the golf course was closed and the property was acquired by the CRAA in 2015. In the northern portion of the 3.6 ha (9.1 ac) parcel, there is less evidence of disturbance, but there was a water treatment plant and another pond evident on aerial imagery dating back to 2003. Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) mapping shows evidence of soil berms and other earth moving. In the northern and northwest portions, approximately 0.61 ha (1.5 ac) of relatively undisturbed land was identified, which was formerly farmland and the former fringe of the golf facility. These areas were subjected to a Phase I archaeological survey with spot disturbance assessment of areas to the east and south.

Four survey areas were delineated for Phase I survey and subject to investigation. The remaining project area parcel was subject to visual inspection and a walk over. Area 1 was surface collected; while Areas 2–4 were shovel tested. One auger was placed in Area 2 to determine the depth of the disturbance and evaluate if any intact soils remained below the disturbance. The soils in Areas 2–4 are heavily disturbed. No cultural materials were encountered. Area 1 had good surface visibility at the time of the survey; however, no cultural materials were encountered. The remaining portion of the project area was heavily disturbed.

No further work is recommended for this parcel.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	iii
LIST OF PLATES	iii
INTRODUCTION Research Goals Background Research	1 2 3
Literature Review Update	
Archaeological Field Methods	
RESULTS	
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
REFERENCES	
FIGURES	
PLATES	

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Portions of the ODOT Franklin and Pickaway counties highway map showing the vicinity of the proposed project parcel
Figure 2.	Portion of the 1992 Lockbourne, Ohio quadrangle (USGS 7.5' topographic map) showing proposed project
Figure 3.	Portion of the 1992 Lockbourne, Ohio quadrangle (USGS 7.5' topographic map) showing the previous cultural resource investigations and previously inventoried cultural resources within and adjacent to the project area
Figure 4.	LiDAR mapping of the project area showing the areas of disturbance within the parcel
Figure 5.	Aerial photograph detailing the archaeological survey and keyed to the plates 17

# LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1.	Overview of the corn field in Area 1, looking southwest 19
Plate 2.	View of the surface visibility in Area 1, looking south
Plate 3.	Overview of Area 2, looking northeast
Plate 4.	View of the vegetation in Area 2, looking east
Plate 5.	View of Area 3, looking north
Plate 6.	Overview of Area 4, looking south
Plate 7.	Overview of the project area, looking west
Plate 8.	View of the project area, looking north
Plate 9.	View of the project area, looking northwest from the southeastern corner along Air Base Road/Wright Road (an interior perimeter road)
Plate 10.	View along Air Base Road/Wright Road (an interior perimeter road), looking west.

### INTRODUCTION

ASC Group, Inc. (ASC), under contract with Landrum & Brown, Inc. has completed an addendum Phase I archaeological survey to accompany the Section 106 Project Summary Form for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP), Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment completed by Douglas Terpstra (2020). The project would be located on land that is owned by the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA). The project location is south of the Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK) in Madison Township, Pickaway County in the southeastern portion of the CRAA property (Figures 1 and 2).

The Proposed Action consists of the development of five commercial bulk distribution warehouses, as well as an extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 133.5-hectare (ha) [330-acre (ac)] site located south of LCK. The Proposed Action includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 133.5 ha (330 ac) in size and is located south of RGLP;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases 3b and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouses totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.

CRAA is proposing an expansion of warehouse facilities at the RGLP on the border of Franklin and Pickaway counties, Ohio. Most of this 133.5-ha (330-ac) area needed for the warehouse facilities was surveyed previously for archaeology at the Phase I level by ASC in 2005, but a rectangular 4.5-ha (11.3-ac) area was not surveyed (Hillen et al. 2005). The parcel includes the former Landings at Rickenbacker Golf Course that was privately owned and operated before the golf course was closed and the property was acquired by the CRAA in 2015.

However, in 2019, ASC surveyed a 0.89-ha (2.2-ac) portion of this area for a laydown yard for a sanitary subtrunk sewer line installation (Aukeman and Schwarz 2019a, 2019b). Thus, currently there are 3.6 ha (9.1 ac) needing to be cleared by the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) prior to the construction of the logistics park.

There are various disturbances in the southern and eastern parts of this parcel, including disturbance associated with a golf course clubhouse, which has been demolished, and a driving range. The golf course landscaping introduced some disturbance and there is a pond. The parcel includes the former Landings at Rickenbacker Golf Course that was privately owned and operated before the golf course was closed and the property was acquired by the CRAA in 2015. In the northern portion of the 3.6 ha (9.1 ac) parcel, there is less evidence of disturbance, but there was a water treatment plant and another pond. Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) mapping shows evidence of soil berms and other earth moving. In the northern and northwest portions, approximately 0.61 ha (1.5 ac) of relatively undisturbed land was identified, which was formerly farmland and the former fringe of the golf facility. These areas were subjected to a Phase I archaeological survey with spot disturbance assessment of areas to the east and south. Today these areas are grassy. A fairly substantial prehistoric archaeological site (33PI757) is located 19.8 meters (m) [65-feet (ft)] to the north, and a Phase II archaeological investigation was completed at the site in 2007 (Hillen et al. 2007).

The purpose of this investigation is to provide information for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The survey was completed in accordance with *Archeology and Historic Preservation; Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines* (Federal Register 1983). The federal standards are supplemented by the SHPO (1994) *Archaeology Guidelines*. The goals of this survey were to identify and document all archaeological resources in the project area and to determine if any of the identified resources might be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The evaluation of eligibility followed the NRHP criteria for evaluation (Andrus 1997).

An updated literature review was conducted for this project. Dawn Walter Gagliano, Eric Aukeman, and Marie Swartz completed the fieldwork on July 29, 2020. Kevin Schwarz, PhD, RPA, served as the principal investigator and project manager. This report outlines the methods and results of this Phase I cultural resources survey.

# **RESEARCH GOALS**

The primary goal of this Phase I archaeological survey is the location and identification of archaeological resources in the study area and, if possible, to recommend a determination as to their eligibility for inclusion on the NRHP. As such, it is difficult to link the Phase I study with an explicit research design outside of the basic goals of anthropological and historical research. These

goals include the construction of cultural chronologies, the reconstruction of past lifeways, and the search for the processes of cultural change.

# **BACKGROUND RESEARCH**

Before an effective cultural resources survey can be conducted, it is necessary to have an understanding of the environmental setting, the prehistory and history within that environment, and any previous research in the region. With this information it is possible to develop a framework for understanding the prehistoric and early historic settlement patterns in the region. This may be utilized to guide fieldwork and the interpretation of any cultural remains that might be encountered, and to preliminarily evaluate their NRHP eligibility.

A detailed cultural history of the area has been adequately presented in numerous Phase I reports and will not be presented in this addendum document (Aukeman and Schwarz 2019a, 2019b; Walter Gagliano 2020). A series of literature reviews have been conducted for numerous development projects adjacent to the current project area (Aukeman and Schwarz 2019a, 2019b; Terpstra 2020; Walter Gagliano 2020) and will be summarized below.

# LITERATURE REVIEW UPDATE

The following information is adapted from Aukeman and Schwarz 2019a, 2019b; Terpstra 2020; and Walter Gagliano 2020. The original literature review consisted of checking the following records pertaining to Franklin and Pickaway counties at SHPO and Ohio History Connection (OHC): National Historic Landmark (NHL) listings, NRHP listings, NRHP nomination form files, NRHP determination of eligibility files, *Archeological Atlas of Ohio* (Mills 1914), United States Geological Survey (USGS) 15' topographic maps, and USGS 7.5' topographic maps.

Historical maps and cemetery records pertaining to Pickaway County were checked at the Archives-Library, OHC. The literature review update consisted of checking the SHPO on-line Geographic Information Systems (GIS) website. These websites were used to identify any of the following types of resources that might be within the vicinity of the study area: the locations of NHL; historic properties listed in the NRHP, determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, and delisted from the NRHP; properties that have received federal and/or state historic rehabilitation tax credits; archaeological sites and architectural history resources included in the Ohio Archaeological Inventory (OAI) and Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI), respectively; dams; cemeteries recorded by the Ohio Genealogical Society (Troutman 2003); areas previously

surveyed for cultural resources pursuant to the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, state law, and other cultural resources management activities; and historic bridges.

Many previous surveys and cultural resources have been recorded near the project. No NHL or historic bridges are in the immediate vicinity of the project. Of the hundreds of sites in Franklin and Pickaway counties recorded by Mills (1914) along the Scioto River and Walnut Creek, the only one near the study area is a mound located about 0.8 km (0.5 mi) south of Air Base Road in the southwestern corner of Section 17.

There are 42 archaeological sites recorded within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the parcel (Figure 3). While none are within the current project area, 33PI757 is located approximately 19 m (65 ft) to the north.

Nine previous Phase I cultural resources surveys are documented within the literature review area: Aukeman and Schwarz (2019a, 2019b), Hillen and Bankowitz (2004), Hillen et al. 2005, 2007), Schwarz (2008), Sewell et al. (2019), Terpstra (2020), and Walter Gagliano (2020) [Figure 3].

Aukeman and Schwarz (2019a, 2019b) completed two surveys for a sanitary sewer expansion project south of the RGLP. The surveys identified 12 archaeological sites, none of which were deemed to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Hillen and Bankowitz (2004) completed a cultural resources survey to the southwest of the current project area that documented four archaeological sites and four architectural properties, none of which were deemed eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Hillen et al. (2005) was a survey for development areas to the north, east, and west of this project area that documented 35 archaeological sites and 17 architectural history properties. Further work was recommended at three of the prehistoric archaeological sites (33PI757, 33PI767, and 33PI770) if they could not be avoided by the project; the rest of documented cultural resources were not deemed eligible for inclusion in the NRHP (Hillen et al. 2005). Hillen et al. (2007) completed a Phase II survey for 33PI757, which they recommended be determined not eligible for the NRHP. Ohio SHPO concurred with ASC's eligibility recommendation for 33PI757.

Sewell et al. (2019) conducted a cultural resource survey for the proposed Pickaway County Industrial Park. The project area for this survey is located mostly south of the former golf course. The Area of Potential Effects (APE) for above-ground structures in the Sewell et al. (2019) study extends north to include buildings along Air Base Road, including three near the present project: PIC-757-4 through PIC-759-4. These three resources are not shown on Figure 3, which focuses on archaeological sites. No history/architecture resources recorded by Sewell et al. (2019) were recommended as eligible for the NRHP.

Schwarz (2008) completed a Phase I archaeological survey on Columbus Regional Airport Authority property at RGLP for the Industrial Development Opportunity Area (IDO) 4 in Harrison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. The project investigated approximately 4.2 ha (10.2 ac) and identified one archaeological site: 33PI960, a small historic scatter. The site was determined ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP and no further work was recommended.

Terpstra (2020) completed a SHPO scoping request form, that this report is an addendum to, who concluded that no further cultural resources investigation of the APE is recommended.

Walter Gagliano (2020) completed a Phase I archaeological survey for a proposed perimeter access road within the LCK grounds. Two sites were documented, none of which were deemed eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Examination of historic USGS topographic maps show that the project area has previously had sparse aboveground development other than resources related to Lockbourne Air Force Base (AFB). The 1925 East Columbus, Ohio quadrangle (USGS 15' topographic map) shows buildings north, west, and south of the project area that were removed during the development of Lockbourne AFB beginning in the 1940s. East of the project area, three buildings are depicted at the south bend in London Lancaster Road, none of which are extant today. There are three properties (PIC-757-4 through PIC-759-4) along Air Base Road that were recorded in the OHI by Sewell et al. (2019). The 1964 Lockbourne, Ohio quadrangle (USGS 7.5' topographic map) shows roads, buildings, and structures associated with Lockbourne AFB. Two farmsteads are depicted at the south bend in London Lancaster Road, neither of which are extant today, although the barn from one of the properties may now be part of a later property. No buildings are depicted along the eastern side of London Lancaster Road or along the road extending east from its south bend. No additional properties were present along Air Base Road. Detailed historic USGS mapping can be found in Terpstra (2020).

The first Euroamerican burial made in Madison Township (Ohio Genealogical Society Identification [OGSID] 9513) is reportedly located in the center of Section 17 and depicted in the SHPO GIS database along the south side of Air Base Road near the eastern end of the project area

(Figure 3). The grave location is unknown and the burial condition is listed as one. It is labeled as "First Cemetery" on Figure 3.

#### **METHODS**

#### **ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD METHODS**

Four methods of investigation were utilized during the Phase I archaeological survey: visual inspection, shovel test pit (STP) excavation, auger testing, and surface collection. All survey areas were entirely visually inspected to identify readily visible archaeological resources, such as mounds, earthworks, and building or structure remnants, and to identify areas of disturbance. Visual inspection, as the name implies, is a visual examination of areas.

Surface collection was performed in areas that yielded greater than 50 percent surface visibility. Areas subjected to surface collection were traversed at 5-m (16.4-ft) intervals while the surface was carefully examined for cultural material. Surface collection was performed in Area 1.

Auger testing was conducted in those areas having a potential for buried archaeological deposits. An 8.8-centimeter (cm) [3.5-inch (in)] screw type auger is utilized to test the alluvium as deeply as possible. Soils are examined for color, texture, structure, and artifact content. Soils recovered from the auger are screened through 0.64-cm (0.25-in) hardware cloth. Auger testing was conducted in Area 2 only.

STP excavation is a subsurface testing strategy utilized to determine the presence of archaeological resources in relatively level areas where the surface visibility is less than 50 percent. Typically, STPs are excavated 15 m (50 ft) apart. However, for the current project, due to the high level of previous ground disturbance, the interval was increased to 30-m (98-ft) intervals. STPs are 50-cm (20-in) squares and are typically excavated to a minimum depth of 5 cm (2 in) into the subsoil, but do not usually exceed a depth of 50 cm (20in). Soil from the STPs is screened through 0.64-cm (0.25-in) hardware cloth to facilitate the recovery of artifacts. In all instances, the STPs were placed at the discretion of the supervising archaeologist based on lot lines and buildings depicted on historic mapping. Notes are taken on each STP, to record soil characteristics and whether cultural material is present. STP excavations were conducted in Areas 2–4.

Additional field notes are kept to record information including field conditions, methods of investigation, locations of STPs, sites, features, etc. Similar notes are kept for each site to record field conditions, landforms, methods of investigation, site characteristics, photograph numbers,

etc. Photographs of the sites, excavation units, and survey areas are taken as deemed appropriate. A record of the photographs is kept in a photo log. The locations where STPs are excavated and various landmarks, etc., are recorded using a Trimble GeoXT Global Positioning System (GPS) unit.

#### RESULTS

#### **SURVEY RESULTS**

The overall acreage of the current project area was visually inspected. The area is currently overgrown with tall weeds offering very limited surface visibility. Based on the LiDAR data, four areas were identified as possibly having intact soils and the potential to yield cultural materials (Figure 4). The northwestern corner of the current project area is also in close proximity to 33PI757, a large prehistoric site located 19.8 m (65.0 ft) to the north. The remainder of the parcel appears to be heavily disturbed by historic and modern disturbances.

The project area was divided into four survey areas (Areas 1–4) based on available LiDAR and aerial imagery (Figure 4). Area 1 was visually inspected and surface collected; while Areas 2–4 were visually inspected and shovel tested. Auger testing occurred in Area 2 only (Figure 5).

Soils in the vicinity are part of the Crosby-Kokomo-Celina Association with Kokomo silt clay loam making up the majority of the project area, and a small part of the western portion of the project area consisting of Crosby silt loam (United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service 1980).

Area 1 is small triangular section in the northwestern corner of the project area and consists of a corn field with 80 percent surface visibility (Figure 5; Plates 1–2). Due to the high surface visibility, the corn field was surface collected at a 5-m (16.4-ft) interval. No cultural materials were found in Area 1.

Area 2 is a section along the northern end of the project area boundary and adjacent to the corn field (Figure 5; Plates 3–4). This section for the project area is approximately 19 m (65 ft) south of site 33PI757, a Paleoinidan/Early Archaic camp. The area was investigated through STP excavation and auger testing. Due to the disturbed condition of the soils in this area, six STPs were excavated across the area at 30-m (98-ft) intervals. A generalized soil profile for Area 2 consists of a 0-35 cm (0-13 in) layer of mottled brown (10YR 5/3) silt loam with dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) compact silt loam over a mottled yellowish brown (10YR 5/6) silt loam with very dark

brown (10YR 2/2) compact redox silt loam. An auger test was placed in the base of STP T1 U3. The STP was excavated to a depth of 50 cm (20 in) below the ground surface, then the auger was used to investigate soils to a depth of 1 m (3 ft). The soils in the auger consisted of a mottled yellowish brown (10YR 5/6) silt loam with very dark brown (10YR 2/2) compact silt loam to a depth of 70 cm (27 in), then transition to a yellowish brown (10YR 5/6) sandy silt loam to the depth of 1 m (3 ft). No intact paleosols or cultural materials were encountered in the auger test. No cultural materials were found in Area 2.

Areas 3 and 4 are along the northwestern edge of the project area, adjacent to the edge of the corn field (Figure 5; Plates 5–6). These areas are covered with dense weeds, thistles, and brambles, often indicative of disturbed soils. The visual inspection of Areas 3 and 4 showed numerous piles of pushed soils and gravel. The terrain was severely rutted and small exposed patches of soil showed mottled soils on the surface mixed with rocks and gravel. Shovel testing in Areas 3 and 4 indicated that the soils in these two sections are heavily disturbed. A generalized soil profile for Areas 3 and 4 consists of a 0–35 cm (0–13 in) layer of mottled brown (10YR 5/3) silt loam with dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) compact silt loam over a mottled yellowish brown (10YR 5/6) silt loam with very dark brown (10YR 2/2) compact redox silt loam. No cultural materials were found in Areas 3 or 4.

The remainder of the overall project area was subject to visual inspection and a walk over (Figure 5; Plates 7–10). The areas contained two former pond locations with 70 percent surface visibility that had patches of soil that showed mottled soils on the surface mixed with rocks and gravel. The overall project area contained many push piles and evidence of prior ground disturbances. A review of aerial images on Google Earth indicates that the project area was heavily disturbed due to the golf course clubhouse construction and the installation of septic facilities dating back to at least 1994.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CRAA is proposing an expansion of warehouse facilities at the RGLP on the border of Franklin and Pickaway counties, Ohio. ASC has completed an addendum Phase I archaeological survey for the proposed development in the area.

The project area is adjacent to the previously surveyed IDO Area 4 (Hillen et al. 2005). Most of this 133.5-ha (330-ac) area needed for the warehouse facilities was surveyed previously for archaeology at the Phase I level by ASC in 2005, but a rectangular 4.5 ha (11.3-ac) area was not surveyed. In 2019, ASC surveyed a 0.89 ha (2.2-ac) portion of this area for a laydown yard for a sanitary subtrunk sewer line installation (Aukeman and Schwarz 2019a, 2019b). There are 3.6 ha (9.1 ac) needing to be cleared by the SHPO prior to the construction of the logistics park.

There are various disturbances in the southern and eastern parts of this parcel, including disturbance associated with a golf course clubhouse, which has been demolished, and a driving range. Also, the golf course landscaping introduced some disturbance, including the construction of a pond. In the northern portion of the 3.6 ha (9.1 ac) parcel, there is less evidence of disturbance, but there was a water treatment plant and another pond evident on aerial imagery dating back to 2003. LiDAR mapping shows evidence of soil berms and other earth moving. In the northern and northwest portions, approximately 0.6 ha (1.5 ac) of relatively undisturbed land were identified, which was formerly farmland and the former fringe of the golf facility. These areas were subjected to a Phase I archaeological survey with spot disturbance assessment of areas to the east and south. Today these areas are grassy.

The investigations described above were conducted in response to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The goals of this investigation were to determine whether archaeological or other cultural resources exist within the project area and, if possible, to determine whether any identified resources meet the NRHP criteria for evaluation.

Four survey areas were delineated for Phase I survey and subject to investigation. The remaining project area parcel was subject to visual inspection and a walk over. Area 1 was surface collected; while Areas 2–4 were shovel tested. One auger was placed in Area 2 to determine the depth of the disturbance and evaluate if any intact soils remained below the disturbance. The soils in Areas 2–4 are heavily disturbed. No cultural materials were encountered. Area 1 had good surface visibility at the time of the survey; however, no cultural materials were encountered. The remaining portion of the project area was heavily disturbed from modern earthmoving activities. No further work is recommended for this parcel.

# REFERENCES

#### Andrus, Patrick W.

1997 *How to Apply the National Register Criteria of Evaluation*, edited by R. H. Shrimpton. Revised ed. National Register Bulletin No. 15. Interagency Resources Division, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

### Aukeman, Eric, and Kevin R. Schwarz

2019a Phase I Archaeological Survey for Phase I of the Rickenbacker Intermodal Sanitary Subtrunk Extension Project in Harrison and Madison Townships, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to Prime AE Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

2019b Phase I Archaeological Survey for Phase II of the Rickenbacker Intermodal Sanitary Subtrunk Extension Project in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to Prime AE Group, Inc., Columbus. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Federal Register

1983 Archeology and Historic Preservation; Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, Pt IV, Vol. 48, No. 190. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

#### Hillen, Luella Beth, and Rachel Bankowitz

2004 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Rickenbacker International Airport in Madison and Harrison Townships, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to TranSystems, Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

#### Hillen, Luella Beth, Rachel Bankowitz, and Donald Miller

2005 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Industrial Development Opportunity Areas 3 and 4 at Rickenbacker International Airport in Hamilton and Madison Townships, Franklin County, and Harrison and Madison Townships, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to TranSystems, Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

# Hillen, Luella Beth, Kevin Gibbs, and Erica L. Schneider

2007 Phase II Evaluation of 33PI757 in Industrial Development Opportunity Area 4 at Rickenbacker International Airport in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to TranSystems, Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

# Mills, William C.

1914 Archeological Atlas of Ohio. Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society. Fred J. Heer, Columbus, Ohio.

Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO)

1994 Archaeology Guidelines. Ohio Historical Society, Columbus.

# Schwarz, Kevin R.

2008 Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Industrial Development Opportunity Area 4 at Rickenbacker International Airport in Harrison Township, Pickaway, County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to TranSystems, Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

# Sewell, Andrew R., Brett A. Carmichael, and Justin P. Zink

2019 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Approximately 400 Acres (162 ha) for the Proposed Pickaway County Industrial Park in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. Lawhon & Associates, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Submitted to Hull & Associates, Inc., Dublin, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

# Terpstra, Douglas

2020 Section 106 Project Summary Form Supporting Information for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Franklin County and Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Landrum & Brown, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus.

# Troutman, K. Roger (editor)

2003 Ohio Cemeteries: 1803–2003. Ohio Genealogical Society, Mansfield.

# United States Department of Agriculture-Soil Conservation Service (USDA, SCS)

1980 *Soil Survey of Pickaway County, Ohio.* USDA Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Lands and Soil, and the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

# Walter Gagliano, Dawn

2020 Phase I Archaeological Survey for Airfield Improvements for the Rickenbacker International Airport Access Road Project in Hamilton and Madison Townships, Franklin County and Harrison and Madison Townships, Pickaway County, Ohio. ASC Group, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. Landrum & Brown, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio. Copies on file at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus. FIGURES









Created by TMD, JVT; last saved: 8/11/2020 1:54:22 PM





16

Created by TMD; last saved: 8/11/2020 11:23:57 AM



17

PLATES



Plate 1. Overview of the corn field in Area 1, looking southwest.



Plate 2. View of the surface visibility in Area 1, looking south.



Plate 3. Overview of Area 2, looking northeast.



Plate 4. View of the vegetation in Area 2, looking east.



Plate 5. View of Area 3, looking north.



Plate 6. Overview of Area 4, looking south.



Plate 7. Overview of the project area, looking west.



Plate 8. View of the project area, looking north.



Plate 9. View of the project area, looking northwest from the southeastern corner along Air Base Road/Wright Road (an interior perimeter road).



Plate 10. View along Air Base Road/Wright Road (an interior perimeter road), looking west.

Letter from SHPO to FAA with Concurrence of Finding of 'No Effect on Historic Properties' (dated October 26, 2020)


October 26, 2020

In reply, please refer to: 2020-FRA-49574

Ernest P. Gubry Federal Aviation Administration Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Suite 107 Romulus, Michigan 48174

### RE: Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Madison Township, Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio

Dear Mr. Gubry:

This letter is in response to correspondence received on September 24, 2020. Our comments are made pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and the associated regulations at 36 CFR Part 800.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. The project is being proposed by the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) and requires Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) consent to convert airport-dedicated property to non-aeronautical, revenue-producing purposes.

The following comments pertain to the *Phase I Archaeological Survey: Addendum for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio* (ASC Group, Inc.) (ASC) (2020). A literature review, visual inspection, and shovel test unit excavation were completed as part of the investigations. The current investigations did not result in the identification of any cultural materials. No additional investigation is necessary.

The following comments pertain to the Section 106 Project Summary Form Supporting Information for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Cargo Campus Environmental Assessment in Madison Township, Franklin County, and Madison Township, Pickaway County, Ohio (ASC) (2020). A literature review and field survey were completed as part of the investigations. Four properties with a house or outbuilding fifty years of age or older were newly recorded to the Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI). Additionally, three previously recorded OHI properties were assessed for eligibility. It is ASC's recommendation that the properties identified in the report are not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Our office agrees with ASC's recommendations regarding eligibility.

Based on the information provided, our office concurs with your finding that the project as proposed will have no effect on historic properties. No further coordination with this office is necessary, unless the project changes.

October 26, 2020 Ernest P. Gubry Page 2

If you have any questions, please contact me at jwilliams@ohiohistory.org. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joy Williams, Project Reviews Manager Resource Protection and Review

"Please be advised that this is a Section 106 decision. This review decision may not extend to other SHPO programs." RPR Serial No: 1085666

# **OHIO HISTORY CONNECTION** 800 E. 17th Ave., Columbus, OH 43211-2474 • 614.297.2300 • ohiohistory.org

**Response from Native American Tribe** 

# Miami Tribe of Oklahoma



3410 P St. NW, Miami, OK 74354 ● P.O. Box 1326, Miami, OK 74355 Ph: (918) 541-1300 ● Fax: (918) 542-7260 www.miamination.com



Via email: Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov

January 6, 2021

Ernest Gubry Detroit Airports District Office Metro Airport Center 11677 South Wayne Road, Ste. 107 Romulus, MI 48174

Re: Cargo Campus Development at Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, Franklin & Pickaway Counties, Ohio – Comments of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma

Dear Mr. Gubry:

Aya, kikwehsitoole – I show you respect. The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, a federally recognized Indian tribe with a Constitution ratified in 1939 under the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of 1936, respectfully submits the following comments regarding Cargo Campus Development at Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park in Franklin & Pickaway Counties, Ohio.

The Miami Tribe offers no objection to the above-referenced project at this time, as we are not currently aware of existing documentation directly linking a specific Miami cultural or historic site to the project site. However, given the Miami Tribe's deep and enduring relationship to its historic lands and cultural property within present-day Ohio, if any human remains or Native American cultural items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) or archaeological evidence is discovered during any phase of this project, the Miami Tribe requests immediate consultation with the entity of jurisdiction for the location of discovery. In such a case, please contact me at 918-541-8966 or by email at dhunter@miamination.com to initiate consultation.

The Miami Tribe accepts the invitation to serve as a consulting party to the proposed project. In my capacity as Tribal Historic Preservation Officer I am the point of contact for consultation.

Respectfully,

Diane Hunter

Diane Hunter Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

### Cummins-Sanchez, Guadalupe (FAA)

From:	Cummins-Sanchez, Guadalupe (FAA)
Sent:	Friday, June 25, 2021 4:20 PM
To:	dhunter@miamination.com
Subject:	Cargo Campus Development at Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park - EA
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

Ms. Hunter,

I am following up to my call this afternoon. I am contacting you in regards to the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park, in Columbus, Ohio.

The FAA received your letter January 6, 2021 stating no objection to the proposed project. During project scoping, the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) also concurred with the FAA's finding the proposed project will have no effects on historic properties.

A letter dated March 18, 2021 was sent to you by Landrum & Brown informing you of the availability of the Draft EA, which was available for public review from March 19 to April 20, 2021. A public virtual workshop was held on April 20, 2021. I apologize for not informing you directly of that project milestone.

I wanted to confirm whether you had further comments and ask if you would like the FAA to provide a link to the electronic copy of the Final EA at the time of final FAA decision.

Please let me know any comments you may have by July 2, 2021.

Regards,

Guadalupe Cummins Environmental Protection Specialist

FAA Detroit Airports District Office 11677 S. Wayne Road, Suite 107 Romulus, MI 48174

(during telework)

# Appendix D – Water Resources

This appendix contains a copy of the Jurisdictional Determination and coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to obtain permitting in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

A wetland delineation field survey was conducted at the Proposed Action in 2015 and updated in 2019. A Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report and request for Jurisdictional Determination (JD) was submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in December 2019. The USACE issued a JD on January 21, 2020. The Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR), which revised previous guidance by which USACE determines the jurisdictional status of streams and wetlands, became effective on June 22, 2020. Therefore, additional coordination was conducted with the USACE to determine jurisdictional status of the wetlands and streams within the Proposed Action site. The following pages contains the following documentation:

- Jurisdictional Determination dated January 21, 2020
- Request for early scoping comments on the EA dated August 13, 2020
- Response to request for scoping comments dated September 3, 2020
- Request for an updated JD (with revisions to the Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report based on the June 2020 NWPR guidelines) dated May 17, 2021

**Jurisdictional Determination** 



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY HUNTINGTON DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS 502 EIGHTH STREET HUNTINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA 25701-2070

January 21, 2020

Regulatory Division North Branch LRH-2019-990-SCR-UNT Walnut Creek

#### APPROVED AND PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATIONS

Mr. Mark Kelby Columbus Regional Airport Authority 4600 International Gateway Columbus, Ohio 43219

Dear Mr. Kelby:

I refer to the *Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report Rickenbacker – Air Cargo Campus, Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio* dated November 2019, submitted on your behalf by TranSystems, and received in this office on December 23, 2019 with additional information received on December 26, 2019. You have requested a preliminary jurisdictional determination (JD) for the potential jurisdictional aquatic resources and an approved JD for the potential non-jurisdictional features on the approximately 329-acre site located southeast of the Rickenbacker International Airport in Lockbourne, Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio at approximately 39.797414 latitude, -82.925231 longitude. Your JD request has been assigned the following file number: LRH-2019-990-SCR-UNT Walnut Creek. Please reference this number on all future correspondence related to this JD request.

The United States Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) authority to regulate waters of the United States is based on the definitions and limits of jurisdiction contained in 33 CFR 328 and 33 CFR 329. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Section 404) requires a Department of the Army (DA) permit be obtained prior to discharging dredged and/or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands. Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (Section 10) requires a DA permit be obtained for any work in, on, over or under a navigable water.

#### Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination

Based upon a review of the information provided, this office has determined 0.83 acre of two (2) emergent wetlands (Wetland-2 NEW and 2019 Wetland 2), 1.82 acres of three (3) forested wetlands (Wetland-1 NEW, Wetland BK, and Wetland CM), 2,510 linear feet of three (3) ephemeral streams (Streams 35-37), 1,992 linear feet of one (1) intermittent stream (Stream 39), and 5,433 linear feet of three (3) perennial streams (Streams 20, 31, and 34) are located within the 329-acre site. The aquatic resources identified above and on the enclosed preliminary JD

form may be waters of the United States in accordance with the Regulatory Guidance Letter for JDs issued by the Corps on October 31, 2016 (Regulatory Guidance Letter No. 16-01). As indicated in the guidance, this preliminary JD is non-binding and cannot be appealed (33 CFR 331.2), and only provides a written indication that waters of the United States, including wetlands, may be present on-site.

You have declined to exercise the option to obtain an approved JD in this instance and at this time for the above aquatic resources. However, for the purposes of the determination of impacts, compensatory mitigation, and other resource protection measures for activities that require authorization from this office, the above aquatic resources will be evaluated as if they are waters of the United States.

Enclosed please find two (2) copies of the preliminary JD. If you agree with the findings of this preliminary JD and understand your options regarding the same, please sign and date one (1) copy of the preliminary JD form and return it to this office within 30 days of receipt of this letter. You should submit the signed copy to the following address:

United States Army Corps of Engineers Huntington District Attn: North Branch 502 Eighth Street Huntington, West Virginia 25701

#### **Approved Jurisdictional Determination**

Our December 2, 2008 headquarters guidance entitled *Clean Water Act Jurisdiction Following the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in <u>Rapanos v. United States</u> & <u>Carabell v. United</u> <u>States</u> was followed in the final verification of Section 404 jurisdiction. Based on a review of the information provided and other information available to us, 2019 Wetland 1 (0.07 acre), 2019 Wetland 3 (0.04 acre), Wetland 3-NEW (0.03 acre), Wetland CL (0.59 acre), Wetland CO (0.72 acre), and Wetland CQ (0.52 acre) are surrounded by uplands and do not exhibit a distinct surface water connection to a water of the United States. Additionally, 2019 Wetland 1, 2019 Wetland 3, Wetland 3-NEW, Wetland CL, Wetland CO, and Wetland CQ would not support interstate or foreign commerce interests, nor do they contain any rare or endangered species. Therefore, 2019 Wetland 1, 2019 Wetland 3, Wetland 3-NEW, Wetland CL, Wetland CO, and Wetland CQ are not jurisdictional waters of the United States and are not subject to regulation under Section 404. However, you should contact the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Surface Water, at (614) 664-2001 to determine state permit requirements.* 

In accordance with the June 5, 2007 Joint Memorandum between the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Corps and the January 28, 2008 Corps Memorandum regarding coordination on jurisdictional determinations, this isolated wetland determination was coordinated with the USEPA Region 5 and the Corps Headquarters, with coordination completed on January 14, 2020. This jurisdictional verification is valid for a period of five (5) years from the date of this letter unless new information warrants revision of the delineation prior to the expiration date. This letter contains an approved JD for the subject site within the approved JD boundary. If you object to this determination, you may request an administrative appeal under Corps regulations at 33 CFR 331. Enclosed you will find a Notification of Appeal Process (NAP) fact sheet and Request for Appeal (RFA) form. If you request to appeal this determination you must submit a completed RFA form to the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division Office at the following address:

Appeal Review Officer United States Army Corps of Engineers Great Lakes and Ohio River Division 550 Main Street, Room 10524 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-3222 Phone: (513) 684-2699 Fax: (513) 684-2460

In order for an RFA to be accepted by the Corps, the Corps must determine that it is complete, that it meets the criteria for appeal under 33 CFR 331.5, and that it has been received by the Division Office within 60 days of the date of the NAP. Should you decide to submit an RFA form, it must be received at the above address by March 20, 2020. It is not necessary to submit an RFA form to the Division Office if you do not object to the determination in this letter.

A copy of this letter will be provided to your agent, Brian Metz with TranSystems at 5400 West Nationwide Boulevard, Suite 225, Columbus, Ohio 43215. If you have any questions concerning the above, please contact Ms. Kayla Adkins of the North Branch at 304-399-5850, by mail at the above address, or by email at kayla.n.adkins@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

Laurie Moore

Laurie Moore Regulatory Project Manager North Branch

Enclosures

#### Appendix 2 - PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (PJD) FORM

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR PJD: 26 December 2019

- B. NAME AND ADDRESS OF PERSON REQUESTING PJD: Mr. Mark Kelby Columbus Regional Airport Authority 4600 International Gateway Columbus, Ohio 43219
- C. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Huntington District, Rickenbacker Air Cargo Campus Property JD, LRH-2019-990-SCR-UNT Walnut Creek

#### D. PROJECT LOCATION(S) AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: (USE THE TABLE BELOW TO DOCUMENT MULTIPLE AQUATIC RESOURCES AND/OR AQUATIC RESOURCES AT DIFFERENT SITES)

State: Ohio County/parish/borough: Franklin and Pickaway City: Lockbourne Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat.: 39.797414 Long.: -82.925231 Universal Transverse Mercator: (X) 335014.814999, (Y) 4407162.315358 Name of nearest waterbody: Unnamed tributary to Walnut Creek

#### E. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 17 January 2020 Field Determination. Date:

# TABLE OF AQUATIC RESOURCES IN REVIEW AREA WHICH "MAY BE" SUBJECT TO REGULATORY JURISDICTION.

Site number	Latitude (decimal degrees)	Longitude (decimal degrees)	Estimated amount of aquatic resource in review area (acreage and linear feet, if applicable)	Type of aquatic resource (i.e., wetland vs. non- wetland waters)	Geographic authority to which the aquatic resource "may be" subject (i.e., Section 404 or Section 10/404)
Stream 20	39.80222	-82.92216	2,665 linear feet	Non-Wetland	Section 404
Stream 31	39.79912	-82.92278	501 linear feet	Non-Wetland	Section 404
Stream 34	39.79695	-82.92143	2,267 linear feet	Non-Wetland	Section 404
Stream 35	39.80056	-82.92934	596 linear feet	Non-Wetland	Section 404
Stream 36	39.79981	-82.92912	774 linear feet	Non-Wetland	Section 404
Stream 37	39.79651	-82.93467	1,140 linear feet	Non-Wetland	Section 404
Stream 39	39.79441	-82.93104	1,992 linear feet	Non-Wetland	Section 404
2019 Wetland 2	39.79878	-82.92979	0.51 acre	Wetland	Section 404
Wetland 1-NEW	39.79836	-82.92175	0.03 acre	Wetland	Section 404
Wetland 2-NEW	39.79753	-82.93690	0.32 acre	Wetland	Section 404
Wetland BK	39.80520	-82.92521	1.7 acres	Wetland	Section 404
Wetland CM	39.79974	-82.92891	0.09 acre	Wetland	Section 404

- The Corps of Engineers believes that there may be jurisdictional aquatic resources in the review area, and the requestor of this PJD is hereby advised of his or her option to request and obtain an approved JD (AJD) for that review area based on an informed decision after having discussed the various types of JDs and their characteristics and circumstances when they may be appropriate.
- In any circumstance where a permit applicant obtains an individual permit, or a 2) Nationwide General Permit (NWP) or other general permit verification requiring "preconstruction notification" (PCN), or requests verification for a non-reporting NWP or other general permit, and the permit applicant has not requested an AJD for the activity, the permit applicant is hereby made aware that: (1) the permit applicant has elected to seek a permit authorization based on a PJD, which does not make an official determination of jurisdictional aquatic resources; (2) the applicant has the option to request an AJD before accepting the terms and conditions of the permit authorization, and that basing a permit authorization on an AJD could possibly result in less compensatory mitigation being required or different special conditions; (3) the applicant has the right to request an individual permit rather than accepting the terms and conditions of the NWP or other general permit authorization; (4) the applicant can accept a permit authorization and thereby agree to comply with all the terms and conditions of that permit, including whatever mitigation requirements the Corps has determined to be necessary; (5) undertaking any activity in reliance upon the subject permit authorization without requesting an AJD constitutes the applicant's acceptance of the use of the PJD; (6) accepting a permit authorization (e.g., signing a proffered individual permit) or undertaking any activity in reliance on any form of Corps permit authorization based on a PJD constitutes agreement that all aquatic resources in the review area affected in any way by that activity will be treated as jurisdictional, and waives any challenge to such jurisdiction in any administrative or judicial compliance or enforcement action, or in any administrative appeal or in any Federal court; and (7) whether the applicant elects to use either an AJD or a PJD, the JD will be processed as soon as practicable. Further, an AJD, a proffered individual permit (and all terms and conditions contained therein), or individual permit denial can be administratively appealed pursuant to 33 C.F.R. Part 331. If, during an administrative appeal, it becomes appropriate to make an official determination whether geographic jurisdiction exists over aquatic resources in the review area, or to provide an official delineation of jurisdictional aquatic resources in the review area, the Corps will provide an AJD to accomplish that result, as soon as is practicable. This PJD finds that there "may be" waters of the U.S. and/or that there "may be" navigable waters of the U.S. on the subject review area, and identifies all aquatic features in the review area that could be affected by the proposed activity, based on the following information:

#### SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for PJD (check all that apply)

Checked items should be included in subject file. Appropriately reference sources below where indicated for all checked items: Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report, Rickenbacker – Air Cargo Campus, Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio completed by TranSystems dated November 2019 (JD, Nov 2019) and updated Table 2 dated December 2019

Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the PJD requestor: Figure 1 – Aerial Location Map, Figure 2 – Topographic Map, and Figure 3 – Unpermitted Areas (JD, Nov 2019)
<ul> <li>Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the PJD requestor.</li> <li>Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. Appendix C – Data Sheets (JD, Nov 2019)</li> <li>Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report. Rationale:</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Data sheets prepared by the Corps:</li> <li>Corps navigable waters' study:</li> <li>U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>USGS NHD data.</li> <li>USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps. 05060001 – Upper Scioto, 050600011805 – Big Run-Walnut Creek</li> <li>U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale &amp; quad name: 1:24K Quad, OH-Lockbourne</li> <li>Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Figure 5 – Soil Map (JD, Nov 2019)</li> <li>National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Figure 4 – NWI Map (JD, Nov 2019)</li> <li>State/local wetland inventory map(s):</li> </ul>
100-year Floodplain Elevation is:(National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
<ul> <li>Photographs: Aerial (Name &amp; Date):</li> <li>or Other (Name &amp; Date): Appendix B – Site Photographs (JD, Nov 2019)</li> <li>Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:</li> <li>Other information (please specify):</li> </ul>
IMPORTANT NOTE: The information recorded on this form has not necessarily been verified by the Corps and should not be relied upon for later jurisdictional determinations.
Kayla N. Adkins Date: 2020.01.21 09:42:51

Signature and date of Regulatory staff member completing PJD

Signature and date of person requesting PJD (REQUIRED, unless obtaining the signature is impracticable)<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Districts may establish timeframes for requestor to return signed PJD forms. If the requestor does not respond within the established time frame, the district may presume concurrence and no additional follow up is necessary prior to finalizing an action.

Agency Coordination Letter



TranSystems

400 West Nationwide Blvd Suite 225 Columbus OH 43215

www.transystems.com

May 17, 2021

Ms. Kayla Osborne U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Regulatory Division Office Huntington District Office 502 Eighth Street Huntington, WV 25701

Re: JD LRH-2019-990-SCR-UNT Walnut Creek Revised Jurisdictional Determination request for Cargo Campus

Ms. Osborne,

On behalf of the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) we are submitting here for your review the revised Jurisdictional Determination Request (JDR) form for the Cargo Campus located in Lockbourne Ohio. Also included is the Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report dated November 2019, and revised on April 28, 2021 to account for the 2020 changes to the NWPR

The CRAA is requesting that your agency review the attached revised report and issue a revised JD in accordance with the new definition of waters of the U.S. Should you have any questions or comments please contact me at TranSystems (direct number: 614-433-7813 or <u>bsmetz@transystems.com</u>.

Respectfully,

73.m.G. May

Brian S. Metz, Senior Environmental Scientist TranSystems Corporation

#### RICKENBACKER - CARGO CAMPUS Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Franklin & Pickaway Counties, Ohio November 2019, Revised May 4th, 2021 due to 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRO	DDUCTION	1
	1.1	Project Description	1
	1.2	Study Area Description	1
	1.3	Study Objectives	1
2.0	METH	IODS	1
	2.1	Aquatic Resources	2
	2.1.1	Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI)	2
	2.1.2	Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index (HHEI)	2
	2.2	Wetland Resources	3
	2.2.1	Wetland Determinations	3
	2.2.2	Ohio Rapid Assessment Method (ORAM)	4
	2.2.3	Determination of Adjacency	4
	2.3	Ponds	5
3.0	ECOL	OGICAL RESOURCE RESULTS	6
	3.1	Streams	6
	3.2	Wetlands	8
	3.2.1	Wetland Categorization	12
	3.2.2	Wetland Delineation Summary	13
	3.3	Ponds & Potential Jurisdictional Ditches	13
REFE	RENCES	S CITED	14
CON	TRIBUTC	DRS	16

APPENDIX A - FIGURES APPENDIX B - PHOTOGRAPHS APPENDIX C – DATA SHEETS



**EXPERIENCE** Transportation

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

#### 1.1 Project Description

TranSystems Corporation was selected to complete a comprehensive survey of potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources (i.e. wetlands, streams, jurisdictional ditches) on the 328.672 acre property, known as the Cargo Campus, owned by the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) in and around the Rickenbacker International Airport in Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio. This area was previously surveyed in 2015. This report documents the results of the updated, 2019 field reconnaissance and survey. Summaries of results are presented in tabular format within the report. Maps are presented in Appendix A, photos are presented in Appendix B, and field data sheets are presented in Appendix C.

### 1.2 Study Area Description

The study area is located directly southeast of Rickenbacker International Airport (Figures 1-2), and directly north of the former Landings at Rickenbacker Golf Club property. The study area includes a mix of active row crop fields, wooded lots, and fallow fields.

In years prior to the current survey, the dominant land use within the study area has been active agriculture. During the 2019 survey, the majority of the study area is still actively farmed and was planted in soybeans for the 2019 growing season. Non-agricultural areas are dominated by forest (ash-maple and ash-oak), shrub communities (multi-flora rose dominated), as well as streams and wetlands.

The study area is located within the Big Run-Walnut Creek watershed (HUC 05060001-18-05). Study area waters flow south into Walnut Creek, which then flows southwest into the Scioto River.

#### 1.3 Study Objectives

This report documents data that was collected to describe the aquatic and wetland habitats located within the study area. The study objectives were as follows:

- Identify and evaluate the significance of the aquatic and wetland habitats
- Evaluate any streams and wetlands within the study area by utilizing the most current versions of the Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI), Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index (HHEI), Ohio Rapid Assessment Method (ORAM), and US Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation (Midwest Region) Forms



## 2.0 METHODS

A field survey of the study area was conducted on September 30, 2019. The weather conditions were warm and sunny with limited cloud cover during the investigation. The following discusses the methods employed to delineate and evaluate the aquatic and wetland resources within the study area. Secondary source information was evaluated prior to the initiation of fieldwork. This review involved a close examination of the study area aerial imagery (Figure 1. Aerial Location Map), USGS topographic map (Figure 2. Topographic Map), Wetland and Stream maps created based off 2015 wetland delineation reporting, National Wetland Inventory maps (Figure 4. NWI Map), NRCS soil survey maps (Figure 5. Soil Map) and the Flood Insurance Rate map (FIRM) (Figure 6. Flood Insurance Rate map (FIRM)-Study Area).

## 2.1 Aquatic Resources

Stream habitat evaluation assessments were completed utilizing the proper methodology of the Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index (HHEI) and Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI) for all encountered streams within the proposed study area. Streams with a drainage area of one square mile or less and with the deepest pools 40 centimeters or less were evaluated using the HHEI developed by Ohio EPA (Final v3.0 January 2012), while streams with a drainage area greater than one square mile and with pools deeper than 40 centimeters were evaluated using the QHEI (Ohio EPA, 2006). Furthermore, the flow regime of each stream within the study area was estimated (i.e. perennial, intermittent or ephemeral) and the length for that portion of each stream which was located within the study area boundaries was calculated (Table 1).

# 2.1.1 Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI)

The Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI) was used to characterize streams with drainage areas greater than one square mile, and to determine their appropriate Aquatic Life Use Designation established by the Ohio EPA. This classification system rates streams according to their physical aquatic habitat quality and includes the following categories: Coldwater Habitat (CWH), Exceptional Warmwater Habitat (EWH), Seasonal Salmonid Habitat (SSH), Warmwater Habitat (WWH), Limited Warmwater Habitat (LWH), Modified Warmwater Habitat (MWH), and Limited Resource Waters (LRW). The Aquatic Life Use Designation is intended to provide streams within anti-degradation protection (i.e. to protect the existing beneficial use designations of the stream).

# 2.1.2 Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index (HHEI)

The Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index (HHEI) was used to determine the status of smaller streams as one of three classes of Primary Headwater Habitats (PHWH). Class I streams offer limited aquatic habitat (namely, ephemeral streams), Class II streams offer seasonal aquatic habitat for pioneering species of fish, salamander, and benthic macroinvertebrates (warm-water adapted native fauna communities), and Class III streams offer substantial benthic macroinvertebrate, fish, and amphibian habitat. Class III streams are often associated with cold water adapted species of headwater fish and/or obligate aquatic species of salamanders (cool-cold water adapted native fauna community).

The HHEI method scores streams on a range of 0 to 100 based on physical characteristics. Generally, scores less than 30 indicate a Class I PHWH, scores 30 to 50 indicate a Class II PHWH,



scores 50 to 70 can be either Class II or Class III depending on substrate composition, and scores 70 or greater indicate a Class III PHWH. QHEI and HHEI field data sheets can be found in Appendix C.

# 2.2 Wetland Resources

## 2.2.1 Wetland Determinations

Wetlands within the study area were identified and their boundaries determined using the procedures outlined in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (Environmental Laboratory, 1987) and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest Region (USACE, 2010). Wetlands were identified based on the presence of the following three criteria: occurrence of hydric soils, wetland hydrology, and greater than 50% hydrophytic vegetation. An area must meet all three criteria to be considered a wetland.

To determine if hydrophytic vegetation was present and abundant within each suspect wetland community, the dominant species from each stratum (tree, sapling, shrub, herb, and/or woody vine) was visually estimated. The indicator status of each of the dominant species was determined using the USACE wetland indicator status plant list for Ohio (Lichvar et al. 2014). An indicator status of obligate wetland (OBL), facultative wetland (FACW), facultative (FAC), facultative upland (FACU) and/or upland (UPL) has been assigned to each plant species, with three facultative categories (FACW, FAC, and FACU). An area is considered to have hydrophytic vegetation when under normal circumstances, more than 50 percent of the dominant species from all strata are OBL, FACW, or FAC species.

Dominance and Prevalence Tests were also run on all suspect wetland communities. The Dominance Test assesses if greater than 50 percent of all dominant species have an indicator status of FAC, OBL, or FACW, then the community is assumed to be dominated by wetland vegetation. If 50 percent or less of the dominant species has these statuses, then the community is considered dominated by upland species. A Prevalence Test was also run on each wetland community area, which utilizes the total cover percentage of OBL, FACW, FAC, FACU, and UPL plant species and various multipliers to yield a ratio. The resulting ratio or number must be below or equal a value of 3.0 to qualify as a hydrophytic vegetation indicator.

Soils in suspect wetland communities were evaluated for the presence of hydric soil indicators. Soils were sampled using a tile spade or soil probe to a depth of 12 to 18 inches. The profile was characterized in accordance with the Corps manual, including assessing the colors of the soil by comparison to the *Munsell Soil Color Chart* (Kollmorgen, 1994). Other features of the soil, including redoximorphic characteristics, hydrogen sulfide production, and apparent moisture regime were also noted. Soil texture was estimated by the tactile method. Hydric soil indicators were also determined using the *NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, Version 7.0* (NRCS, 2010).

Within the study area, suspect wetlands were examined for signs of hydrology. These included primary signs such as surface water, saturated soils, water marks, water-stained leaves, drift deposits, sediment deposits, oxidized root zones surrounding live roots within the upper 12 inches of soil, and secondary signs such as surface soil cracks and drainage patterns (USACE, 2010).



**EXPERIENCE** | Transportation

Suspect wetland communities that met all three criteria; hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology were considered to be wetlands. Wetland boundaries were mapped at the margin where one or more of these three criteria gave way to upland characteristics. Surveys were also conducted in nearby apparent upland areas to confirm that one or more of the criteria were not met in those locations.

Waters of the United States do not include prior converted cropland. However, if narrow bands adjacent to or small pockets interspersed among agricultural land were unable to support crops or were unable to be tilled due to the presence of hydrology for one or more years, and if these areas demonstrated the criteria for a wetland, they have been delineated as a non-agricultural wetland (i.e. unable to support agriculture). None of the wetlands met the definition of prior converted cropland.

Wetland boundaries were delineated using hand-held Trimble Global Positioning System (GPS) Units. The GPS data points were then entered into a GIS base map and the wetland areas were calculated. Wetland Determination sheets can be found in Appendix C.

#### 2.2.2 Ohio Rapid Assessment Method (ORAM)

To assess the function and quality of all wetlands within the subject property, the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands (ORAM version 5.0) by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, was utilized (Mack, 2001). Ohio EPA has developed a method for the categorization of wetlands based on the quantification of certain criteria, which imposes differing levels of regulation. Those wetland categories are defined as 1, 2, and 3 and correspond to wetlands of low, medium, and high "quality" as per the ORAM v. 5.0. Following Ohio EPA guidance, scoring sheets for individual wetlands within the study area were completed by detailed field observations and were used as the basis for provisional wetland categorizations. ORAM data sheets can be found in Appendix C.

## 2.2.3 Determination of Adjacency

A United States Supreme Court ruling in 2001, found that while the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) does have jurisdiction over wetlands that are considered adjacent (hydrologically connected) to a "water of the United States," it does not have jurisdiction over isolated wetlands (SWANCC v. USACE, et al., 2001). In response to this decision, the Ohio General Assembly (2001) enacted a bill that gives the Ohio EPA authority to regulate and permit impacts to isolated wetlands. Therefore, in an attempt to establish the level of jurisdictional authority, the hydrology of each wetland within the subject property was evaluated to define whether individual wetlands should be considered adjacent or isolated.

On June 25, 2020, Ohio EPA issued a final, combined general permit for ephemeral streams and certain isolated wetlands (level one) to help ensure the continued oversight of these resources following removal from federal jurisdiction under the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR).

Rickenbacker - Cargo Campus Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report November 2019, rev May 4, 2021



**EXPERIENCE** | Transportation

4

The experience and professional opinion of a TranSystems Corporation wetland scientist was utilized to determine whether wetlands should be considered isolated, abutting, or adjacent to a lake or stream through a surface water connection. The main criterion used in this determination was whether the wetland had a surface water (including intermittent or ephemeral) connection to a broad tributary system, considered "waters of the U.S." Under Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act, any wetland adjacent to a perennial or intermittent upstream tributary system is considered jurisdictional by the Corps and thus regulated under their jurisdiction. Based on the 2020 NWPR, Wetlands adjacent to an ephemeral stream are no longer considered jurisdictional. Wetlands that meet the three-wetland criteria as per the *1987 Manual*, but are considered as not having a connection to other "waters of the U.S." are classified as non-tributary or, isolated, and thus fall under the jurisdiction of the Ohio EPA only.

Based on mapping conducted using ArcGIS FEMA 100-Year Flood Zones tool (Figure 6, Appendix A) and additional mapping, the study area is not located within the 100-year floodplain of a traditionally navigable water, interstate water, or the territorial seas. The study area is located in proximity to Walnut Creek, which is not considered a traditional navigable water. Based on this information, it was determined that a "significant nexus analysis" may not be required for any of the wetlands present within the study area limits.

#### 2.3 Ponds

Unlike wetlands, ponds are classified as deepwater habitats. According to the Wetland Classification System developed by Cowardin (Cowardin, et. al. 1979), a deepwater habitat is differentiated from a wetland by the presence of permanent, deep water where water, rather than air, is the principal medium within which the dominant organisms live. According to the Corps, deepwater habitats are permanently inundated at a mean water depth greater than 6.6 feet, or are permanently inundated at less than or equal to 6.6 feet that do not support rooted-emergent or woody plant species (USACE, 1987).



**EXPERIENCE** Transportation

## 3.0 ECOLOGICAL RESOURCE RESULTS

### 3.1 Streams

Seven streams (Streams 20, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 39) were identified during the investigation within the study area (Figure 3). All streams were fully delineated within the study area, and labeled as such on the project mapping (Table 1). HHEI field data sheets are located in Appendix C. Color photographs of the streams can be found in Appendix B. Streams within the study area are summarized in the following table:

Stream Identifier	Stream Type	HHEI Score/Class	QHEI Score/Provisional Use Designation	Length (linear feet)	Date(s) Surveyed	Photo Log Number
Stream 20	Perennial	63 Mod Class II	NA	2,664.81	09/30/2019	36-37
Stream 31	Perennial	69 Mod Class II	NA	501.08	09/30/2019	37-38
Stream 34	Perennial	NA	37.5 Mod WWH	2,267.25	09/30/2019	31-35
Stream 35	Ephemeral	22 Class I	NA	596.16	09/30/2019	43-45
Stream 36	Ephemeral	22 Class I	NA	773.58	09/30/2019	46-47
Stream 37	Ephemeral	19 Class I	NA	1,140.10	09/30/2019	39-42
Stream 39	Intermittent	50 Mod Class II	NA	1,991.51	09/30/2019	48-49

Table 1. Su	ummary of Strea	ms within the	Study Area
-------------	-----------------	---------------	------------

**Stream 20** (Appendix B, photos 36-37) is an unnamed tributary to Walnut Creek. Stream 20 flows north to south throughout the eastern portion of the study area (Figure 3). The stream appears to have been highly channelized and modified, as evident by the deeply cut, trapezoidal banks, and appears to drain portions of the surrounding farm fields, and portions of the Rickenbacker International Airport area located north of the study area. This stream has an approximate drainage area of 0.8 square miles, and shallow flow throughout the study area; therefore the HHEI was used to evaluate stream habitat. Stream 20 had a score of 63 utilizing the latest version of the HHEI (Appendix C). Due to the modifications of the stream channel, this score places Stream 20 as a Modified Class II primary headwater habitat stream (Ohio EPA, 2012). Stream flow appeared perennial, due to consistent surrounding and upstream drainage inputs.

**Stream 31** (Appendix B, photos 37-38) is an unnamed tributary to Walnut Creek. Stream 31 flows northwest to southeast throughout a small portion of the eastern study area boundary (Figure 3). The stream appears to have been highly channelized and modified, as evident by the deeply cut, trapezoidal banks, and appears to drain the Rickenbacker International Airport area located north of the study area, as evidenced by two large drainage culverts located at the northern boundary of the stream. This stream has an approximate drainage area of 0.5 square miles, therefore the HHEI was



6

used to evaluate stream habitat. Stream 31 had a score of 69 utilizing the latest version of the HHEI (Appendix C). Due to the modifications of the stream channel, this score places Stream 31 as a Modified Class II primary headwater habitat stream (Ohio EPA, 2012). Stream flow appeared perennial, due to consistent surrounding drainage inputs.

**Stream 34** (Appendix B, photos 31-35) is an unnamed tributary to Walnut Creek. Stream 34 flows north to south throughout the eastern portion of the study area (Figure 3). The stream appears to have been highly channelized and modified, as evident by the deeply cut, trapezoidal banks, and appears to drain the Rickenbacker International Airport area located north of the study area. Additionally, there is a large low-head dam present just north of the southern road crossing boundary (Airbase Rd), which causes water to pool and backup in Stream 34. This stream has an approximate drainage area of 2.4 square miles; therefore the QHEI was used to evaluate stream habitat. Stream 34 had a score of 37.5 utilizing the latest version of the QHEI (Appendix C). Due to stream channelization and limited stream substrate diversity, this score places Stream 34 in the Modified Warm Water Habitat Aquatic Life Use Designation (Ohio EPA, 2006). Stream flow appeared perennial, due to consistent surrounding and upstream drainage inputs.

**Stream 35** (Appendix B, photos 43-45) is an unnamed tributary to Walnut Creek. Stream 35 flows northwest to southeast within the central portion of the study area (Figure 3). The stream appears to have been highly channelized and modified, as evident by the deeply cut, trapezoidal banks, and appears to drain portions of the surrounding farm fields, access roads, and portions of the Rickenbacker International Airport area located north of the study area. This stream has an approximate drainage area of less than 1.0 square miles, and shallow flow throughout the study area; therefore the HHEI was used to evaluate stream habitat. Stream 35 had a score of 22 utilizing the latest version of the HHEI (Appendix C). Due to the modifications of the stream channel, this score places Stream 35 as a Class I primary headwater habitat stream (Ohio EPA, 2012). Stream flow appeared ephemeral, and the stream channel was completely dry at the time of the field investigation.

**Stream 36** (Appendix B, photos 46-47) is an unnamed tributary to Walnut Creek. Stream 36 flows southwest to northeast within the central portion of the study area (Figure 3), and downstream portions receive some flow from Stream 35, before proceeding further downstream (northeast) towards a drainage culvert. The stream appears to have been highly channelized and modified, as evident by the deeply cut, trapezoidal banks, and appears to drain portions of the surrounding farm fields, access roads, and portions of the Rickenbacker International Airport area located north of the study area. This stream has an approximate drainage area of less than 1.0 square miles, and shallow flow throughout the study area; therefore the HHEI was used to evaluate stream habitat. Stream 36 had a score of 22 utilizing the latest version of the HHEI (Appendix C). Due to modifications of the stream channel, this score places Stream 36 as a Class I primary headwater habitat stream (Ohio EPA, 2012). Stream flow appeared ephemeral, and the stream channel was completely dry at the time of the field investigation.

Rickenbacker - Cargo Campus Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report November 2019, rev May 4, 2021



**EXPERIENCE** Transportation

7

**Stream 37** (Appendix B, photos 39-42) is an unnamed tributary to Walnut Creek. Stream 37 flows northwest to southeast within the western portion of the study area (Figure 3), and continues to flow downstream into Stream 39. The stream appears to have been highly channelized and modified, as evident by the deeply cut, trapezoidal banks, and appears to drain portions of the surrounding farm fields, access roads, and portions of the Rickenbacker International Airport area located north of the study area. Upstream portions of Stream 37 have lost their defined channel (bed and bank) and ordinary high water mark, due to ephemeral conditions; and are now functioning as a wetland (Wetland 2-NEW). This stream has an approximate drainage area of less than 1.0 square miles, and shallow flow throughout the study area; therefore the HHEI was used to evaluate stream habitat. Stream 37 had a score of 19 utilizing the latest version of the HHEI (Appendix C). Due to the modifications of the stream channel, this score places Stream 37 as a Class I primary headwater habitat stream (Ohio EPA, 2012). Stream flow appeared ephemeral, and the stream channel was completely dry at the time of the field investigation.

**Stream 39** (Appendix B, photos 48-49) is an unnamed tributary to Walnut Creek. Stream 39 flows northwest to southeast within the southwestern portion of the study area (Figure 3), and continues to flow downstream out of the study area, and through the former Landings at Rickenbacker Golf Club property. The stream appears to have been highly channelized and modified, as evident by the deeply cut, trapezoidal banks, and appears to drain portions of the surrounding farm fields and access roads. Stream 37 also contributes some hydrology to Stream 39 near its upstream boundary. Stream 39 has an approximate drainage area of less than 0.31 square miles, and shallow flow throughout the study area; therefore the HHEI was used to evaluate stream habitat. Stream 39 had a score of 50 utilizing the latest version of the HHEI (Appendix C). Due to the modifications of the stream channel, this score places Stream 39 as a Modified Class II primary headwater habitat stream (Ohio EPA, 2012). Stream flow appeared intermittent, as groundwater contributes to seasonal flow in addition to precipitation, though this is highly dependent on surrounding drainage area inputs.

#### 3.2 Wetlands

In 2015, the Cargo Campus was surveyed for potential wetlands and streams. During this initial survey, ten wetlands were identified. The 2019 survey identified an additional 3 wetlands, and confirmed that two of the originally identified wetlands are no longer present. The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Wetlands Mapper identified nine potential wetlands and two freshwater ponds within the study area boundaries (Figure 3). Four of the nine mapped wetlands coincided with wetlands actually found during field reconnaissance, which is generally expected because NWI wetlands are mapped using aerial imagery and generally not confirmed via field reconnaissance. None of the depicted ponds were located during the investigation. The nine potential wetlands and two freshwater ponds are depicted on the NWI (Figure 4) as the following types (number of each type follows in parenthesis):

8

- PEM1C(2): Palustrine emergent, persistent, seasonally flooded
- PEM1Cd(1): Freshwater emergent wetland
- PFO1C(2): Freshwater forested/shrub wetland
- PEM1A(4): Palustrine emergent, persistent, temporarily flooded
- PUBGx(2): Freshwater pond

Rickenbacker - Cargo Campus Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report November 2019, rev May 4, 2021



The field investigation confirmed the presence of eight previously surveyed wetlands, three new wetlands, and the removal of two previously surveyed wetlands that are no longer present. All identified wetlands were found to consist of one of the following wetland habitat types or a complex of one or more of the following per the classification system developed by Cowardin et al. (1979) for wetland categorization:

- Palustrine Emergent (PEM) Wetland Habitat is characterized by erect, rooted herbaceous hydrophytes, excluding mosses and lichens, and includes a vast array of grasslike plants, true grasses, and broad leaf plants (Cowardin et al., 1979).
- Palustrine Forested (PFO) Wetland Habitat is characterized by woody vegetation that is six meters or taller and normally possesses an overstory of trees, an understory of young trees or shrubs, and a herbaceous layer (Cowardin, et al., 1979).
- Palustrine Scrub-Shrub (PSS) Wetland Habitat is characterized by woody vegetation less than six meters tall. The species composition includes true shrubs, young trees, and trees or shrubs that are small or stunted due to environmental conditions (Cowardin, et al., 1979).

### Wetland Descriptions

A total of 11 wetlands comprised of at least three different wetland habitat types were identified within the study area (Table 2). Each individual wetland is described in detail according to the habitat type, including dominant plant species and facultative status, probable hydrologic regime, mapped soil type, provisional wetland category, and total wetland acreage. Wetlands that were located within close proximity to each other, shared hydrologic connectivity, and were located in similar geographic positions were considered wetland complexes and analyzed as one wetland. Wetlands with upland inclusions within the wetland area were delineated around the perimeter of these wetland/upland complexes. Field data was collected on Wetland Determination Data Forms, Midwest Region (Appendix C), while ORAM scoring sheets (Appendix C) were used to rate and categorize each wetland. The routine data forms provide the field support for the wetland/upland boundary determinations. Color photographs of the wetlands can be found in Appendix B.

Wetland Identifier	ORAM Score	Provisional Antidegradation Category	Isolated?	Size (acres)	Date Surveyed	Photo Log Number
2019 Wetland 1	29	Category 1	Yes	0.07	09/30/2019	1-3
2019 Wetland 2	30	Category 2	Yes	0.51	09/30/2019	4-6
2019 Wetland 3	19.5	Category 1	Yes	0.04	09/30/2019	7-8
Wetland 1- NEW	36	Modified Category 2	No	0.03	09/30/2019	50-51
Wetland 2- NEW	26	Category 1	Yes	0.32	09/30/2019	15-18

Table 2. Summary of Wetlands within the	he Study Area
---	---------------

Rickenbacker - Cargo Campus Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report November 2019, rev May 4, 2021



**EXPERIENCE** Transportation

9

Wetland Identifier	ORAM Score	Provisional Antidegradation Category	Isolated?	Size (acres)	Date Surveyed	Photo Log Number
Wetland 3- NEW	22	Category 1	Yes	0.03	09/30/2019	9-11
Wetland BK	42	Modified Category 2	No	1.70	09/30/2019	24-26
Wetland CL	32.5	Category 2	Yes	0.59	09/30/2019	19-21
Wetland CM	33	Category 2	Yes	0.09	09/30/2019	22-23
Wetland CO	38	Modified Category 2	Yes	0.72	09/30/2019	27-30
Wetland CQ	34	Category 2	Yes	0.52	09/30/2019	12-14

Note: Wetlands not hydrologically connected to a perennial or intermittent stream were classified as isolated in accordance with the final Navigable Waters Protection Rule.

**2019-Wetland 1** (Appendix B, photos 1-3) is a PEM wetland located near the eastern portion of the project limits in a former agricultural field. 2019 Wetland 1 is dominated by path rush (*Juncus tenuis*), wool grass (*Scirpus cyperinus*) and Eastern cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*) saplings. This wetland is likely seasonally saturated during the growing season, with soils composed of Crosby-Urban land complex, nearly level throughout the complex (NRCS, 2019). According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 29, which makes this a Category 1 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.07 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**2019-Wetland 2** (Appendix B, photos 4-6) is a PEM wetland located just southeast of Stream 36 in an actively farmed agricultural field. 2019-Wetland 2 is dominated by yellow nut sedge (*Cyperus esculentus*), rough cocklebur (*Xanthium strumarium*), and narrow leafed cat-tail (*Typha angustifolia*). This wetland is likely seasonally inundated during most of the growing season, with soils composed of Crosby silt loam, Southern Ohio Till Plain, 0 to 2 percent (NRCS, 2019). 2019-Wetland 2 appears to be adjacent to Stream 36, with sources of hydrology including precipitation, and potential intermittent surface water (stream flow). According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 30, which makes this a Category 2 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.51 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**2019-Wetland 3** (Appendix B, photos 7-8) is a small PEM wetland complex located just west of 2019-Wetland 1 along the edge of an agricultural field. 2019-Wetland 3 is dominated by narrow leafed cattail. This wetland is likely seasonally inundated during most of the growing season, with soils composed of Crosby-Urban land complex, with nearly level slopes. According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 19.5, which makes this a Category 1 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.04 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**Wetland 1-NEW** (Appendix B, photos 50-51) is a PFO/PSS wetland complex located just east of the confluence of Stream 20 and Stream 34. Wetland 1 is dominated by spice bush (*Lindera benzoin*-FACW), gray's sedge (*Carex grayii*-FACW), and green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*-FACW). This wetland is likely seasonally inundated/saturated during most of the growing season, with soils



10

composed of Crosby silt loam (CrA), Southern Ohio Till Plain, 0 to 2 percent slopes, throughout the complex (NRCS, 2019). Wetland 1-NEW appears to be adjacent to Stream 34, with sources of hydrology including precipitation, and potential intermittent surface water (stream flow). According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 36, which makes this a Modified Category 2 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.03 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**Wetland 2-NEW** (Appendix B, photos 15-18) is a PEM/PSS wetland complex located northwest of Stream 39, and portions of Stream 37. Wetland 2-NEW is dominated by rice cutgrass (*Leersia oryzoides*-OBL), and sandbar willow (*Salix exigua*-FACW). This wetland is likely seasonally saturated throughout most of the growing season, with soils composed of Kokomo-Urban land complex (Ku), throughout the complex (NRCS, 2019). Wetland 2-NEW appears to be abutting Stream 37, as Wetland 2-NEW has formed in areas where inconsistent stream flow has caused the loss of a defined stream channel and habitat features, and given way to dominant hydrophytic wetland vegetation. Sources of hydrology for Wetland 2-NEW include precipitation and intermittent surface water (Stream 37 flow). According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 26, which makes this a Category 1 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.32 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**Wetland 3-NEW** (Appendix B, photos 9-11) is a PEM wetland complex located southeast of Wetland CQ. Wetland 3-NEW is dominated by rice cutgrass (*Leersia oryzoides*-OBL), and rough cocklebur (*Xanthium strumarium*-FAC). This wetland is likely seasonally saturated through most of the growing season, with soils composed of Crosby-Urban land complex (CuA), nearly level, throughout the complex (NRCS, 2019). Wetland 3-NEW appears to be isolated, with sources of hydrology including precipitation only. According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 22, which makes this a Category 1 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.03 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**Wetland BK** (Appendix B, photos 24-26) is a PFO wetland complex located along the northern boundary of the study area. Wetland BK is dominated by pin oak (*Quercus palustris*-FACW), eastern cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*-FAC), poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*-FAC), and crested sedge (*Carex cristatella*-FACW). This wetland is likely seasonally inundated through most of the growing season, due to high water marks visible on the surrounding trees, and may be functioning as a vernal pool. Soils within Wetland BK are composed of Kokomo-Urban land complex (Ku), throughout the complex (NRCS, 2019). Sources of hydrology for Wetland BK include precipitation and potential intermittent surface water from the adjacent Stream 20. According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 42, which makes this a Modified Category 2 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 1.70 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**Wetland CL** (Appendix B, photos 19-21) is a PEM wetland complex located west of Stream 35, and occurs as a long wetland swale within an active row crop field. Wetland CL is dominated by rough cocklebur (*Xanthium strumarium*-FAC). This wetland is likely seasonally saturated through most of the growing season, with soils composed of Crosby-Urban land complex (CuA), nearly level, throughout the complex (NRCS, 2019). Wetland CL appears to be isolated, with sources of hydrology including precipitation and potential roadside ditch flow. According to the latest version of



the ORAM, this wetland scored a 32.5, which makes this a Category 2 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.59 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**Wetland CM** (Appendix B, photos 22-23) is a PFO/PSS wetland complex located just south of Stream 36. Wetland CM is dominated by pin oak (*Quercus palustris*-FACW), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*-FACW), and poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*-FAC). This wetland is likely seasonally saturated through most of the growing season, with soils composed of Crosby silt loam (CrA), Southern Ohio Till Plain, 0 to 2 percent slopes, throughout the complex (NRCS, 2019). Wetland CM appears to be adjacent to Stream 36, with sources of hydrology including precipitation and intermittent surface water. According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 33, which makes this a Category 2 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.09 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**Wetland CO** (Appendix B, photos 27-30) is a PFO wetland complex located southwest of Wetland CL in a large wooded lot. Wetland CO is dominated by pin oak (*Quercus palustris*-FACW), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*-FACW), poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*-FAC), and shallow sedge (*Carex lurida*-OBL). This wetland is likely seasonally saturated through most of the growing season, with soils composed of Crosby-Urban land complex (CuA), nearly level, throughout the complex (NRCS, 2019). Wetland CO appears to be isolated, with sources of hydrology including precipitation only. According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 38, which makes this a Modified Category 2 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.72 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

**Wetland CQ** (Appendix B, photos 12-14) is a PEM wetland complex located southeast of Wetland CO. Wetland CQ is dominated by rice cutgrass (*Leersia oryzoides*-OBL), and water plantain (*Alisma subcordatum*-OBL). This wetland is likely seasonally saturated through most of the growing season, with soils composed of Crosby-Urban land complex (CuA), nearly level, throughout the complex (NRCS, 2019). Wetland CQ appears to be isolated, with sources of hydrology including precipitation only. According to the latest version of the ORAM, this wetland scored a 34, which makes this a Category 2 wetland (Mack, 2001). In total extent, this wetland is 0.52 acres within the study area (Figure 3).

## 3.2.1 Wetland Categorization

The study area wetlands were assessed utilizing the ORAM (Version 5.0) for categorizing wetlands as developed by the Ohio EPA (Mack, 2001). This methodology has been designed to attempt to evaluate wetlands based on quality and function. ORAM scores are typically used to categorize wetlands during initial project planning and to determine wetland mitigation ratios. Field investigations determined that four (4) wetlands were provisional Category 1 wetlands, four (4) wetlands were Category 2 wetlands, and three (3) were Modified Category 2 wetlands (Table 2). In general, the scores of most of the wetlands were low due to the intense surrounding land use (farming). During drier years, some of the wetlands may be farmed when the ground is dry enough to support farming equipment, as evidenced by tire ruts and successional growth of vegetation along the edges of some wetlands. Lower scores were generally expected due to wetland size and narrow

Rickenbacker - Cargo Campus Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report November 2019, rev May 4, 2021



**EXPERIENCE** | Transportation

buffers, while higher scores of some wetlands were the result of greater acreage and surrounding forested areas. The ORAM Data Sheets can be found in Appendix C.

The provisional wetland categories previously presented in Table 2 are based on Ohio EPA classifications shown below in Table 3. Ultimately, the provisional categories assigned to each wetland are subject to verification by Ohio EPA. An ORAM score that falls into one of the "transitional" zones between two categories should be placed in the higher of the two categories unless proven otherwise (Mack, 2001).

Tubic 0. Dett	Tuble 0. Determination of Metiana Outegory bused on the Orthan Score						
ORAM Score	0-29.9	30-34.9	35-44.9	45-59.9	60-64.9	65-100	
Category	1	1 or 2 gray zone	Modified 2	2	2 or 3 gray zone	3	

Table 3. Determination of Wetland Category based on the ORAM score

These three categories (1, 2, and 3) correspond to wetlands of low, medium, and high quality (Mack, 2001). Category 1 wetlands are generally low quality wetland habitats that "support minimal wildlife habitat, and minimal hydrological and recreational functions" and do not provide critical habitat for threatened or endangered species or contain rare, threatened, or endangered species (Mack, 2001). Category 2 wetlands are defined as wetlands that "support moderate wildlife habitat, or hydrological, or recreational functions" and are dominated by native plant species (Mack, 2001). Category 3 wetlands are wetlands which contain or provide habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species, are high quality mature forested wetlands, vernal pools, bogs, fens, or wetlands which are scarce regionally and/or statewide (Mack, 2001). No Category 3 wetlands were identified during the field investigations within the boundaries of the study area.

# 3.2.2 Wetland Delineation Summary

A total of 11 wetlands comprising 4.62 acres were delineated within the study area (Table 2). Four (4) wetlands were considered Category 1 wetlands, four (4) wetlands were considered Category 2, and three (3) wetlands were considered Modified Category 2 wetlands. Two of the 11 wetlands within the study area were determined to be "non-isolated" or abutting/adjacent wetlands. This means that they do exhibit a connection to a "water of the U.S." and therefore fall under the jurisdiction of both the USACE and Ohio EPA. The remaining nine wetlands did not exhibit a connection to a water of the United States and, therefore, could be considered isolated and fall under the jurisdiction of the Ohio EPA only.

# 3.3 Ponds & Potential Jurisdictional Ditches

No ponds or potentially jurisdictional ditches with apparent connectivity to waters of the U.S. were identified during the comprehensive site survey.

Rickenbacker - Cargo Campus Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report November 2019, rev May 4, 2021


## **REFERENCES CITED**

- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F. C. Golet, and E. T. LaRoe. 1979. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States.* U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. Washington, D.C.
- Environmental Laboratory. 1987. *Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual*, Technical Report Y-87-1, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- Kollmorgen Instrument Corporation. 1994. Munsell soil color charts. Rev Edition. Newburgh, NY.
- Lichvar, R.W., M. Butterwick, N.C. Melvin, and W.N. Kirchner. 2014. *State of Ohio 2014 Wetland Plant List, The National Wetland Plant List:* 2014 Update of Wetland Ratings. Phytoneuron 2014-41:1-42.
- Mack, John J. 2001. Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands v. 5.0 Users Manual and Scoring Forms. Ohio EPA Technical Report WET/2001-1. Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetland Ecology Unit, Columbus, OH.
- Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. 2012. *Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's Primary Headwater Habitat Streams.* Version 3.0. Columbus, Ohio.
- Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. 2006. Methods for Assessing Habitat in Flowing Waters: Using the Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI). Ohio EPA Technical Bulletin EAS/2006-06-1. Ecological Assessment Section, Division of Surface Water, Groveport Ohio.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2010. *Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States*, Version 7.0. L.M. Vasilas, G.W. Hurt, and C.V. Noble (eds.). USDA, NRCS, in cooperation with the National Technical Committee for Hydric Soils.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1999. Army Corps of Engineers Standard Operating Procedures for the Regulatory Program.

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2010. *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest Region* (Version 2.0). Washington D.C.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1992. Memorandum concerning clarification and interpretation of the 1987 Manual Directorate of Civil Works. Washington D.C.



## CONTRIBUTORS

Jessica Deeds, TranSystems. Primary ecological investigator and author.

Brian S. Metz, TranSystems. Ecological investigator and project manager.

Jennifer N. Spinosi, TranSystems. GIS and mapping.

Rickenbacker - Cargo Campus Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Potential Jurisdictional Waters Survey Report November 2019, rev May 4, 2021



**EXPERIENCE** Transportation



4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700. Cincinnati, OH 45242 USA T +1 513 530 5333 F +1 513 530 1278 landrum-brown.com

August 13, 2020

Teresa Spagna Chief, North Branch U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Regulatory Division Office 502 8th Street Huntington, West Virginia 25701

# Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Ms. Spagna,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.

The Project Site is surrounded by commercial and aviation land uses to the north and east and a former golf course to the south. Project site features include undeveloped land that is leased for agriculture, a former golf course clubhouse, and a former U.S. Air Force firing range.



The Proposed Action, when fully operational, would include bulk distribution warehouse facilities that are not dependent upon air travel. As such, the facilities would have no access to the airfield. Therefore, the proposed facilities would not cause an increase or decrease in aircraft operations and would not result in changes to the aircraft fleet at LCK.

A Wetland and Waters of the US Delineation has been conducted in accordance with the US Army Corps of Engineers 1987 Wetlands Delineation Manual and the 2010 Midwest Regional Supplement. A Jurisdictional Determination was received from your office dated January 21, 2020. The site contains both jurisdictional and isolated wetlands. There are ten wetlands and six streams within the Project Site that would be impacted. Additional coordination will be conducted to obtain the necessary permits per Section 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action. We would appreciate your assistance and request that your comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

This Sandos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority

Enclosure





LCK Cargo Campus EA

Z 🕸

**Proposed Action** 

2

# Agency Response to Coordination Letter

This page intentionally left blank



#### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY HUNTINGTON DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS 502 EIGHTH STREET HUNTINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA 25701-2070

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

September 3, 2020

Regulatory Division North Branch LRH-2019-990-SCR-UNT Walnut Creek

Mr. Chris Sandfoss Landrum & Brown 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, Ohio 45242

Dear Mr. Sandfoss:

I refer to the agency scoping letter dated August 13, 2020 submitted on behalf of the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). You have requested the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) submit comments for consideration in the FAA's preparation of an Environmental Assessment for the proposed CRAA Cargo Campus Development Project pursuant to FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* 

The Corps' authority to regulate waters of the United States is based on the definitions and limits of jurisdiction contained in 33 CFR 328, including the amendment to 33 CFR 328.3 (85 Federal Register 22250), and 33 CFR 329. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Section 404) requires a Department of the Army (DA) permit be obtained prior to the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands. Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 requires a DA permit be obtained for any work in, on, over or under navigable water.

As you are aware, this office completed a jurisdictional determination (JD) dated January 21, 2020 for the CRAA Cargo Campus Development Project. Based upon a review of the information provided, this office determined the site contains streams and wetlands which may be waters of the United States in accordance with the Regulatory Guidance Letter for JDs issued by the Corps on October 31, 2016 (Regulatory Guidance Letter No. 16-01).

Based on a preliminary review of the provided information, the proposed project will require authorization under Section 404. Therefore, a DA permit will be required. In this regard, to ensure the information presented in any NEPA document is adequate to fulfill the Corps statutory requirements, including the requirements of Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act

and the Corps' public interest review, the Corps requests the topics listed in Enclosure 1 be included in the scoping and evaluation of any submitted NEPA document.

The Corps accepts your invitation to serve as a cooperating agency. We look forward to working with the FAA and the CRAA during the preparation of the EA for the proposed project. If you have any questions concerning the above, please contact Kayla Adkins of the North Branch at 304-399-5850, by mail at the above address, or by email at kayla.n.adkins@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

Digitally signed Teresa by Teresa Spagna Date: 2020.09.03 12:07:10 -04'00' Teresa D. Spagna

Chief, North Branch

## Enclosure 1 - Corps Request for Items to be Scoped and Evaluated in the NEPA document

- 1) **Purpose and Need for the Project**. The NEPA document should clearly describe the purpose and need for the proposed project.
- 2) Aquatic Resource Identification. The NEPA document must include a site-specific identification of all aquatic resources within the proposed project areas, including any aquatic resources within proposed borrow, spoil, or mitigation areas. The identification should include a description of any streams, open water areas, and wetlands. The identification of aquatic resources within the on-site and off-site project areas must be based on field observations and field data. The identification must include a wetland delineation for each site prepared in accordance with the Corps' 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) and any applicable Regional Supplement. This information would be required to determine the effects of the project on aquatic resources.
- 3) Avoidance and Minimization. A fundamental precept of the Corps' Regulatory Program under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act is that the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into waters of the United States will be avoided and minimized, where it is practicable to do so. Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, only the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative would receive Corps authorization. An alternative is practicable if it is available and capable of being done after taking into consideration cost, logistics and existing technology in light of overall project purposes. The NEPA document should evaluate how the project was designed to avoid and minimize the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into waters of the United States. The alternatives analysis section of the NEPA document should analyze on-site avoidance and minimization alternatives and avoidance and minimization alternatives for any off-site borrow, spoil, or mitigation areas.
- 4) Compliance with the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. The Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (Guidelines) are the substantive criteria used in evaluating discharges of dredged and/or fill material under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Guidelines are published at 40 CFR Part 230. The fundamental precept of the Guidelines is that discharges of dredged and/or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands, should not occur unless it can be demonstrated that such discharges, either individually or cumulatively, will not result in unacceptable adverse effects on the aquatic ecosystem. Subpart B of the Guidelines establishes the four (4) conditions which must be satisfied in order to make a finding that a proposed discharge of dredged and/or fill material complies with the Guidelines. These conditions generally state:
  - a. No discharge of dredged and/or fill material shall be permitted if there is a practicable alternative to the proposed discharge which would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem, so long as the alternative does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences.
  - b. No discharge of dredged or fill material shall be permitted if it:
    - Causes or contributes, after consideration of disposal site dilution and dispersion, to violations of any applicable State water quality standard; Violates any applicable toxic effluent standard or prohibition under section 307 of the Act;

- ii. Jeopardizes the continued existence of species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, or results in likelihood of the destruction or adverse modification of a habitat which is determined by the Secretary of Interior or Commerce, as appropriate, to be a critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended; or
- iii. Violates any requirement imposed by the Secretary of Commerce to protect any marine sanctuary designated under title III of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.
- c. No discharge of dredged and/or fill material shall be permitted which will cause or contribute to significant degradation of the waters of the United States. Under these Guidelines, effects contributing to significant degradation considered individually or collectively, include:
  - i. Significant adverse effects of the discharge of pollutants on human health or welfare, including but not limited to effects on municipal water supplies, plankton, fish, shellfish, wildlife, and special aquatic sites;
  - ii. Significant adverse effects of the discharge of pollutants on life stages of aquatic life and other wildlife dependent on aquatic ecosystems, including the transfer, concentration, and spread of pollutants or their byproducts outside of the disposal site through biological, physical and chemical processes;
  - iii. Significant adverse effects of the discharge of pollutants on aquatic ecosystem diversity, productivity, and stability. Such effects may include, but are not limited to, loss of fish and wildlife habitat or loss of the capacity of a wetland to assimilate nutrients, purify water, or reduce wave energy; or
  - iv. Significant adverse effects of discharge of pollutants on recreational, aesthetic and economic values.

Findings of significant degradation related to the proposed discharge are based upon appropriate factual determinations, evaluations, and tests required by Subparts B and G of the Guidelines, after consideration of subparts C through F, with special emphasis on the persistence and permanence of the effects outlined in those subparts.

d. No discharge of dredged and/or fill material shall be permitted unless appropriate and practicable steps have been taken which will minimize potential adverse impacts of the discharge on the aquatic ecosystem.

NEPA document should provide a sufficient analysis to determine compliance with the Guidelines.

5) **Corps Public Interest Review Factors**. The Corps must evaluate the probable impacts, including cumulative impacts, of the proposed activity and its intended use on the public interest. Among the factors that must be evaluated as part of the Corps' public interest review include: conservation, economics, aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands, historic properties, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, floodplains values, land use, navigation, shore erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, energy needs, safety, food and fiber production, mineral needs, water quality, considerations of property ownership, air and noise impacts, and, in general, the needs and welfare of the people (See 33 CFR 320.4). These factors should be scoped and evaluated in the NEPA document.

- 6) Effects to Aquatic Resources. The NEPA document should quantify the anticipated impacts to waters of the United States, both temporary and permanent, resulting from activities within the Corps jurisdiction. For rivers and streams, the quantity should be described in linear feet and in acreage. For wetlands, the quantity should be described by acreage. The NEPA document should also describe the wetland classification (e.g. palustrine, forested, scrub-shrub, or emergent). The NEPA document should differentiate between permanent and temporary impacts and must describe any permanent conversion in the wetland classification (e.g. palustrine forested to palustrine emergent, etc.).
- 7) **Cumulative and Indirect Effects**. The cumulative and indirect impacts on aquatic resources resulting from the project should be scoped and evaluated in the NEPA document.
- 8) **Off-Site Areas**. The NEPA document should include an analysis of the environmental effects to any off-site borrow, spoil, or mitigation areas.
- 9) **Compliance with Other Federal Laws and Executive Orders**. The NEPA document should document compliance with:
  - a. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. The Corps suggests the FAA contact the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for an updated list of listed species.
  - b. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The NEPA document must describe compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and must describe the research efforts undertaken to identify historic properties within the project areas, including any off-site borrow, spoil, or mitigation area. The NEPA document should use site-specific collected data in the identification of historic properties within the project area.
  - c. Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. The NEPA document must describe compliance with Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.
  - d. Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The NEPA document must describe compliance with Section 402 of the Clean Water Act
  - e. **Migratory Bird Treaty Act**. The NEPA document must describe compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
  - f. Executive Orders (EO). The NEPA document must described compliance with
    - i. EO 13175, Consultation with Indian Tribes, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians;
    - ii. EO 11988, Floodplain Management;
    - iii. EO 12898, Environmental Justice;
    - iv. EO 13112, Invasive Species; and
    - v. EOs 13212 and 13302, Energy Supply and Availability.

This page intentionally left blank

# Appendix E – Air Quality

## E.1 Introduction

The purpose of this Air Quality Technical Report is to provide supporting documentation for the Environmental Assessment (EA) being prepared for the Cargo Campus development project (the Proposed Action) at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP). The following document discloses the affected environment and environmental consequences of air quality for construction and operation of the Proposed Action. Construction of the Proposed Action is anticipated to occur in phases between 2022 and 2029.

# E.2 Regulatory Setting

This air quality assessment of the Proposed Action and its alternatives was conducted in accordance with the guidelines provide in the more recent version of the FAA's *Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook*.<sup>1</sup>

## E.2.1 National Ambient Air Quality Standards

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is the primary federal agency responsible for regulating air quality. The USEPA implements the provisions of the Clean Air Act (CAA). The CAA, including the 1990 Amendments, provides for the establishment of standards and programs to evaluate, achieve, and maintain acceptable air quality in the U.S. Under the CAA, the USEPA established a set of standards, or criteria, for six pollutants determined to be potentially harmful to human health and welfare.<sup>2</sup> The USEPA considers the presence of the following six criteria pollutants to be indicators of air quality:

- Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>);
- Carbon monoxide (CO);
- Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>);
- Particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>);<sup>3</sup>
- Sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>); and
- Lead (Pb).

The National Ambient Air Quality Standards for the criteria pollutants (NAAQS) are summarized in **Table E-1**. For each of the criteria pollutants, the USEPA established primary standards intended to protect public health, and secondary standards for the protection of other aspects of public welfare, such as preventing materials damage, preventing crop and vegetation damage, and assuring good visibility. Areas of the country where air pollution levels consistently exceed these standards may be designated nonattainment by the USEPA.

<sup>1</sup> Federal Aviation Administration, Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook, Version 3 Update 1, January 2015.

<sup>2</sup> USEPA, Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 50 (40 CFR Part 50) National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), July 2011.

<sup>3</sup> PM10 and PM2.5 are airborne inhalable particles that are less than ten micrometers (coarse particles) and less than 2.5 micrometers (fine particles) in diameter, respectively.

## Table E-1 National Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant		Primary / Secondary	Averaging Time	Level	Form	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)		nrimary	8 hours	9 ppm	Not to be exceeded more than	
		prinary	1 hour	35 ppm	once per year	
Lead (Pb)		primary and secondary	Rolling 3-month 0.15 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (1 average		Not to be exceeded	
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2)		primary	1 hour	100 ppb	98th percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations, averaged over 3 years	
		primary and secondary	1 year	53 ppb (2)	Annual Mean	
Ozone (O <sub>3</sub> )		primary and secondary	8 hour	0.070 ppm (3)	Annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hr concentration, averaged over 3 years	
	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	primary	1 year	12.0 µg/m³	Annual mean, averaged over 3 years	
Dartiquiato		secondary	1 year	15.0 µg/m³	Annual mean, averaged over 3 years	
Matter		primary and secondary	24 hours	35 µg/m³	98th percentile, averaged over 3 years	
	PM <sub>10</sub>	primary and secondary	24 hours	150 µg/m³	Not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over 3 years	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )		primary 1 hour		75 ppb (4)	99th percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations, averaged over 3 years	
		secondary	3 hours	0.5 ppm	Not to be exceeded more than once per year	

(1) In areas designated nonattainment for the Pb standards prior to the promulgation of the current (2008) standards, and for which implementation plans to attain or maintain the current (2008) standards have not been submitted and approved, the previous standards (1.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> as a calendar quarter average) also remain in effect.

(2) The level of the annual NO<sub>2</sub> standard is 0.053 ppm. It is shown here in terms of ppb for the purposes of clearer comparison to the 1-hour standard level.

(3) Final rule signed October 1, 2015, and effective December 28, 2015. The previous (2008)  $O_3$  standards additionally remain in effect in some areas. Revocation of the previous (2008)  $O_3$  standards and transitioning to the current (2015) standards will be addressed in the implementation rule for the current standards.

(4) The previous SO<sub>2</sub> standards (0.14 ppm 24-hour and 0.03 ppm annual) will additionally remain in effect in certain areas: (1) any area for which it is not yet 1 year since the effective date of designation under the current (2010) standards, and (2)any area for which an implementation plan providing for attainment of the current (2010) standard has not been submitted and approved and which is designated nonattainment under the previous SO<sub>2</sub> standards or is not meeting the requirements of a SIP call under the previous SO<sub>2</sub> standards (40 CFR 50.4(3)). A SIP call is an EPA action requiring a state to resubmit all or part of its State Implementation Plan to demonstrate attainment of the required NAAQS.

Notes: ppm is parts per million; ppb is parts per billion, and  $\mu g/m^3$  is micrograms per cubic meter.

Source: EPA, https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants/naaqs-table Accessed November 2, 2020.

A nonattainment area is a homogeneous geographical area<sup>4</sup> (usually referred to as an air quality control region) that is in violation of one or more NAAQS and has been designated as nonattainment by the USEPA as provided for under the CAA. Some regulatory provisions, for instance the CAA conformity regulations, apply only to areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance.

A maintenance area describes the air quality designation of an area previously designated nonattainment by the USEPA and subsequently redesignated attainment after emissions are reduced. Such an area remains designated as maintenance for a period up to 20 years at which time the state can apply for redesignation to attainment, provided that the NAAQS were sufficiently maintained throughout the maintenance period.

## E.2.2 General Conformity

The General Conformity Rule under the CAA is conducted in three phases: (1) applicability, (2) evaluation, and (3) determination. The General Conformity Rule establishes minimum values, referred to as the *de minimis* thresholds, for the criteria and precursor pollutants<sup>5</sup> for the purpose of:

- Identifying federal actions with project-related emissions that are clearly negligible (de minimis);
- Avoiding unreasonable administrative burdens on the sponsoring agency; and
- Focusing efforts on key actions that would have potential for significant air quality impacts.

The *de minimis* rates vary depending on the severity of the nonattainment area and further depend on whether the general federal action is located inside an ozone transport region.<sup>6</sup> An evaluation relative to the General Conformity Rule (the Rule), published under 40 CFR Part 93<sup>7</sup>, is applicable to general Federal actions that would cause emissions of the criteria or precursor pollutants, and are:

- Federally-funded or federally-approved;
- Not a highway or transit project<sup>8</sup>;
- Not identified as an exempt project<sup>9</sup> under the CAA;
- Not a project identified on the approving federal agency's Presumed to Conform list<sup>10</sup>; and
- Located within a nonattainment or maintenance area.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has designated the Franklin County as maintenance for ozone (O3) and maintenance for fine particulate matter (PM2.5). The Primary Annual PM2.5 (1997) NAAQS was revoked effective October 24, 2016.<sup>11</sup> Franklin County is designated attainment for all other Federally regulated pollutants, which are carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), coarse particulate matter (PM10), and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> A homogeneous geographical area, with regard to air quality, is an area, not necessarily bounded by state lines, where the air quality characteristics have been shown to be similar over the whole area. This may include several counties, encompassing more than one state, or may be a very small area within a single county.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Precursor pollutants are pollutants that are involved in the chemical reactions that form the resultant pollutant. Ozone precursor pollutants are NOx and VOC, whereas PM<sub>2.5</sub> precursor pollutants include NOx, VOC, SOx, and ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The ozone transport region is a single transport region for ozone (within the meaning of Section 176A(a) of the CAA), comprised of the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area that includes the District of Columbia, as given at Section 184 of the CAA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> USEPA, 40 CFR Part 93, Subpart B, Determining Conformity of General Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans, July 1, 2006.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Highway and transit projects are defined under Title 23 U.S. Code and the Federal Transit Act.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> The Proposed Action is not listed as an action exempt from a conformity determination pursuant to 40 CFR Part 93.153(c). An exempt project is one that the USEPA has determined would clearly have no impact on air quality at the facility, and any net increase in emissions would be so small as to be considered negligible.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> The provisions of the CAA allow a Federal agency to submit a list of actions demonstrated to have low emissions that would have no potential to cause an exceedance of the NAAQS and are presumed to conform to the CAA conformity regulations. This list would be referred to as the "Presumed to Conform" list. The FAA Presumed to Conform list was published in the Federal Register on February 12, 2007 (72 FR 6641-6656) and includes airport projects that would not require evaluation under the General Conformity regulations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> PM-2.5 NAAQS SIP Requirements Final Rule, effective October 24, 2016. (81 FR 58009)

lead (Pb).<sup>12</sup> Pickaway County is designated attainment for all criteria pollutants. Therefore, the Proposed Action meets the remaining criteria for requiring an evaluation under the General Conformity Rule. When the action requires evaluation under the General Conformity regulations, the net total direct and indirect emissions due to the Federal action may not equal or exceed the relevant *de minimis* thresholds unless:

- An analytical demonstration is provided that shows the emissions would not exceed the NAAQS; or
- Net emissions are accounted for in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) planning emissions budget; or
- Net emissions are otherwise accounted for by applying a solution prescribed under 40 CFR Part 93.158.

The federal *de minimis* thresholds established under the CAA are given in **Table E-2**. Conformity to the *de minimis* thresholds is relevant only with regard to those pollutants and the precursor pollutants for which the area is nonattainment or maintenance. Notably, there are no *de minimis* thresholds to which a federal agency would compare ozone emissions. This is because ozone is not directly emitted from a source. Rather, ozone is formed through photochemical reactions involving emissions of the precursor pollutants, nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOC), in the presence of abundant sunlight and heat. Therefore, emissions of ozone on a project level are evaluated based on the rate of emissions of the ozone precursor pollutants, NOx and VOC. Because conformity to the *de minimis* threshold is relevant only with regard to the ozone precursor pollutants, only NOx and VOC emissions are presented and evaluated in this report.

If the General Conformity evaluation for this air quality assessment were to show that any of the applicable thresholds were equaled or exceeded due to the Proposed Action, further, more detailed analysis to demonstrate conformity would be required, which is referred to as a General Conformity Determination. Conversely, if the General Conformity evaluation were to show that none of the relevant thresholds were equaled or exceeded, the Proposed Action would be presumed to conform to the applicable Ohio SIPs and no further analysis would be required under the CAA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> USEPA Nonattainment Status for Each county by Year for Ohio, (Current as of September 30, 2020). Accessed on October 10, 2020 via <a href="https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo\_oh.html">https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo\_oh.html</a>

## Table E-2De MinimisThresholds

Criteria and Precursor Pollutants	Type and Severity of Nonattainment Area	Tons Per Year Threshold
	Serious nonattainment	50
	Severe nonattainment	25
Ozone (VOC or NO <sub>x</sub> ) <sup>1</sup>	Extreme nonattainment	10
	Other areas outside an ozone transport region (OTR)	100
Ozone (NO <sub>x</sub> ) <sup>1</sup>	Marginal and moderate nonattainment inside an OTR <sup>2</sup>	100
	Maintenance	100
0 (1/00)1	Marginal and moderate nonattainment inside an OTR <sup>2</sup>	50
Ozone (VOC)	Maintenance within an OTR <sup>2</sup>	50
	Maintenance outside an OTR <sup>2</sup>	100
Carbon monoxide (CO)	All nonattainment & maintenance	100
Sulfur dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	All nonattainment & maintenance	100
Nitrogen dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> )	All nonattainment & maintenance	100
	Serious nonattainment	70
Coarse particulate matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	Moderate nonattainment and maintenance	100
Fine particulate matter ( $PM_{2.5}$ ) (VOC, NO <sub>x</sub> , NH <sub>3</sub> , and SO <sub>x</sub> ) <sup>3</sup>	All nonattainment & maintenance	100
Lead (Pb)	All nonattainment & maintenance	25

<sup>1</sup> The rate of increase of ozone emissions is not evaluated for a project-level environmental review because the formation of ozone occurs on a regional level and is the result of the photochemical reaction of NOx and VOC in the presence of abundant sunlight and heat. Therefore, USEPA considers the increasing rates of NOx and VOC emissions to reflect the likelihood of ozone formation on a project level.

<sup>2</sup> An OTR is a single transport region for ozone, comprised of the states of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area that includes the District of Columbia.

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of General Conformity applicability, VOCs and NH<sub>3</sub> emissions are only considered PM<sub>2.5</sub> precursors in nonattainment areas where either a State or USEPA has made a finding that the pollutants significantly contribute to the PM<sub>2.5</sub> problem in the area. In addition, NO<sub>X</sub> emissions are always considered a PM<sub>2.5</sub> precursor unless the State and USEPA make a finding that NO<sub>X</sub> emissions from sources in the State do not significantly contribute to PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the area. Refer to 74 FR 17003, April 5, 2006.

Notes: Federal thresholds that are shaded are applicable to this project.

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 40, Protection of the Environment.

USEPA defines de minimis as emissions that are so low as to be considered insignificant and negligible.

Volatile organic compounds (VOC); Nitrogen oxides (NOx); Ammonia (NH3); Sulfur oxides (SOx).

Sources: USEPA, 40 CFR Part 93.153(b)(1) & (2).

## E.2.3 Transportation Conformity Rule Applicability

Although airport improvement projects are usually considered under the General Conformity regulations, there can be elements of a federal action or its alternatives that may require an analysis to demonstrate Transportation Conformity, such as actions relating to transportation plans, programs, projects developed, funded, or approved under Title 23 United States Code (U.S.C.) or the Federal Transit Act (FTA)<sup>13</sup>, or that involve federal highways. In such cases, the sponsoring federal agency would be required to coordinate with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the state Department of Transportation (DOT), and the local metropolitan planning organization (MPO) to assist in completing a Transportation Conformity evaluation.

As with General Conformity, Transportation Conformity regulations apply only to federal actions located within a nonattainment or maintenance area. The Proposed Action would <u>not</u> be developed, funded, or approved by the FHWA or FTA. Therefore, the Transportation Conformity regulations would not apply.<sup>14</sup>

# E.3 Modeling Methodology

The primary sources of air emissions accounted for in the inventory data presented in this report are derived from construction and operational activities. The following software were used to develop the construction and operations emissions inventory attributed to the Proposed Action.

## **Airport Construction Emissions Inventory Tool Version 1**

The Airport Construction Emissions Inventory Tool (ACEIT) Version 1 was developed by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) to assist airports and other stakeholders in developing airport construction emissions inventories. The ACEIT was used to find the type of equipment and the hours of usage for each type of equipment based on the proposed construction activities.<sup>15</sup>

## Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator Version 2014b

The USEPA's Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES) Version 2014b is an emission modeling system that estimates emissions for mobile sources at the national, county, and project level for criteria air pollutants, greenhouse gases, and air toxics. The type and usage of construction equipment found in the ACEIT was inputted into MOVES, which was used to estimate construction activity emissions resulting from on-road and non-road construction equipment.

## E.4 Construction Activities

Temporary impacts would result from construction activities associated with the Proposed Action, primarily from air pollutants emitted by construction equipment. Construction of the Proposed Action is anticipated to be completed in phases, starting in 2022 and finished by 2029/30.

## E.4.1 Construction Phasing

The Proposed Action construction phases and estimated construction years are detailed in **Table E-3**. The Proposed Action with building site boundaries is shown on **Exhibit E-1**, *Proposed Action with Building Sites*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> USEPA, 40 CFR Part 93.153, *Applicability*, July 1, 2006.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> At this time, no Federal funding is expected for Rickenbacker Parkway extension Phase 3b or Phase 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> ACEIT uses emission factors from the USEPA's Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES) and NONROAD modeling programs to estimate emissions resulting from construction activities. While ACEIT is not mentioned in Section 6.1.4 of the Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook, Version 3, the Handbook recommends the use of MOVES and NONROAD emission factors to estimate emissions from construction activities. Furthermore, FAA Order 1050.1F, Paragraph 4-2.b allows the use of supplemental models for analysis of nonaviation sources "with prior approval from [the Office of Environment and Energy (AEE)]."

#### Exhibit E-1 – Proposed Action with Building Sites



Appendix E – Air Quality | E-7

This page intentionally left blank

## Table E-3 Estimated Project Construction

Element	Estimated Construction Year
Site Preparation	2022
Phase 3b of Rickenbacker Parkway extension and utilities for all warehouse sites	2023
Phase 4 of Rickenbacker Parkway extension and construction of warehouse Site L and associated parking	2024
Construction of warehouse Site K and associated parking	2025
Construction of warehouse Site M and associated parking	2026
Construction of warehouse Site N and associated parking	2028
Construction of warehouse Site P and associated parking	2029

Source: CRAA and Landrum & Brown analysis, 2020

## E.4.2 Construction Emissions

A construction emissions inventory was prepared to reflect the use of construction equipment and vehicles attributed to the Proposed Action. ACEIT defaults were used for construction equipment and construction worker trip generation data. Project cost inputs for ACEIT were based on costs of similar development costs. The construction equipment defaults from ACEIT were used as inputs into MOVES, along with the construction phasing, to get the annual construction emissions inventory provided in **Table E-4.** Construction emissions are expected to be higher during the third and fourth construction years when a majority of the warehouse construction is anticipated to occur.

Year	Annual Emissions (short tons per year)							
	CO	VOC	NOx	SOx	<b>PM</b> 10	PM2.5		
2022	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0		
2023	0.9	0.6	2.0	0.1	0.2	0.2		
2024	1.7	1.5	3.2	0.1	0.3	0.3		
2025	0.7	0.9	1.1	0.0	0.1	0.1		
2027	0.7	0.5	1.1	0.0	0.1	0.1		
2026	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.0	0.1	0.1		
2028	0.7	0.5	1.1	0.0	0.1	0.1		
2029	0.7	0.3	1.1	0.0	0.1	0.1		

### Table E-4 Construction Emissions Inventory

Source: Landrum & Brown analysis, 2020.

# E.5 Operational Activities

The Proposed Action, when fully operational, would include bulk distribution warehouse facilities that are not dependent upon air travel. As such, the facilities would have no access to the airfield. Therefore, the proposed facilities would not cause an increase or decrease in aircraft operations and would not result in changes to the aircraft fleet at LCK.

The Proposed Action is intended to meet existing warehouse and distribution needs in the central Ohio region. The end users of the facilities would operate warehousing and distribution facilities to meet local demand. These users may benefit from the proximity to the Airport for shipping and receiving goods. However, it is anticipated that the majority of shipping and receiving would primarily occur via truck. While some goods may be shipped inbound or outbound via air cargo carriers, it is expected that the shipping via air would utilize existing cargo capacity and would not cause an increase in the number of cargo operations at LCK. Therefore, no change in aircraft operations or emissions would occur as a result of the Proposed Action. The increase in emissions would be limited to temporary emissions from construction activity and operational emissions from surface vehicle traffic to and from the proposed warehouses.

Operation of the Proposed Action would result in indirect emissions as the result of surface vehicle traffic from trucks and employee vehicles traveling to and from the proposed distribution warehouses. This additional surface vehicle traffic was estimated based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation methodology to determine the number of vehicles based on the proposed building square footages. **Table E-5** shows the estimated annual number of trucks and employee vehicles that would be expected to operate at the site. Operational emissions are expected to occur after construction of the first warehouse site and continue to increase annually in proportion to the increase in warehouse space. **Table E-6** shows the estimated operational emissions from that activity based on modeling conducted using MOVES Version 2014b

Year	Average Daily Traffic Volumes (round trips)							
	Employee Cars and Light Trucks	Tractor Trailer Trucks	Total Surface Vehicles					
2025	1,288	694	1,982					
2026	2,644	1,424	4,068					
2027	3,627	1,953	5,580					
2028	4,215	2,269	6,484					
2029	4,494	2,420	6,914					

### Table E-5 Commercial Truck and Employee Vehicle Trip Generation Estimates

Year	Annual Emissions (short tons per year)								
i oui	со	VOC	NOx	SOx	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>			
2025	11.9	1.5	14.7	0	0.7	0.6			
2026	24.4	3.1	30.1	0	1.4	1.3			
2027	33.4	4.3	41.3	0.1	1.9	1.8			
2028	38.8	5	6.8	0.1	2.2	2.1			
2029	41.4	5.4	51.1	0.1	2.4	2.2			

#### Table E-6 Operational Emissions Inventory

## E.6 Environmental Setting and Proposed Action Site

**Table E-7** shows the total net emissions for the Proposed Action, that includes both construction and operational emissions. As shown in Table E-5, this analysis of the Proposed Action demonstrates that the applicable de minims thresholds would not be exceeded and there would be no significant air quality impacts from construction or operation of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is therefore assumed to comply with the provisions of the Ohio State Implementation Plan (SIP) and meet all relevant requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the CAA.

		Criteria and Precursor Pollutants (tons per year)							
Year		CO	voc	NOx	SOx	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		
	CAA De Minimis Thresholds	n/a	100	100	n/a	n/a	100		
	Construction	0.7	0.5	1.6	0	0.1	0.1		
2021	Operation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
	Total	0.7	0.5	1.6	0	0.1	0.1		
	Construction	0.3	0	0.3	0	0	0		
2022	Operation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
	Total	0.3	0	0.3	0	0	0		
	Construction	0.9	0.6	2	0.1	0.2	0.2		
2023	Operation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
	Total	0.9	0.6	2	0.1	0.2	0.2		
	Construction	1.7	1.5	3.2	0.1	0.3	0.3		
2024	Operation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
	Total	1.7	1.5	3.2	0.1	0.3	0.3		
2025	Construction	0.7	0.9	1.1	0	0.1	0.1		
	Operation	11.9	1.5	14.7	0	0.7	0.6		
	Total	12.6	2.4	15.8	0	0.8	0.7		
	Construction	0.7	0.7	1.1	0	0.1	0.1		
2026	Operation	24.4	3.1	30.1	0	1.4	1.3		
	Total	25.1	3.8	31.2	0	1.5	1.4		
	Construction	0.7	0.5	1.1	0	0.1	0.1		
2027	Operation	33.4	4.3	41.3	0.1	1.9	1.8		
	Total	34.1	4.8	42.4	0.1	2	1.9		
	Construction	0.7	0.3	1.1	0	0.1	0.1		
2028	Operation	38.8	5	6.8	0.1	2.2	2.1		
	Total	39.5	5.3	7.9	0.1	2.3	2.2		
	Construction	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
2029	Operation	41.4	5.4	51.1	0.1	2.4	2.2		
	Total	41.4	5.4	51.1	0.1	2.4	2.2		

## Table E-7 Total Net Emissions – Proposed Action

Notes: NOx and VOC emissions from the project is compared with the 100 tons per year de-minimis threshold. The Primary Annual PM2.5 (1997) NAAQS was revoked effective October 24, 2016 and Franklin County is in attainment for the 2006 24-hour Standard and the 2012 Annual Standard; however, the Ohio State Implementation Plan still recognizes Franklin County as maintenance for PM2.5. Therefore, net annual emissions are compared in this table to a de minimis threshold of 100 tons per year. Emissions of CO, SO2, and PM10 are provided for disclosure purposes.

Total may not sum correctly due to rounding.

Source: Landrum & Brown analysis, 2021.

# Appendix F – Farmland

This appendix contains a copy of the coordination materials for consultation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service related to the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

This page intentionally left blank

Agency Coordination and Form AD-1006

This page intentionally left blank



4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700. Cincinnati, OH 45242 USA T +1 513 530 5333 F +1 513 530 1278 landrum-brown.com

August 13, 2020

Justin Armintrout District Conservationist USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service 1550 Old Henderson Road Columbus, OH 43220

## Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Armintrout,

This letter is sent to inform you that the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) Cargo Campus development (the Proposed Action). The Proposed Action would occur on an approximately 330-acre site located to the south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead Federal agency that will review the EA. The EA will investigate, analyze, and disclose any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action consists of the development of several commercial cargo and warehouse structures, as well as extension of Rickenbacker Parkway to provide access to the site. **Exhibit 1**, *Project Site*, shows the general project area along with the location of the project site at LCK. The Proposed Action, which is shown on **Exhibit 2**, *Proposed Action*, includes the following activities:

- Site preparation of the Cargo Campus site which measures approximately 330 acres in size and is located south of LCK;
- Extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b, and 4;
- Construction and operation of five commercial bulk distribution warehouse buildings totaling approximately 4.2 million square feet in area on the Cargo Campus;
- Construction of paved parking and internal vehicle circulation roads;
- Extension of utilities to and within the site; and
- Development of stormwater mitigation areas.

The Project Site is surrounded by commercial and aviation land uses to the north and east and a former golf course to the south. Project site features include undeveloped land that is leased for agriculture, a former golf course clubhouse, and a former U.S. Air Force firing range.



The Proposed Action, when fully operational, would include bulk distribution warehouse facilities that are not dependent upon air travel. As such, the facilities would have no access to the airfield. Therefore, the proposed facilities would not cause an increase or decrease in aircraft operations and would not result in changes to the aircraft fleet at LCK.

The EA document will be prepared in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.* As part of the coordination process for this EA, the CRAA and the FAA are respectfully seeking your comments and identification of any specific areas of concern related to this Proposed Action.

The property is owned by the CRAA. Portions of the 330-acre site have been used for agriculture in the past under a lease agreement between the CRAA and a local farmer. Therefore, we are seeking a determination regarding the potential for the site to contain prime or unique farmland, or farmland of state or local importance. We have enclosed Form AD-1006 with Part I and Part III completed. We are requesting your office complete applicable sections of the form.

We would appreciate your assistance and request that the completed Form AD-1006 and any other comments are returned within 30 days or at your earliest convenience. If you would like additional information on this project, or would like to speak with me directly, please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <a href="mailto:csandfoss@landrum-brown.com">csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</a>.

Please send any written comments to the following address:

Landrum & Brown Attn: Chris Sandfoss 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45242

Your prompt response is appreciated so that the project may proceed as scheduled. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

This Sandos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority

Enclosures: Exhibits 1 & 2, Form AD-1006





LCK Cargo Campus EA



**Proposed Action** 

U.S. Department of Agriculture FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING								
PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)			Date Of Land Evaluation Request 8/13/2020					
Name of Project RGLP Cargo Campus Development			Federal Agency Involved Federal Aviation Administration					
Proposed Land Use Commercial Warehouses			County and State Franklin & Pickaway Counties. Ohio					
PART II (To be completed by NRCS)			Date Request Received By			Person Completing Form:		
Does the site contain Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Important Farmland?				Acres I	rrigated	Average	Farm Size	
Major Crop(s)	Farmable Land In Govt. Acres: %	Jurisdiction		Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: %				
Name of Land Evaluation System Used	Name of State or Local S	Site Assessn	nent System	Date Land	Evaluation Re	eturned by NR	RCS	
PART III (To be completed by Federal Age	ncy)			Cito A	Alternative	Site Rating	Cito D	
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly				330	Site B	Site C	Site D	
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly				550		+		
C. Total Acres In Site				330		+	<u> </u>	
PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Lan	d Evaluation Information			000				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland								
B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Loca	Important Farmland							
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Lo	ocal Govt. Unit To Be Converted							
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdi	ction With Same Or Higher Relat	ive Value						
PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Relative Value of Farmland To Be C	l Evaluation Criterion onverted (Scale of 0 to 100 Point	s)						
<b>PART VI</b> (To be completed by Federal Age (Criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5 b. For	ncy) Site Assessment Criteria Corridor project use form NRCS-	CPA-106)	Maximum Points	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D	
1. Area In Non-urban Use			(15)				<u> </u>	
2. Perimeter In Non-urban Use								
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed			(20)					
4. Protection Provided By State and Local	Government		(20)					
5. Distance From Urban Built-up Area			(15)					
6. Distance To Urban Support Services			(15)					
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To	Average		(10)					
8. Creation Of Non-farmable Farmland			(10)					
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services			(5)					
10. On-Farm Investments			(20)					
11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Suppor	t Services		(10)					
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural	Use		(10)					
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS	TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS				0	0	0	
PART VII (To be completed by Federal A	lgency)							
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)			100	0	0	0	0	
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or local site assessment)			160	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)			260	0	0	0	0	
Site Selected:	Date Of Selection     Was A Local Site Assessment Use       YES     NO			NO				
Reason For Selection:								

Date:

### STEPS IN THE PROCESSING THE FARMLAND AND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FORM

- Step 1 Federal agencies (or Federally funded projects) involved in proposed projects that may convert farmland, as defined in the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) to nonagricultural uses, will initially complete Parts I and III of the form. For Corridor type projects, the Federal agency shall use form NRCS-CPA-106 in place of form AD-1006. The Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) process may also be accessed by visiting the FPPA website, <a href="http://fppa.nrcs.usda.gov/lesa/">http://fppa.nrcs.usda.gov/lesa/</a>.
- Step 2 Originator (Federal Agency) will send one original copy of the form together with appropriate scaled maps indicating location(s) of project site(s), to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) local Field Office or USDA Service Center and retain a copy for their files. (NRCS has offices in most counties in the U.S. The USDA Office Information Locator may be found at <a href="http://offices.usda.gov/scripts/ndISAPI.dll/oip\_public/USA\_map">http://offices.usda.gov/scripts/ndISAPI.dll/oip\_public/USA\_map</a>, or the offices can usually be found in the Phone Book under U.S. Government, Department of Agriculture. A list of field offices is available from the NRCS State Conservationist and State Office in each State.)
- Step 3 NRCS will, within 10 working days after receipt of the completed form, make a determination as to whether the site(s) of the proposed project contains prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland. (When a site visit or land evaluation system design is needed, NRCS will respond within 30 working days.
- Step 4 For sites where farmland covered by the FPPA will be converted by the proposed project, NRCS will complete Parts II, IV and V of the form.
- Step 5 NRCS will return the original copy of the form to the Federal agency involved in the project, and retain a file copy for NRCS records.
- Step 6 The Federal agency involved in the proposed project will complete Parts VI and VII of the form and return the form with the final selected site to the servicing NRCS office.
- Step 7 The Federal agency providing financial or technical assistance to the proposed project will make a determination as to whether the proposed conversion is consistent with the FPPA.

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FORM (For Federal Agency)

**Part I**: When completing the "County and State" questions, list all the local governments that are responsible for local land use controls where site(s) are to be evaluated.

Part III: When completing item B (Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly), include the following:

- 1. Acres not being directly converted but that would no longer be capable of being farmed after the conversion, because the conversion would restrict access to them or other major change in the ability to use the land for agriculture.
- 2. Acres planned to receive services from an infrastructure project as indicated in the project justification (e.g. highways, utilities planned build out capacity) that will cause a direct conversion.
- Part VI: Do not complete Part VI using the standard format if a State or Local site assessment is used. With local and NRCS assistance, use the local Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA).
- 1. Assign the maximum points for each site assessment criterion as shown in § 658.5(b) of CFR. In cases of corridor-type project such as transportation, power line and flood control, criteria #5 and #6 will not apply and will, be weighted zero, however, criterion #8 will be weighed a maximum of 25 points and criterion #11 a maximum of 25 points.
- 2. Federal agencies may assign relative weights among the 12 site assessment criteria other than those shown on the FPPA rule after submitting individual agency FPPA policy for review and comment to NRCS. In all cases where other weights are assigned, relative adjustments must be made to maintain the maximum total points at 160. For project sites where the total points equal or exceed 160, consider alternative actions, as appropriate, that could reduce adverse impacts (e.g. Alternative Sites, Modifications or Mitigation).

**Part VII:** In computing the "Total Site Assessment Points" where a State or local site assessment is used and the total maximum number of points is other than 160, convert the site assessment points to a base of 160. Example: if the Site Assessment maximum is 200 points, and the alternative Site "A" is rated 180 points:

 $\frac{\text{Total points assigned Site A}}{\text{Maximum points possible}} = \frac{180}{200} \text{ X } 160 = 144 \text{ points for Site A}$ 

For assistance in completing this form or FPPA process, contact the local NRCS Field Office or USDA Service Center.

NRCS employees, consult the FPPA Manual and/or policy for additional instructions to complete the AD-1006 form.
From:	Glanville, Jeff - NRCS, Columbus, OH <jeff.glanville@usda.gov></jeff.glanville@usda.gov>		
Sent:	Friday, August 28, 2020 9:44 AM		
To:	Chris Sandfoss		
Cc:	Ortiz, Eliezer - NRCS, Columbus, OH; Armintrout, Justin - NRCS, Circleville, OH; Mark Kelby; Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov		
Subject:	RE: Request for Consultation for Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Development EA		
Attachments:	Rickenbacker_Cargo_Campus_Franklin_AD-1006.zip.pdf;		
	Rickenbacker_Cargo_Campus_Pickaway_AD-1006.zip.pdf; Rickenbacker_Cargo_Campus_WSS_report_		
	08282020.pdf; Rickenbacker_Cargo_Campus_WSS_important_farmland_08282020.pdf;		
	Rickenbacker_Cargo_Campus_WSS_productivity_index_08282020.pdf		

**CAUTION:** This email attachment originated from a third party. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have attached completed AD-1006 forms for this project. I had to separate these by county, since this project runs across county line.

I have also attached some Web Soil Survey reports.

Please note that acre total of my area of interest in Web Soil Survey exceeded the ~330ac estimate in your letter and preliminary AD-1006.

Please let me know of any questions or concerns.

Jeff Glanville Soil Scientist/Soil Database Manager and acting State Soil Scientist USDA-NRCS 200 North High Street, Room 522 Columbus, OH 43215-2478

614-255-2507 855-867-9515 FAX

Jeff.Glanville@oh.usda.gov

From: Ortiz, Eliezer - NRCS, Columbus, OH <eliezer.ortiz@usda.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2020 4:23 PM
To: Chris Sandfoss <csandfoss@landrum-brown.com>
Cc: Armintrout, Justin - NRCS, Circleville, OH <justin.armintrout@usda.gov>; Mark Kelby
<MKelby@ColumbusAirports.com>; Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov; Glanville, Jeff - NRCS, Columbus, OH
<jeff.glanville@usda.gov>
Subject: RE: Request for Consultation for Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Development EA

Good afternoon,

Your request has been submitted to the Ohio NRCS-USDA Acting State Soil Scientist Jeff Glanville. He have been included in this e-mail. He will be in contact with you soon. Direct any questions related to this request to Jeff.

Jeff Glanville Soil Scientist/Soil Database Manager and acting State Soil Scientist USDA-NRCS 200 North High Street, Room 522 Columbus, OH 43215-2478 614-255-2507 855-867-9515 FAX Jeff.Glanville@oh.usda.gov

Thanks,



#### Eliezer Ortiz-Barbosa

Resource Conservationist Franklin & Pickaway Co Natural Resources Conservation Service | U.S. Department of Agriculture Franklin Co Field Office | Columbus Service Center <u>Suite 164 N | 1550 Old Henderson Rd | Columbus, OH 43220</u> Phone: 614.459.4225 etx. 4065 | Fax: 1.855.842.8012

From: Chris Sandfoss <<u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u>>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2020 3:27 PM
To: Ortiz, Eliezer - NRCS, Columbus, OH <<u>eliezer.ortiz@usda.gov</u>>
Cc: Armintrout, Justin - NRCS, Circleville, OH <<u>justin.armintrout@usda.gov</u>>; Mark Kelby
<<u>MKelby@ColumbusAirports.com</u>>; Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov
Subject: Request for Consultation for Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Development EA

Mr. Barbosa,

Hello, My firm, Landrum & Brown, is assisting the Columbus Regional Airport Authority with an Environmental Assessment for the proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park near Rickenbacker International Airport in Franklin and Pickaway counties. We are seeking any comments from your agency and assistance with completion of Form AD-1006. Please let me know if there is any other information needed for your review.

Thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Chris

#### Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

#### Landrum & Brown Global Aviation Planning & Development

T +1 513 530 1256

#### landrum-brown.com

The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.



4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700. Cincinnati, OH 45242 USA T +1 513 530 5333 F +1 513 530 1278 landrum-brown.com

November 5, 2020

Jeff Glanville Soil Scientist/Soil Database Manager and Acting State Soil Scientist USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service 200 North High Street, Room 522 Columbus, OH 43215

#### Re: Agency Scoping for Cargo Campus Development Project Environmental Assessment at Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Dear Mr. Glanville,

Thank you for your response dated August 28, 2020 with the updated Farmland and Conversion Impact Rating Form AD-1006 for the proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP). Please find the enclosed copies of the forms for Franklin and Pickaway Counties with Part VI completed, and Attachment A with the rationale for the score for each assessment criteria.

Per your direction, separate versions of the form have been completed for the proposed project site (Site A) in Franklin County and Pickaway County since the site is located on the county boundary. The assessment resulted in a score of 127 total points (out of a possible 260 points) for the area in Franklin County and 136 points (out of a possible 260 points) for the area in Franklin County and 136 points (out of a possible 260 points) for the area in Franklin County and 136 points (out of a possible 260 points) for the area in Pickaway County. According to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 6.1.1, a score below 160 for either area indicates that no further analysis is necessary and no significant impacts to farmlands would occur due to the Proposed Action.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (513) 530-1256 or by email at <u>csandfoss@landrum-brown.com</u> if there are any additional comments or questions. Thank you for your time and assistance with this process.

Sincerely,

his Sandos

Chris Sandfoss, AICP Managing Consultant

cc: Ernest Gubry, Federal Aviation Administration Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority

Enclosures: Completed Form AD-1006 for Franklin and Pickaway County areas, Attachment A, Exhibits 1 & 2

# ATTACHMENT A

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

PART VI SCORING RATIONALE

1. How much land is in non-urban use within a radius of 1.0 mile from where the project is intended?

As shown in **Exhibit 1**, *Urban Area within 1-Mile Radius of the Project Site*, there is nearby commercial development to the west of the site and the Rickenbacker International Airport facilities are located to the northwest of the site that would be considered urban area. The table below provides the total urban and non-urban acreage within the 1-mile radius of the proposed project site.

Land Use	Acres	Percent of Total
Urban	1,493	34%
Non-urban	2,854	66%
Total	4.347	100%

## Points Allocated: 10

2. How much of the perimeter of the site borders on land in non-urban use?

As shown in Exhibit 1, the proposed project site is in the vicinity of urban land uses; however, the perimeter of the site does not directly border any urban uses.

### Points Allocated: 10

3. How much of the site has been farmed (managed for schedule harvest or timber activity) more than five of the last ten years?

Several parcels within the site are leased to a local farmer for agricultural purposes. **Exhibit 2**, *Property Leased for Farmland*, shows the areas that are leased and used for farming within the proposed project site. Based on a review of past aerial imagery, it appears that these areas have been farmed for more than five of the past ten years. The Table below presents the total acreage and percent of the site farmed within each county.

	Total Acres	Acres Farmed	Percent Farmed
Franklin County	90	25	28%
Pickaway County	240	129	54%
Total	330	155	47%

## Points Allocated: Franklin County 4, Pickaway County 11

4. Is the site subject to state or unit of local government policies or programs to protect farmland or covered by private programs to protect farmland?

The Project Site is owned by the Airport and then leased to the farm owner. There are no state or local policies or programs applicable to the Airport to protect the farmland such as tax relief, right to farm laws, agricultural districting, agricultural zoning, development rights, Governor's executive order, voluntary, or mandatory state programs. Therefore a score of 0 points was assessed for this criteria.

## Points Allocated: 0

5. How close is the site to an urban built-up area?

There are commercial areas to the west of the proposed project site. These facilities are not adjacent to the proposed project site; although they are less than one mile from the project site boundary. Therefore a score of 5 points was assessed for this criteria.

#### **Points Allocated: 5**

6. How close is the site to water lines, sewer lines and/or other local facilities and services whose capacities and design would promote nonagricultural use?

The proposed project site is within less than one mile of existing commercial development with access to public utilities. Existing utility service lines, including electric, natural gas, water, and wastewater, are located approximately one-half mile from the perimeter of the proposed project site.

#### Points Allocated: 0

7. Is the farm unit(s) containing the site (before the project) as large as the average-size farming unit in the county? (Average farm sizes in each county are available from the NRCS field offices in each state. Data are from the latest available Census of Agriculture, Acreage of Farm Units in Operation with \$1,000 or more in sales.)

The total number of farms and total farm acreage was obtained from the USDA, Census of Agriculture, 2017 Census Volume 1, Chapter 2: County Level Data.<sup>1</sup> The table below provides the total number of farms, farm acreage, and average farm size for Franklin and Pickaway Counties.

	Number	Acres	Average
	<u>of Farms</u>	<u>Operated</u>	Farm Size
Franklin County	408	52,356	128
Pickaway County	805	296,988	369

The total acreage farmed within the proposed project site within Franklin County is 25 acres, or 20% of the average farm size in the County. The total acreage farmed within the proposed project site within Pickaway County is 129 acres, or 35% of the average farm size in the County. Since both values are less than 50% of the average farm size, zero points were assessed for this criteria.

#### Points Allocated: 0

8. If this site is chosen for the project, how much of the remaining land on the farm will become non-farmable because of interference with land patterns?

There would be no land remaining for farming activities after construction of the Proposed Action has been completed. Therefore, the maximum score of 10 points was assessed for this criteria.

## Points Allocated: 10

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> https://www.nass.usda.gov/Quick\_Stats/CDQT/chapter/2/table/1/state/OH/county/129/year/2017

9. Does the site have available adequate supply of farm support service and markets, i.e., farm suppliers, equipment dealers, processing and storage facilities and farmer's markets?

Both Franklin County and Pickaway County have ongoing farming activities that require adequate farming support services; therefore, it is expected that all services are available to the farm and therefore the maximum number of 5 points was assigned for this criteria.

### Points Allocated: 5

10. Does the site have substantial and well-maintained on farm investments such as barns, other storage buildings, fruit trees and vines, field terraces, drainage, irrigation, waterways or other soil and water conservation measure.

The property is leased as-is to the local farmer. The site does not contain any improvements, such as barns, sheds, other outbuildings, or permanent irrigation systems, to support farming activities. Such improvements are restricted by the lease agreement; therefore, zero points were assessed for this criteria.

### Points Allocated: 0

11. Would the project at this site, by converting farmland to nonagricultural use, reduce the support for farm support services so as to jeopardize the continued existence of these services and thus, the viability of the farms remaining in the area?

The farmed land within the proposed project site represents a small percentage (less than 0.1%) of the total farmed acres in Franklin and Pickaway Counties. Therefore, it is not likely that conversion of the property to non-farming use would be of substantial socioeconomic impact on farm equipment companies or cause a reduction in other farming support service. Therefore a score of 0 points was assessed for this criteria.

#### Points Allocated: 0

12. Is the kind and intensity of the proposed use of the site sufficiently incompatible with agriculture that it is likely to contribute to the eventual conversion of the surrounding farmland to nonagricultural use?

The proposed project includes construction and operation of bulk distribution warehouses. Activities on the site would include truck traffic and short-term storage of goods and materials. Similar development exists within less than one-half mile of the site and has limited effect on current farming activities on the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not be incompatible with farming activities and is unlikely to contribute to the conversion of neighboring farmland. Therefore, a score of 2 points was assessed for this criteria.

## Points Allocated: 2

## Total Points Assessed for Part VI of Form AD-1006:

Franklin County: 46

## Pickaway County: 53



LCK Cargo Campus EA

Zeß

Urban Area within 1-Mile Radius of the Project Site



U.S. Department of Agriculture FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING							
PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency) Date Of La			f Land Evaluation	Request 8/	3/2020		
Name of Project RGLP Cargo Campus Development		Federa	Agency Involved	Federal	Aviation	Administ	ration
Proposed Land Use Commercial Warehouses County a			and State Frank	lin County,	Ohio		
PART II (To be completed by NRCS) Date Required NRCS			equest Received 08/13/2020	By )	Person C J. Glar	ompleting For VIIIe	m:
Does the site contain Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Important Farmland?       YE         (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form)       YE			YES NO	Acres Ir 362	rigated	Average 128	Farm Size
Major Crop(s)	Major Crop(s) Farmable Land In Govt. Jurisdiction		Amount of F	armland As 1277 %	Defined in FP	PA	
Name of Land Evaluation System Used     Name of State or Local Site Assessment System       OH     OH			Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 08/28/2020				
PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)					Alternative	e Site Rating	
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly				Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly				330			
C. Total Acres In Site				330			
PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Ev	aluation Information			000			
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland				0.2			
B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland				0.0			
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted				.000000			
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value			i.	42			
<b>PART V</b> (To be completed by NRCS) Land Eva Relative Value of Farmland To Be Conve	aluation Criterion erted (Scale of 0 to 100 Point	s)		81			
<b>PART VI</b> (To be completed by Federal Agency) Site Assessment Criteria (Criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5 b. For Corridor project use form NRCS-CPA-106)		Maximum ) Points	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D	
1. Area In Non-urban Use		(15)	10				
2. Perimeter In Non-urban Use			(10)	10			
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed			(20)	4			
4. Protection Provided By State and Local Government			(20)	0			
5. Distance From Urban Built-up Area		(15)	5				
6. Distance To Urban Support Services		(15)	0				
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Ave	erage		(10)	0			
8. Creation Of Non-farmable Farmland		(10)	10				
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services		(5)	5				
10. On-Farm Investments			(20)	0			
11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services		(10)	0				
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use			(10)	2			
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS			160	46	0	0	0
PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)							
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)			100	81	0	0	0
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or local site assessment)			160	46	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)			260	127	0	0	0
Site Selected: Site A Da	te Of Selection 10/28/20	020		Was A Loca	Site Asses	sment Used?	
Reason For Selection: The proposed project meets the stated cause a significant impact to prime or u	need to provide bulk di nique farmland, or farm	stributio	on warehouse statewide or l	space in th ocal import	e Columb ance.	us area an	d does not

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)       E         Name of Project RGLP Cargo Campus Development       F         Proposed Land Use Commercial Warehouses       C         PART II (To be completed by NRCS)       E         Does the site contain Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Important Farmland?       (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form)         Major Crop(s)       Farmable Land In Govt. Juri         CORN, SOYbeans, wheat       Acres: 308457% 95         Name of Land Evaluation System Used       Name of State or Local Site         OH       OH         PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)         A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly         B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly         C. Total Acres In Site         PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland         B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted         D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative	Date Of La Federal Ag County and Date Reque	nd Evaluation ency Involved	Request 8/1 Federal	3/2020		
Name of Project       RGLP Cargo Campus Development       F         Proposed Land Use       Commercial Warehouses       C         PART II (To be completed by NRCS)       L       C         Does the site contain Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Important Farmland?       (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form)         Major Crop(s)       Farmable Land In Govt. Juri         CORN, Soybeans, wheat       Acres: 308457% 95         Name of Land Evaluation System Used       Name of State or Local Site         OH       OH         PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)         A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly         B. Total Acres In Bite         PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland         B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted         D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative         PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Critorion	Federal Ag County and Date Reque	ency Involved	Federal			
Proposed Land Use       Commercial Warehouses       C         PART II (To be completed by NRCS)       L         Does the site contain Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Important Farmland?       (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form)         Major Crop(s)       Farmable Land In Govt. Juri         CORN, SOYbeans, wheat       Acres: 308457% 95         Name of Land Evaluation System Used       Name of State or Local Site         OH       OH         PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)         A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly         B. Total Acres In Bite         PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland         B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted         D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative	County and Date Reque			Aviation	Administ	ration
PART II (To be completed by NRCS)       Image: Completed by NRCS)         Does the site contain Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Important Farmland?         (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form)         Major Crop(s)       Farmable Land In Govt. Juri         CORN, SOYbeans, Wheat       Acres: 308457% 95         Name of Land Evaluation System Used       Name of State or Local Site         OH       OH         PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)         A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly         B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly         C. Total Acres In Site         PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative         PART V (To be completed by NRCS) L and Evaluation Critorion	Date Reque	State Picka	way County	, Ohio		
Does the site contain Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Important Farmland?         (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form)         Major Crop(s)       Farmable Land In Govt. Juri         CORN, SOYbeans, Wheat       Acres: 308457% 95         Name of Land Evaluation System Used       Name of State or Local Site         OH       OH         PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)         A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly         B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly         C. Total Acres In Site         PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted         D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative         PART V (To be completed by NRCS) L and Evaluation Criterion	PART II (To be completed by NRCS) Date Reque NRCS 08			Person Co J. Glan	mpleting Forr	m:
(If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form)         Major Crop(s)       Farmable Land In Govt. Juri         CORN, SOYbeans, wheat       Acres: 308457% 95         Name of Land Evaluation System Used       Name of State or Local Site         OH       OH         PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)         A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly         B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly         C. Total Acres In Site         PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted         D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative	YE	S NO	Acres Ir	rigated	Average I	⁻arm Size
Major Crop(s)       Farmable Land In Govt. Jun         CORN, SOybeans, wheat       Acres: 308457% 95         Name of Land Evaluation System Used       Name of State or Local Site         OH       OH         PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)       A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly         B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly       C. Total Acres In Site         PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland         B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative         PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Criterion			2604		369	
Name of Land Evaluation System Used       Name of State or Local Site         OH       OH         PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)         A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly         B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly         C. Total Acres In Site         PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland         B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted         D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative         PART V (To be completed by NRCS) L and Evaluation Criterion	risdiction		Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA			
OH       OH         PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)       A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly         B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly       C. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly         C. Total Acres In Site       PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland       B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted       D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative         PART V (To be completed by NRCS) L and Evaluation Criterion       D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative	e Assessme	ent Svstem	Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS			
<ul> <li>PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)</li> <li>A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly</li> <li>B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly</li> <li>C. Total Acres In Site</li> <li>PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information</li> <li>A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland</li> <li>B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland</li> <li>C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted</li> <li>D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative</li> <li>PART V (To be completed by NRCS) L and Evaluation Criterion</li> </ul>	OH O					
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly     B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly     C. Total Acres In Site     PART IV ( <i>To be completed by NRCS</i> ) Land Evaluation Information     A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland     B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland     C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted     D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative     PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Criterion	PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)			Alternative	Site Rating	
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly     C. Total Acres In Site     PART IV ( <i>To be completed by NRCS</i> ) Land Evaluation Information     A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland     B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland     C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted     D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative     PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Criterion			Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D
C. Total Acres In Site PART IV ( <i>To be completed by NRCS</i> ) Land Evaluation Information A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Criterion			330			
PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information         A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland         B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland         C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted         D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative         PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Criterion			330			
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland     B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland     C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted     D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative     PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Lond Evaluation Criterion			000			
B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland     C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted     D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative     PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Lond Evolution Criterion	A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland					
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative <b>PART V</b> (To be completed by NRCS) Lond Evoluction Criterion			0.0			
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative	C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted					
<b>PART V</b> (To be completed by NPCS) Land Evaluation Criterian	D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value					
Relative Value of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points)			83			
<b>PART VI</b> (To be completed by Federal Agency) Site Assessment Criteria	PA-106)	Maximum Points	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D
1. Area In Non-urban Use	A-100)	(15)	10			
2. Perimeter In Non-urban Use		(10)	10			
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed		(20)	11			
4. Protection Provided By State and Local Government		(20)	0			
5. Distance From Urban Built-up Area		(15)	5			
6. Distance To Urban Support Services		(15)	0			
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average		(10)	0			
8. Creation Of Non-farmable Farmland		(10)	10			
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services		(5)	5			
10. On-Farm Investments		(20)	0			
11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services		(10)	0			
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use		(10)	2			
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS		160	53	0	0	0
PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)				-		
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)		100	83	0	0	0
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or local site assessment)		160	53	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)		260	136 Was A Loca	U Site Assess	0	0
Site Selected: Site A Date Of Selection 10/28/2020	20		YES YES	S	NO V	
Reason For Selection: The proposed project meets the stated need to provide bulk distr						

Name of Federal	agency representative	completing this	form:

## Agency Response

From:	Glanville, Jeff - NRCS, Columbus, OH <jeff.glanville@usda.gov></jeff.glanville@usda.gov>
Sent:	Monday, November 9, 2020 3:11 PM
То:	Chris Sandfoss
Cc:	Ortiz, Eliezer - NRCS, Columbus, OH; Armintrout, Justin - NRCS, Circleville, OH; Mark Kelby;
	Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov
Subject:	RE: Request for Consultation for Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Development EA

Chris

I concur with the ratings. No more comments.

Thank you.

Jeff Glanville Soil Scientist/Soil Database Manager USDA-NRCS 200 North High Street, Room 522 Columbus, OH 43215-2478

614-255-2507 855-867-9515 FAX

Jeff.Glanville@oh.usda.gov

From: Chris Sandfoss <csandfoss@landrum-brown.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 2:47 PM
To: Glanville, Jeff - NRCS, Columbus, OH <jeff.glanville@usda.gov>
Cc: Ortiz, Eliezer - NRCS, Columbus, OH <eliezer.ortiz@usda.gov>; Armintrout, Justin - NRCS, Circleville, OH <justin.armintrout@usda.gov>; Mark Kelby <MKelby@ColumbusAirports.com>; Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov
Subject: RE: Request for Consultation for Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Development EA

Mr. Glanville,

Please see the attached completed AD-1006 forms and accompanying documentation for this project. Let us know if you concur with the ratings or if you have any questions or comments.

Thanks,

Chris

# Appendix G – Public Involvement

This Appendix contains the copies of coordination materials for this Environmental Assessment. The following documentation is included:

- 1) Public Workshop / Hearing materials including the Notice of Availability and the public workshop/hearing presentation;
- 2) Comments received on the Draft EA; and
- 3) Responses to those comments.

## PUBLIC WORKSHOP/ HEARING

A public workshop / public hearing was held to present the findings and obtain public comment on the Draft EA on April 20, 2021 from 5:30pm to 7:00pm.

Due to the recommended precautions to stop the spread of COVID-19, this workshop / hearing was conducted online. Notification about the workshop / hearing was published in local newspapers and online at <a href="https://www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ea/">https://www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ea/</a>.

A dedicated telephone number was set up to allow members of the public to contact the project team with any need for special accommodations to view the Draft EA or participate in the public workshop/hearing.

This appendix includes a copy of the presentation that was given at the online public workshop.

There was one agency question/comment during the public hearing. There was no public testimony given during the public hearing.

www.columbusmessenger.com

Library Southeast Brand 3980 S. Hamilton Road Groveport, OH 43125 Phone: (614) 645-2275

Pickaway County Library Floyd E. Younión Branch 51 Long Street Ashville, Ohio 43103 Phone: (740) 983-8856

ssistance, are required as is not available



Pest Control Pest Control Find Pest Control Ex-perts Near You! Don't let pests overtake your home. Protect your loved ones! Call to find great deals on Pest Control Services - 833-872-0012

Attention: If you or aloved one worked around the

pesticide Roundup (glyphosate) for at least 2

years and has been diag-nosed with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, you may be entitled to compensation. 855-341-5793

YOUR DAY CARE

OR PRESCHOOL **Call Kathy at the** 

The Columbus Messenger

For More Info

614-272-5422

Preschool/Daycare

and the second second

Dona Bar

5:1

D)

NOTICLE The following states: CA, CT, FL, IA, IL, IN, KY, LA, MD, ME, MI, MN, NE, NC, NH, OH, OK, SC, SD, TX, VT and WA requires seller of certain business opportunities to register with each state before selling. Call to verify lawful registration before you buy. The Generace PWRcell

before you buy. The Generac PWRcell solar plus battery stor-age system. Save mon-ey, reduce reliance on grid, prepare for outages & power your home. Full installation services. \$0 down financing option. Request free no obliga-tion quote. Call 1-855-270-3785

thus Regional Airport Authority and Colorabus International Airpor Administrative Offices 1600 International Geteway Columbus, OH 43219 s call (513) 818-0617 to set up an approximant appointment. Administration Building Operations Department 50 Staucheou Drive, Sulle 100 Columbus, OH 43217 er cell (5/3) 818-0617 to set up an accontingent. ite: www.airportprojects.net/ If special accommodations, such as audio or visual as to participate in the online meeting, or if internet acces planes contact (\$13) \$18-0617 by April 16, 2021. **Attention: Cities & Townships** ADVERTISE YOUR LEGAL! PUBLIC NOTICES The South Messenger now covers Obetz, Canal Winchester; CALL KATHY at the CALL KATHY at the COLUMBUS MESSENGER NEWSPAPERS 614-272-5422 kathy@columbusmessenger.com **Public Notice** ASSOCIATION ADS ASSOCIATION ADS ASSOCIATION ADS GENERAC Standby Gen-erators provide backup power during utiliny power outages, so your home and family stay safe and comfortable. Prepare now. Free 7-year extend-ed warrantly (\$985 val-ue). Request a free quote today! Call for addi-tiona! terms and condi-tiona! terms and t DISH TJV \$64.99 FOR 190 Channels + \$14.95 High Speed Internet. Free In-stallation, Smart HD DVR Included, Free Voice Re-mote. Some restrictions apply. Promo expires 7/21/21. 1-855-270-5098

5:30 pm to 7:00 pm

Attention oxygen therapy users! Inogen One G4 is capable of full 24/7 oxy-gen delivery. Only 2.8 pounds. Free info kit. Call 877-929-9587

tions. 1-855-465-7624 DENTAL INSURANCE-Physicians Mutual Insur-ance Company. Covers 350 procedures. Real insurance - not a dis-count plan. Get your free dental Info kitl 1-886-623-3036 . www.den-tal50plus.com/58 #6258 Donate your car to kids! Fast free pickup running or not - 24 hour re-sponse. Maximum tax donation. Help find miss-ing kids! 877-831-1448



Protect your home w/home security monitored by ADT. Starting at \$27.99/ mo. Get free equipment bundle including keypad, motion sensor, wireless door & windows sensors. 833-719-1073

Train online to do medi-cal billing! Become a Medical Office Professio-nal at CTI! Get trained and certified to work in months! 888-572-6790. (M-F 8-6 ET)

to business with. Thinking about installing a new shower? Ameri-can Standard makes it easy. FREE design com-sulation. Enjoy your shower again Call 1-833-766-0995 today to see how you can save \$1,000 on installation, or visit www.newshower-deal.com/mac Employment

Library Southeast Branch 3960 S. Hamilton Road Groveport, OH 43125 Phone: (614) 645-2275

Pickaway County Library Floyd E. Younkin Branch 51 Long Street Ashville, Ohio 43103

Phone: (740) 983-8856

Virtual Public Workshop / Hearing

Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

Tuesday, April 20, 2021

5:30 pm to 7:00 pm

Pre-registration is required.

Register in advance and submit comments at:

www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ea

A Draft Environmental Assessment document is available for public review at the following locations. Please call prior to enviving at these locations to check hours of availability.

If special accommodations, such as audio or visual assistance, are required to participate in the online meeting, or if internet access is not available, please contact (513) 818-0817 by April 16, 2021.

**Public Notice** 

Pursuant to O.R.C. 505.10, the Madison Township Fire Depart-

ment has in their possession items that have been designated

as surplus and are set to be auctioned to the public at Absolute

Auction by Mike Brandly, Auctioneer, located at 4949 Hendron

Rd. Groveport, Ohio 43125 on Wednesday, April 28 2021. The

TERMS: Payment in full is required on the evening of the

auction. Payment can be made by Cash, Credit Cards, or Debit

Cards (MasterCard, Visa, Discover, and American Express)

auction is from 5:30 p.m. until the last item is sold.

Columbus Regional Airport Authority John Glenn Columbus International Airpor Administrative Offices 4600 International Gateway Columbus, OH 43210 Please call (513) 818-0817 to set up an concidence

appointment.

Rickenbacker International Airport Administration Building Operations Department 7250 Starcheok Onive, Suila 100 Columbus, CH 43217 Please call (513) 818-0617 to set up an operintment

Website: www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ea

# ublic Notices

#### **ADVERTISEMENT FOR BID**

Sealed bids will be received by the Board of Education of the Groveport Madison School District until 12:00 noon on Wednesday, April 7, 2021 for the Asphalt and Concrete Project located at (6) six Groveport Madison School District sites. Sealed bids shall be delivered to the office of Mr. James Grube, Deputy Superintendent, located at the Groveport Madison District Office, 4400 Marketing Place - Suite B, Groveport, Ohio 43125. The bids will be publicly opened and read.

Bids will be received for the General Construction Contract (Single Prime). The Bids shall be opened and read publicly. The probable cost for the total construction contract is \$375,000. Bids shall include all labor, materials, equipment, special tools, and services required to complete the work in accordance with the Contract Documents.

Plans and specifications for the Project may be examined at the Architect's Office or at area Plan Rooms. Bidders may purchase copies of the Contract Documents from Key Blue Prints, 195 East Livingston Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43215, (614) 228-3285.

Each proposal shall contain the name of every person interested therein. Each proposal shall meet the regulations of Section 153.54 of the Ohio Revised Code. All bids must be accompanied by a Bid Guaranty in the form of either a Bid Guaranty and Contract Bond for the full amount of the bid (including add alternates) or a certified check, cashier's check, or an irrevocable letter of credit in an amount equal to 10% of the bid amount, in accordance with the Instructions to Bidders.

No bids may be withdrawn within sixty (60) days after the bid opening. The Owner reserves the right to waive irregularities in bids, to reject any or all bids, and to conduct such review as necessary to determine the responsibility of any bidder submitting a bid for the Project. The Notice to Bidders is also available at www.gocruisers.org

By Order of the Board of Education

Felicia Drummey, Treasurer felicia.drummey@gocruisers.org

#### PUBLIC NOTICE SURPLUS AUCTION

Pursuant to O.R.C. 505.10, Madison Township has in its possession items that have been designated as surplus and are set to be auctioned to the public through GovDeals. During the online auctions, the following will be offered from 8:00 p.m. April 4, 2021, through 8:00 p.m. April 18, 2021:

#### Items:

- 2009 Horton Medic 1FVACWDK49HAL3809
- 2006 Freightliner Medic 1FVACWCT66HV90272
- 2007 Chevy Tahoe 1GNFK03067R424375
- 2000 Ford Van 1FDWE35L6YHA44352 \$5,000.00 reserve
- 2012 Chevy Malibu LS 1G1ZA5EU0CF306316 \$6,850.00 reserve
- Exmark 36" mower Model MG481KA362
- 2005 Dove Car Hauler Trailer 77" x 13'

Complete auction details can be accessed on the Govdeals website at Govdeals.com

All inquiries and questions must go through Govdeals.com For a complete description and step-by-step instructions on how to find these items on the auction site please visit:

www.madisontownship.org, click on Administration, and then Auctions.

Attention: Cities & Townships ADVERTISE YOUR LEGAL/ PUBLIC NOTICES The Eastside Messenger is now serving Pickerington & Canal Winchester. CALL KATHY at the COLUMBUS MESSENGER NEWSPAPERS 614-272-5422 kathy@columbusmessenger.com

#### ASSOCIATION ADS

Looking for auto insur-ance? Find great deals on the right auto insur-ance to suit your needs. Call today for a free quote! 866-924-2397

Life Alert. One press of a button sends help fast 24/7! At home and on the go. Mobile Pendant with GPS. Free first aid kit (with subscription). 877-537-8817 Free bro-chure

Eliminate gutter cleaning forever! LeafFilter, the most advanced debris-blocking gutter protection. Schedule a FREE LeafFi-ter estimate today. 15% off Entire Purchase. 10% Se-nior & Milliary Discounts. Call 1-855-791-1626

Call 1-855-791-1626 GENERAC Standby Gen-Generations provide backup cover durings, so your home and family safe and comfortable. Prepare now. Free 7-year extend-ed warranty (\$959 val-ue). Request a free quote today! Call for addi-tional terms and condi-tional terms and condi-tional. 1-855-465-7624

#### IMPORTANT NOTICE

The following states: CA, CT, FL, IA, IL, IN, KY, LA, MD, ME, MI, MN, NE, NG, NH, OH, OK, SC, SD, TX, VT and WA requires seller of certain business opportunities to register with each state before selling. Call to verify lawful registration before you buy.

before you buy. Attention: If you or aloved one worked around the pesticide Roundup (glyphosate) for at least 2 years and has been diag-nosed with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, you may be entitled to compensation. 855-341-5793 Espanol

ASSOCIATION ADS ASSOCIATION ADS VIAGRA & CIALISI 60 pills for \$99.100 pills for \$150 FREE shipping. Money back guaranteed 1-844-596-4376 SELL YOUR ANTIQUE OR CLASSIC CAR. Advertise with us. You choose where you want to advertise, 800-450-6631 visit macnetonline. com for details. com for details.

Directv Now. No Satel-lite. \$40/mo 65 Chan-nels. Stream news, live events, sports & on de-mand titles. No contract/ commitment. 1-866-825-6523 6523 New authors wanted! Page Publishing will heip self-publish your book. Free author submission kit! Limited offer! 866-951-7214

901-/214 DENTAL INSURANCE-Physicians Mutual Insur-ance Company. Covers 350 procedures. Real insurance - not a dis-count plan. Get your free dental Info kitl 1-888. 623-3036 . www.den-tal50plus.com/58 #6258 HEARING AIDS tal50plus.com/58 #6258 HEARING AIDSI! Buyone/get one FREE! Nearly invisible, fully re-chargeable IN-EAR NANO hearing aids priced thousands less than competitors! 45-day tria!! Call1-877-436-0234

Thail Call+87/-436-0234 VIAGRA and CIALIS USERS! 50 Generic pills SPECIAL \$99.00 FREE Shipping! 100% guaran-teed. 24/7 CALL NOW! 888-445-5928 Hablamos

system. SAVE money, reduce your reliance on the grid, prepare for pow-er outages and power your home. Full installa-tion services available. \$0 Down Financing Option. Request a FREE, no obli-gation, quote today. Call 1-855-900-2894

2- Smith Weight Machines

54- Rusted metal folding chairs





ASSOCIATION ADS BATH & SHOWER UP-DATES in as little as ONE DAY! Affordable prices - No payments for 18 months! Lifetime war-ranty & professional in-stalls. Senior & Military Discounts available. Call 855-761-1725

**Public Notices** 

Items:

1- Stairmaster

11- Wooden tables

ASSOCIATION ADS

Landrum Ç Brown

## The Columbus Dispatch PROOF OF PUBLICATION

## STATE OF OHIO, FRANKLIN COUNTY. SS:

Steve Vacolas Credit Manager

The Columbus Dispatch, a newspaper published at Columbus, Franklin County, Ohio, with a daily paid Circulation of over 130,000 copies, personally appeared and made oath that the notice of which a true copy is here unto attached was published in The Columbus Dispatch for 1 time(s) on M and M and

and that the rate charged therefore is the same as that charged for commercial advertising for like services.

subscribed and Sworn on this 2 + 2 + n d day of  $M \otimes ch$  2021 as witness my hand and seal of office.

ARY PUBLIC - STATE OF OHIO



VERONICA HILL Notary Public, State of Ohio My Commission Expires 12-04-2023 Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Ricketbacker Global Logistics Park and Notice of Public Hearing ACTION: The Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Ricketbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) and associated improvements south of Ricketbacker International Airport (LCK) The EA is being prepared to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

PUBLIC HEARING: The CRAA will conduct a Virtual Public Workshop and Public Hearing related the BA for the proposed improvements at the RGLP. Due to the recommended precautions to stop the spread of COVID-19, this Public Workshop/Hearing will be conducted online. The Workshop/Hearing will be held from 5.30 p.m. to 7.00 p.m. on April 20, 2021. Pre-registration is required to attend the Virtual Public Workshop/Hearing. Register in advance and submit comments at www.airportprojects.net/lck-campuses.

Comments received at the Public Hearing will become part of the final RA document to be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for review.

The CRAA has published a Draft RA document and copies will be available for public review beginning March 22, 2021 at the following locations:

Columbus Regional Airport Authority John Glenn Columbus International Airport Administrative Offices 4600 International Gateway Columbus, OH 45219 Please call (513) 618-0517 to set up an appointment.

Rickenbacker International Airport Administration Building Operations Department 7250 Starcheck Drive, Suite 100 Columbus, OH 45217 Please call (513) 618-0617 to set up an appointment.

Columbus Metropolitan Library Southeast Branch 3980 S. Hamilton Road Groveport, OH 43125 Phone: (614) 645-2275

Pickaway County Library Ployd E. Younkin Branch 51 Long Street Ashville, Ohio 43103 Phone: (740) 933-6856

Website: www.airpariprojects.net/ick-campus-ea

Comments on the Draft EA may be submitted to: Chris Sandfoss, 4445 Lake Forest Drive, Suite 700, Cincinnati, OH 45242; or by email to: LCK-EAQiandrumbrown.com. All comments must be received by May 5, 2021.

If special accommodations, such as audio or visual assistance, are required to participate in the online meeting, or if internet access is not available, please contact (513) 518-0517 by April 16, 2021. 3/22

# **Circleville Herald**

Affidavit of Publication The State of Ohio Pickaway County

#### LANDRUM & BROWN

#### 11279 CORNELL PARK DRIVE CINCINNATI, OH 45242

Account:	170721
Ticket:	620663
RE:	Global Hearing Rickenbacker

Before, the undersigned, a Notary Public of said County and State, duly commissioned, qualified, and authorized by law to administer oaths, personally appeared Sherrie Bossart, who being first duly sworn, deposes and says: that she is the Agent of Circleville Herald, published, issued and entered as second class mail in the city of Circleville: that she is authorized to make this affidavit and sworn statement: that the notice or other legal advertisement, a true copy of which is shown here to, was published in Circleville Herald on the following date(s): 03/23/21

Signature of sworn person above

Sworn to ap subscribed before me this 03/23/2021.

Signature of Notary Public

Lisa Nota My C Secti

Lisa M. Hedrick Notary Public, State of Ohio My Commission Expires 2-202 5 Section 147.03 R.C.

Cost of Notice: S Published on:

\$220,24 03/23/2021

Circleville Herald 401 E. Main Circleville, OH 43113

FED ID 61-1731416

Notice of Availability of a Draft Eavironmental Assessment for the Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park and Notice of Public Hearing

ACTION The Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) and associated improvements south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK) The EA is being prepared to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

PUBLIC HEARING The CRAA will conduct a Virtual Public Workshop and Public Hearing related to the EA for the proposed improvements at the RGLP. Due to the recommended presautions to stop the spread of COVID-19, this Public Workshop/Hearing will be conducted online. The Workshop/ Hearing will be held from 5.30 pm to 7.00 pm on April 20, 2021 Pre-registration is required to attend the Virtual Public Workshop/Hearing Register in add ance and submit comments at www apportprojects net/lck-campus-ea

Comments received at the Public Hearing will become part of the final EA document to be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for review

The CRAA has published a DraB EA document and copies will be available for public review beginning March 22, 2021 at the following locations

Columbus Regional Airport Authority John Glenn Columbus International Airport Administrative Offices 4600 International Gateway Columbus, OH 43219 Please call (513) 818-0617 to set up an appointment

Rickenbacker International Airport Administration Building Operations Department 7250 Starcheck Drive, Suite 100 Columbua, OH 43217 Please call (\$213) \$18-0017 to set up an appointment

Columbas Metropolitan Librari Southeast Branch 3930 S. Hamilton Road Groveport, OH 43125 Phone (614) 645-2275

Pickaway County Library Floyd E Younkin Branch 51 Long Street Ashville, Oluo 43103 Phone (740) 983-8856

Website: www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ca

Comments on the Draft EA may be submitted to Chris Sandfuss, 4445 Lake Forest Drive Suite 700. Cincinnati, OH 45242, or by email to  $LCK EA \hat{g}$  landrumbrown com All comments must be received by May 5, 2021

If special accommodations, such as audio or visual assistance, are required to participate in the online meeting, or if internet access is not available, please contact (513) 818-0617 by April 16, 2021

March 23 2021

Cardeville Hatald - 62061

Landrum & Brown

## Canal Winchester Times PROOF OF PUBLICATION

## STATE OF OHIO, FRANKLIN COUNTY. SS:

Steve Vacolas Credit Manager

*Canal Winchester Times*, a newspaper published at Columbus, Franklin County, Ohio, with a weekly Circulation, personally appeared and made oath that the notice of which a true copy is hereunto attached was published in *Canal Winchester Times* 1 Time(s) on March 25, 2021

and that the rate charged therefore is the same as that charged for commercial advertising for like services.

subscribed and Sworn on this 25th day of  $M_{0.5}ch$  2021 as witness my hand and seal of office.

OTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF OHIO



VERONICA HILL Notary Public, State of Ohio My Commission Expires 12-04-2023

# Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park and Notice of Public Hearing ACTION: The Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) and associated improvements south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The EA is being prepared to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. PUBLIC HEARING: The CRAA will conduct a Virtual Public Workshop and Public Hearing related to the EA for the proposed improvements at the RGLP. Due to the recommended precautions to stop the spread of COVID-19, this Public Workshop/Hearing will be conducted online. The Workshop/Hearing will be held from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. on April 20, 2021. Pre-registration is required to attend the Virtual Public Workshop/Hearing. Register in Advance and submit comments at www.sirportprojects.net/ick-campus-ea. Comments received at the Public Hearing will become part of the final EA document to be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for review. The CRAA has published a Draft EA document and coples will be available for public review beginning March 22, 2021 at the following locations: Columbus Regional Airport Authoräy John Glenn Columbus International Airport Administrative Offices 4500 International Gateway Columbus, OH 43219 Piease call (513) 818-0617 to set up an appointment. Rickenbacker International Airport Administration Building Operations Department 7250 Starcheck Drive, Suite 100 Columbus, OH 43217 Please call (513) 818-0617 to set up an appointment. Columbus Metropolitan Library Southeast Branch 3980 S. Hamilton Road Groveport, OH 43125 Phone: (614) 645-2275 Pickaway County Library Floyd E. Younkin Branch 51 Long Street Ashville, Ohio 43103 Phone: (740) 983-8856 Website: www.airport.projects.net/lck-campus-ea Comments on the Draft EA may be submitted to: Chris Sandloss, 4445 Lake Forest Drive, Suite 700, Cincinnati, OH 45242; or by email to: LCK-EAGUandrumbrown.com. All comments must be received by May 5, 2021. If special accommodations, such as audio or visual assistance, are required to participate in the online meeting, or if internet access is not available, please contact (513) \$18-0617 by April 16, 2021. Canal Winchester 3/25

# 6276942

## Tree program underway

#### **By Rick Palsgrove** Groveport Editor

Inspectors are now evaluating the cityowned trees along Groveport's streets. "Our tree inspection program is under

way," said Groveport City Councilman Ed Dildine, who is also council's representative on the city's trees and decorations committee. "The inspectors are checking species, age, potential danger, and how the trees are growing. Dildine said, if it is determined a tree

must be taken down, city representatives will have a conversation with the nearby homeowner prior to the removal of the tree

"If a tree is taken down, it will be replaced," said Dildine. "It may not be the same kind of tree, but it would be tree that would be good for a particular area. You don't want to put in a large tree that could grow into power lines, for example."

Groveport has consistently been named a Tree City USA and city officials want to maintain that tradition with its annual tree inspection and maintenance program to protect the town's city-owned historic trees, as well as younger ones, that line its streets.

The city has a large number of old, tall trees that enhance the beauty of its streetscape. But older trees also can get sick as they age and present a danger, such as last May when a spring storm uprooted a big tree along Front Street that crushed a Groveport Police cruiser (the police officer was unhurt). After that incident, city officials and an arborist examined old trees on Front Street, and other surrounding streets, and targeted the weaker trees for

#### MORPC proposes new transportation projects

The Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission now has available a list of 12 proposed, new transportation projects set to receive more than \$77 million in federal funds during state fiscal years 2022 to 2027. Among the 12 projects from around cen-

tral Ohio, two are local and include: •Brice Road, from Chantry Drive to south of Channingway Boulevard, \$15 mil-

lion; and •Rickenbacker Area Mobility Center,

\$3.37 million. "MORPC received more than \$220 million in requests for funding of new transportation projects from throughout our transportation planning area," said Thea Ewing, MORPC director of transportation & infrastructure development. "Our Attributable Funds Committee worked to identify the projects that would have the greatest regional impact despite the limit-

greatest regional impact despite the innit-ed financial resources available." Every two years, MORPC solicits proj-ects to receive federal transportation fund-ing in the MORPC transportation planning area of: Franklin County; Delaware County, Bloom and Violet townships in Fairfield County; New Albany, Pataskala and Etna Township in Licking County; and

#### removal.

The goal of the tree program is to conduct regularly scheduled inspections and maintenance of city-owned trees to miti-gate any potential hazards. The program is funded from the city's street fund budget, which is funded from income tax collec-

Groveport City Administrator B.J. King said last December, "Additionally, the city has a tree fund in the budget. The tree fund can only be used to replace stree trees located in subdivisions. In the stree fund there is \$16,000 budgeted for this pro gram in 2021."

The tree inspection and maintenance program's goals are to: maintain the health of all city-owned trees; plant or replant the largest suitable tree for the site selected and maintain a fully stocked urban forest The plan includes: performing health and hazard assessments of all city-owned

trees; removing or pruning for safety al dead and hazardous trees each year; quick response to requests for service; planting a diverse population of trees and replan removed trees each planting season; plan species and placement of trees with aes thetic properties such as summer and fal color and shape; ongoing routine inventory and evaluation of all city-owned trees: rou tine hazard assessment; conducting Arbo Day activities; and coordinating with the city's tree and decorations committee.

According to the plan, maintenance reduces costs and helps keep trees healthy Large trees provide more benefits than small trees and are prioritized when spac allows

Jerome Township in Union County. Examples of the types of transportation improvements eligible for funding includ highways, public transit, bikeways, pedestria facilities, bridges and traffic signal upgrades. MORPC's Attributable Funds Committe

is also proposing to recommend continue funding for 27 projects and programs t which MORPC had previously committee funds. More than \$211 million in futur funding commitments is being proposed.

The draft list of all projects recommended for funding is available on the MORPC-Attributable Funding for Transportation webpage. Printed copies of the draft listing are available upon request by calling MORPC at 614-228-2663. MORPC will consider final approval of the

funding commitments on May 13 and they will be incorporated into the Transportation Improvement Program for the appropriate fiscal year. The Transportation Improvement Program is a financially balanced listing of federal, state and locally funded projects that are scheduled for some phase of implementa-tion or development in a fouryear period. COTA and Delaware County Transit Program of Projects are part of its public involvement process.

# SSF

ns, Wednesdays at 5 p.m., • South/Canal Winchester, Grove City, Madison editions, Tuesdays at 5 p.m. es: Groveport and V All editions by phone, Tuesdays at 5 p.m. - Service Directory, Tuesdays at 5 p.m.

# ublic Notices

#### Notice of Availability of a

**Draft Environmental Assessment for the** Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park and Notice of Public Hearing

ACTION: The Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park (RGLP) and associated improvements south of Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK). The EA is being prepared to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

PUBLIC HEARING: The CRAA will conduct a Virtual Public Workshop and Public Hearing related to the EA for the proposed improvements at the RGLP. Due to the recommended precations to stop the spread of COVID-19, this Public Workshop/Hearing will be conducted online. The Workshop/Hearing will be held from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. on April 20, 2021. Pre-registration is required to attend the Virtual Public Workshop/ Hearing. Register in advance and submit comments at www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ea.

Comments received at the Public Hearing will become part of the final EA document to be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for review

The CRAA has published a Draft EA document and copies will be available for public review beginning March 22, 2021 at the following locations:

**Columbus Regional Airport Authority** John Glenn Columbus International Airport Administrative Offices 4600 International Gatewa Columbus, OH 43219

Please call (513) 818-0617 to set up an appointment. Please call (513) 818-0617 to set up an appointment.

mbus Metropolitan Library Southeast Branch 3980 S. Hamilton Road Groveport, OH 43125 Phone: (614) 645-2275

Pickaway County Library Floyd E. Younkin Branch 51 Long Street Ashville, Ohio 43103 Phone: (740) 983-8856

**Rickenbacker International Airport** 

Administration Building

Operations Department 7250 Starcheck Drive, Suite 100 Columbus, OH 43217

#### Website www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ea

ents on the Draft EA may be submitted to: Chris Sandfoss, 4445 Lake Forest Drive, Suite 700, Cincinnati, OH 45242; or by email to: LCK EA@landrumbrown.com. All comments must be received by May 5, 2021 If special accommodations, such as audio or visual assistance, are required to participate in the online meeting, or if internet access is not available, please contact (513) 818-0617 by April 16, 2021



The Madison Township Police Department is currently in possession of property collected from 2000 to the present. The property includes bicycles, electronics, sporting goods, jewelry, and tools.

Anyone having a legal right or can show proof of ownership should contact Madison Township Police department, Officer K. Mallory, by calling 614-836-5355 or in person at 4567 Madison Lane, Groveport, Ohio 43125.

Further, anyone claiming rights to these items should produce proper identification and identify-ing characteristics of these items, including but not limited to, serial number, the manner in which it was found, any identifying marks, and the condition of the property. Should it be determined by the Court that these items are abandoned, owner-ship to the property will then transfer to The Madison Township Police Department. The last day to claim property is May 4, 2021, at 3:00 p.m.

1.00

120

# CLASSIFIED ADS

Deadlines: Groveport and West editions, Wednesdays at 5 p.m., • South/Canal Winchester, Grove City, Madison editions, Tuesdays at 5 p.m. All editions by phone, Tuesdays at 5 p.m. • Service Directory, Tuesdays at 5 p.m.





http://www.columbus.ki2.ch.us/rfp Responding firms are to submit (1) electronic copy in PDF format of Parts and 11 of the POCC F110.350 State-ment of Qualificative in the provided of the energy of Qualificative in the provided of the genesic provided of the beronstons/columbus.ki2.oh.us. Dead-line for submisms is April 16, 2021 at 1020 Ad. Business Opportunity

Application for Name Change -Franklin County Probate Court 73.8. High Street, 22nd Floor, Colum-bus, OH 42215 Duren and Names, Skylar Rose Diaz Date and Time of Hearing: 05/20/2021 at 3:00pm Case No: 609146 45

This notice is a public service of The Columbus Dispatch

\*\*\*\*NOTICE\*\*\*\*

Investigate before you invest. Call the Ohio Division of Securities BEFORE purchasing an investment. Call the Division's mester Protection Indiane at 60-788-1194 to be reseture the other at 60-788-1194 to be seller is properly inclusived. That onlice is a public service of The Columbus Dispatch.)

Public Notices

LEGAL NOTICE Sealed bids will be received by White-ball City Schools will 1:30 pm, local time, on Morday, April 10, 2021, at the image of the second second second second bale for all labor, material, and serv-nasium Floor. Replacement, as destr-nasium Floor. Replacement, as destr-hed in the Contract Documents pre-tail questions to Paul Miller 4 (161) 798. Golf or puillersicherarchitekts.on. Bids received after this time will not posted on the District's web page www.westrams.org. Taise No.: 600:449 43 This Recent For Application (FEA) is being issued from Application (FEA) is being issued from the Frankini County Roard of Health, operating as Prainking and ashoristics, and through the Cen-ters of Disease Courted and Prevention RFA-CE19.940. Franklin County Pub-lie Realth is requesting applications RFA-CE19.940. Franklin County Pub-lie Realth is requesting applications County Overtises Data to Action Prob-member 1, 2021. August 31, 2022. This Provide and the count of the Central county Overtises Data to Action Prob-member 1, 2021. August 31, 2022. This Provide and the count of the Central county Overtises and the count of the Central county Overtises and the count of the Central county overdase of the Central overdase positioned to contribute in the im-position of country overdase in the im-counts of the Central overdase of the Central overdase of the Central overdase of the Central overdase and implementation of drug overdase of the Central overdase the positioned to contribute in the im-position of the Central overdase of the Centra www.wesrams.org. Contract Documents may be examined without charge during business hours at Schorr Architects, Inc. 230 Bradenton Avenue, Dublin, Ohio 43017, online at www.deplanroom.com, and online for members of Dodge Construc-tion at www.construction.com. tion at www.construction.com. Copies of said drawings and specifica-tions may be obtained by Prime Bid-ders from DC Reprographics, 1254 Courtland Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201; 614297-1200, Fax: 614297-1300, www.dcplanroom.com at a cost of \$40.00.

Increased local and state capacity for sustainable surveillance and preven-tion efforts; Decreased rate of opioid misuse and opioid use disorder; Increased provision of evidence-based treatment form opioid use disor-der.

540.00. "International second pair of the second secon der; • Decreased rates of ED visits due to misuse or opioid use disorder; • Decreased drug overdose death rate, including prescription and illicit opioid overdose death rates.

opiel overfaise Acadim miles and milette Pernkin Compty Pablis Haahah will as-cept applications ejectronically as indesyrotedhausere franklis connych indesyrotedhausere franklis connych togen will abb han on Applications read alord at Prakita Compty Pablis and and a prakita Compty Pablis and and a prakita Compty Pablis 200. Columbus, Ohio All applications and applications control of the control of the second paper of the control of the second paper of the control of the second paper of the abb and the second paper of the abb and the second paper of the control of the second paper of the abb and the second paper of the second paper of the abb and the second paper of the second paper of the abb and the second paper of the second paper of the abb and the second pa COLUMBUS, INC: The Board of Directors (the "Board") of the Franklinon Special Improvement ("Parallinon Special Improvement ("Parallimetion April 7, 2021 beginning at 300 PA, by teleconference, videoconference or similar electronic technological means, as permitted by Amended Substitute House Bill 197 of the 132rd General Assembly of the State of Unix, effective March 27, 820, as amended.

TON: PRANKLIN COUNTY OD2A Project. Applications will be considered valid for 100 days, attorney of the secret of a Application service of the secret of the secret association of the secret of the secret abandon the process and to reject all opplications at any time. Copies of the om Frankin County Public Health's website at https://mython.or may be obtained at its office at 280 East Applications at any time. Copies of the om Frankin County Public Health's defined at its office at 280 East Applications at any time. Copies of the public Health by submitting company, contact name, email address, phone indexy ordenhausers/franklineountych indexy. The meeting is accessible by video at the following link with the passcode 9 = 0 6 7 5 1 : https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88667896475? pvd = 0WH 1a29NNG44aXdLdUx50XQ xUDZkQT09 The meeting is accessible by phone at 1-301-715-8592 with meeting ID 886 6789 8475 and passcode 906751. Please contact Trent Smith, Executive Director, Franklinton Board of Trade at (614) 746-0287 or at trent@franklintonbo.torg with any questions on accessing the meeting.

#### Public Bid Advertisement (Electronic Bidding)

OSU-200518 Doan - Exterior Brick Repair The Ohio State University Columbus, Franklin County

Bids Due: 2:00 p.m. local time, April 20, 2021: through the State's electronic ing syst ://bidexpress.com EDGE Participation Goal: 5% of con-

DOMESTIC STEEL USE IS RE-QUIRED PER ORC 153.011.

Contract Estimated Cost General Contract \$1,210,000.00 (Est Base Bid) \$2,550,000.00 (Base Bid, plus alternates)

Pre-bid Meeting: Thursday, April 8, 2021 at 8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m., via Zoom Meeting Platform: Join Zoom Meeting: van zoom accung: https://osu.zoom/j98035028594?pwd = c2tialXxMXh.UeXKkRGJIMTJqMXdM UT09 Meeting ID: 982 3502 8594 Password: 359236

Bid Documents: The Bid Documents are available electronically at https://bidexpress.com.

More Info: Associate contact: Sara B. Peters, 216-533-4973, 513-241-2981, and speters/withpld.com. OSU contacts: Technical- Jeannie Martin, 614-638-1530, and Administrative-Melissa Bak-er, 614-247-1523, FAX: 614-292-2539.

The Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University reserves the right to waive any informalities or to reject any

seportment. Rickenbacker International Alrport Administration Buding 7250 Starchack Drive, Sular 100 Cohumbus, 0H 3217 Please ad (313) 816-0817 (Josefup an asportment. If special accommodations, such as audio or visual assistance, are required to participate in the online meeting, or if internet access is not available, please contact (513) 818-0617 by April 16, 2021.

waive any informalities or to reject any or all bids. 3292.45, 12 "This hereby gives public notice that the private foundation known as Mis-sion America will make available for review its 2020 form 390 FP. Interested parties should contact (614 406 -1015 to arrange for an appointment at a public 4 dry in the Columbus area.

Public Notices Public Notices NOTICE OF INTENT TO REQUEST RELEASE OF FUNDS April 5, 2021 Department of Finance and Manage-ment 90 West Broad Street Columbus, 04 43215 614-645-8200 Public Notices

614-615-8200 On or about April 13, 2021 The City of Columbus, Department of Finance and Management will authorize the Colum-bus Metropolitan Housing Authority the release of Choire Neighborhood Implementation Grant funds, Choire Muds are authorized by, and to be used in accordance with, Section 24 of the LS Housing Act of 1087, as amended. Following project: EDININGER COMMUNICY

The CMIA request is to undertake the collowing project. POINDEXTER COMMUNITY of park including that only initial do ac-tion space. Community gathering for park including that only initial do ac-tive recreation space. Passive recrea-graften, Offler native landscaping garden, Offler native landscaping garden, Offler native landscaping parten, Offler native landscaping weighborhood implementation Grant and the total project cost is \$500,000. The activity propaed is categorically celled under RUD regulations at 24 CFR 1647 56 from National Environ-mental Review Record (ERIs) that documents the environmental deterni-partment of Finare and Management at email address financission grant grant grant parts partment of Finare and management and individue grant grant grant parts partment of Finare and management at email address humorissionlaumas.gov.

PUBLIC COMMENTS Any individual, group, or agency may submit written comments on the RIR to the Gity of Columbus Department of Finance and Management at email ad-dress RHMorrise columbus groups of the POINDEXTER Community Fark Proj-et ERR Objection' in the subject line. All comments received by April 15 Columbus prior to authorizing submis-sion of a request for release of funds.

ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION

ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION The City of Columbus certifies to IUU that Joe Lombardi in his capacity as Director of innace and Management consents to accept the intrialcion or trongshi to enforce responsibilities in relation to the environmental review process and that these responsibilities of the certification satisfies its respon-sibilities under NEPA and related laws and anthorities and allows the CMLA to use Program Index.

OBJECTIONS TO RELEASE OF FUNDS

OBECTIONS TO RELEASE OF VIUNDS HID of all accept dipictions to its re-certification for a period of filteen period of the high of the observation of the period to the high of the observation of the period to the high of the observation of the period to the high of the observation of the period to the high of the observation of the period to the high of the observation of the period to the high of the observation of the period to the observation of the observation of the period to the observation of the observation of the devicement period to the observation of the period to the observation of the observation of the period to the observation of the observation of the the period the substitution of the observation of the period the substitution of the observation of the period the substitution of the observation of the the observation of the period the substitution of the observation of the the observation of the observation of the observation of the period the observation of the observation

Joe Lombardi Director, Finance and Management <u>4</u>/5

20 Oakstone Community School The draft financial report for fiscal year 2020 has been completed and is available for public inspection at the office of the Fiscal Officer. 43

45 NOTICE OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING FOR THE FRANKLINTON SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT OF COLUMBUS, INC.

# ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS Columbus Regional Airport Authority PCAir Replacement for Passenger Boarding Bridge at Gates BS1 and C55 Project #21047 JOHN GLENN COLUMBUS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Bids will be received by the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) un-til 2:00 pm., local time, Thursday, April 29, 2021 for PCAir Replacement for Passenger Boarding Bridge at Gates B31 and C55

at John Glenn Columbus International Airport. The work consists of Supply and replace two (2) – 45 ton Pre-Conditioned Air Units with pre-cool, hoses and hose racks at Gates BSI and port. The engineer's retained Air port. The engineer's retained for this project is \$350,000.00.

Scaled bids will be received by CRAA electronically via B2GNow. Informa-tion on how to register as well as to bid on this solicitation can at fund https://columusairports.diversitycomp liance.com/ until the specified due date and local time. Bids must be sub-mitted online using the B2GNow Portal by the specified due date and time.

The purposes of the Board meeting at to (1) Review fouget adjustments and to (2) Review fouget adjustments and sense Public Meeting procedures, 0 Biessa setting schedule for future subscription and the considered the CRAN will receit any biotection of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense that the sense of the sense that the sense of the s

## bids regardless of the cause for the de-

Tuesday, April 20, 2021

Register in advance and submit comments at:

www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ea

A Draft Environmental Assessment document is available for public review at the following locations. Please call prior to arriving at these locations to check hours of availability.

Columbus Regional Airport Authorty John Genn Columbus International Airport Admistrative Offices 4600 International Getway Columbus, OH 42319 Please call (51) 815-907 (to set up a call strategy of the set up a call strategy of the set up a columbus, OH 42519 Please value of the set up a columbus, OH 42519 Please valu

5:30 pm to 7:00 pm Pre-registration is required.

Virtual Public Workshop / Hearing Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

INTERNATIONAL AIRCOMENDA Bids will be received by the Columbus the service of the Columbus 11 - 200 name and time. TAA Jay, April 28, 2021 for GPU Replacement for hassayer bearing bridge at Gates for assayer bearing bridge at Gates ternational Airport. The work consists ternational Airport. The work consists ternational Airport. The work consists unstational Gates and the second second second second second second second and the second second second second ternation of the second s

project is \$150,000.00. Scaled bids will be received by CRAA electronically via B2GNow. Informa-tion on how to register as well as to view or bid on this solicitation can be https://columbusairports.diversity.comp liance.com/ until the specified due date and local time. Bids must be sub-mitted online using the B2GNow Portal by the specified due date and time.

Bids submitted by e-mail or fax are not acceptable and will not be considered. CRAA will reject any bids or unsolicit-ed bid addenda that are received after the deadline. CRAA will reject late bids regardless of the cause for the de-lay.

The second secon

Public Notices PUBLIC NOTICES Key Blue Prints to the plan holders who have picked up hard copy docu-ments. Addenda will also be available on the B2GNow website for those who Bilders who do not pick up hard copy documents from Key Blue Prints shall be responsible for checking the B2GNow website to retrieve any ad-dendum.

by: How BI Decements including the mains apportion to a set of the set of the main or are waited in the set of the mation are waited with Fort website and are on file with Fort atthering and the builders Schwage. A set of the set of the set of the builders of the set of the set of the builders of the set of the set of the builders of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the website of the set of the set of the decements from Key Bue Prints website of the regionable for the set of decements from Key Bue Prints website of the set of the set of the set of the decements from Key Bue Prints and the regionable for the set of the decements from Key Bue Prints has the regionable for the set of the set of decements from Key Bue Prints has the regionable for the set of the set of the set of the GRAA reserves the right to rester the set of the dentum. The GLAA reserves the right to reject any or all bids and to waive any itial defects of a mitor nature. This bid will be subject to all applicable Pederal, State and local laws, regula-tions and rules. The Contract will be awarded to the lowest responsive and resetuning bidner in accordance will bid resetuning bidner in

Section 9.5.12 of the Unit ferritsed The Columbia Equival Algorit As-bords, in accordance with the posi-sions of The U of the Civil lights Act of 1964 (71 Stat. 222, 42 U.S.C. § 2000); unitse all bidders that it will affirma-tively ensure that any confract entered isolarbarrated business enterprises or alropt concession disadvantaged busi-tised fuel coproduction of the section of the response to this invitation and will not regulate the binsing of the Civil Algorithm regionse to this invitation and will not pounds of race, color, or national ori-gin in consideration for an award. The CRAA reserves the right to reject dendum. The CRAA reserves the right to reject any or all bids and to varie any informalities, irregularities and tech-nical defects of a minor nature. This reject and the regulation of the reserve toos and rules the contract will be awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidget in accordance will a 532 of the Ohio Revised code.

in in consideration for an award. It is the palicy of the CRAA that Diver-sity Business Partner (DBP) organiz-tions shall have the maximum opport-tions shall have the maximum opport-nervices as cultimed in this request. A business cult precedured as a Diad. Women Business Enterprise (MBE): Women Business Enterprise (MBE): Women Business Enterprise (MBE): Papity (ERXD) certified Business En-tration (Brown and Business Enterprise (BDE): Reputy (ERXD) certified Business En-table (Brot to obtain DBP participation accordance with the goals celabilish-ing the DBP Program, Contact Business Diversity Business Columbus Airports. BURETY REQUIREMENTS: The hidd Control Solar on the Unit Arethone Section 2016 (2016)

com. SUBJETY REQUIREMENTS The bid-der must provide the required surply documentation at the time of the bid due date and time. The documentation shall comply with the requirements, however the state of the state o

An irrevocable Letter of Credit, or Certified Check, or Cashier's Check

Cashiel's Cueck Acceptable survey, document in an amount equal to 100% of the Bid Price, including Alternates: A Bid and Performance Bond exe-cuted by the bidder and a survey com-pany authorized to do business in the State of Ohio and satisfactory to the CRAA, in substantial compliance with the Ohio Revised Code Section 135,371.

Anome surversing a commonscriptors. SURJETY ROCINENENTS: The bid-der must provide the required array documentation at the time of the bid due date and time. The documentation the obio feveres of the common state the bio fevere of code (GRC Sections 15337 and 15351). These BIC Sections 15337 and 15351, These BIC Sections 15347 and 15351, These BIC Sect the Ohn Revised Code Section 133.271. The bidder providing a certified check or cathier's check as security please mail the check to: CHAA, L-349, Columbus, 04: 42800 When sub-cate the project nume on the check the check of the check of the check cate the project nume on the check the check of the check of the check of the check the check of the check of the check of the check the check of the check of the check of the check of the check the check of the c Acceptable surety documents in an amount equal to 10% of the Bid Price including Alternates: An irrevocable Letter of Credit, or Certified Check, or Cashier's Check Cashier's Check Acceptable surety document in an amount equal to 100% of the Bid Price, including Alternates: A Bid and Performance Bond exe-cuted by the bidder and a surety com-cuted by the bidder and a surety com-sitate of Ohio and satisfactory to the CRAA, in substantial compliance with the Ohio Revised Code Section 133.371. Ut he bidder is considired as confifed

PRE-BID MEETING INFORMATION: A MANDATORY pre-bid meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 14, 2021 at 9:00 a.m., local time. This meet-ing will be held by Webex. Below is the information to attend this meeting.

https://craa.webex.com/craa/j.php?M TID = m233ab994eec59a6e6222c5840251

Meeting Access Code: 132 979 4351 Meeting Password: 648MKjappDh

the Ohio Revised Cole Section 133.271. If the bidder providing a certified pheck or cashier's check as security please mail the check to CIAA. I-miting the security check please ndi-net the project name on the check. The Columbus Regional Airport Au-tic the project name on the check. The Columbus Regional Airport Au-tic the project name on the check. The Columbus Regional Airport Au-tic the the check please ndi-tic the the check please ndi-tic the the check the columbus cept. Sarety may also be submitted by EFT. To submit by EFT, please email to Ahro Law recention of the con-trast and as appropriate, the Columbus check to the bidder for the anomat that had been received by CIAA. If you wish to attend via telephone in-stead of WebEx, dial 408-418-9388

PRE-BID MEETING INFORMATION: A MANDATORY pre-bid meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 14, 2021 at 10:30 a.m., local time. This meeting will be held by Webex. Below is the information to attend this meet-ing.

stead of WebEx, dial 406-118-6388 AMANDAORM Stoar of the work sites will commence immediately following the meeting. No stor of the sites will be given after this date. Bids subtituted by data of the site of the site of the data of the site of the site of the data of the site of the site of the SiXNew and all answers will be post-ed via BiXNew. Any required added to of the site of the site of the SiXNew and all answers will be post-ed via BiXNew and all answers will be post-priday, April 23, 2021. https://craa.webex.com/craa/j.php? MTID = m2101bb24183da9110fe3373cfe4 e1a17 Meeting Access Code: 132 933 5749

Meeting Password: 9C0b0vupF28

If you wish to attend via telephone in-stead of WebEx, dial 408-418-9388 The Columbus City School District an-nounces a Request for Qualifications for the following project:

steid of WebEx, diai 463-148-6388 A MANDAORY tour of the work-sites will commence immediately following the meeting. No tour of the sites will be given after this date. Bids submitted by dataty pre-bid will be returned unop-ened. Any questions regarding the work or bid should be submitted via work or bid should be submitted via work or bid should be submitted via ed via B20Xow. Any required addenda will be posted by Key Blue Prints, The priday, April 23, 2021 43. for the following project: Renovation of HVAC Systems in "Con-struction Manager-At-Risk Delivery Model". The work will consist of HVAC Phase 11 Contract - school facilities in not limited to HVAC renovation with related electrical, plumbing and archi-tectural work required to complete the project Qualifications will be received for the following constructs:

tor the tonowing contracts: - One Engineer of Record. A Virtual In-formational meeting covering the proj-cets will be held on Pridox, April 9, and https://cesohus.com.us//885416855127 prod = cktma312 fed/alk/arXef/VFBnAI WxwQTOB Meeting ID: 885 4168 5512 Passcode: 812504 To join to phone, di-al al 164 550 125505 S Meeting ID: 895 4168 5512, Passcode: 812504 ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS Columbus Regional Airport Authority GPU Replacement for Passenger Boarding Bridge at Gates A3 and A4 Project #21048 JOHN GLENN COLUMBUS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Too Gonzi, rascoter Jasori One Construction Manager-At-Risk. A Virtual Informational meeting covering the projects will be held on Priday. Null Sciences and Sciences and Sciences and Sciences https://ecsohus.com.usi/073224876777 passcode: 404578. To joint by Done. di-al and Sciences and Sciences and Sciences and Sciences Passcode: 404578. To Joint by Done. di-al and Sciences and Sciences and Sciences and Sciences 2248 7677, Passcode: 404578

2243 7677, Passcode: 40478 2006, Passcode: 40478 2007, Passcode: 2007, Passcod

Intp://www.coumous.ki.com.usrip Responding firms are to submit one (1) electronic copy (in pdf format) of their qualifications on the OPCC F110-330 Statement of Qualifications Form (most recent version can be downloaded at to Capital Improvements. Construction Contract Manager, Brandle Bronston Houpe bornston@recommusk.kl.oh.ws..Part 1 Houpe at bornstom@columbus.k12.oh.us. Part 1 is limited to 30 pages. EDGE require-ments do not apply to this RFQ. Dead-line for submissions is April 23, 2021 at 10:00 AM. The Board of Education reserves the COLUMBUSCEO 329, 4/5

BlueTacketsXtra.com

Public Notices ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS Columbus Regional Airport Authority Rickenbacker Terminal RTUs #5 and #7 HVAC Replacement Project #21048 RICKENBACKER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

ARTONI Bids will be reseived by the Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRA) un-bil 200 pm., local time. Thursday, April 29, 2021 for Hickenbacker Termi-al RTUs #5 and #7 HVAC Replace-ment at Rickenbacker International Airport. The work consists of supply and replace two (2) – 40 ton Roof Top Units at Rickenbacker International Airport The engineer's estimate for this project is \$20,000.00.

this project is \$200,000.00. Scaled bids will be received by CRAA electronically via B2GNow. Informa-tion on how to register as well as to your bid on this solicitation can bid https://columbus.irports.directive.ity.com liance.com/ until the specified due date and lead time. Bids must be sub-mitted online using the B2GNow Portal by the specified due date and lead.

Bids submitted by e-mail or fax are not acceptable and will not be considered. CRAA will reject any bids or unsolicit-ed bid addenda that are received after the deadline. CRAA will reject late bids regardless of the cause for the de-lay.

bids regardless of the cause for the de-start of the second sec

dendum. The ChaA reserves the right to reject any or all bids and to waive any micht defects of a minor namer. This bid will be subject to all applicable Federal, State and local laws, regula-tions and mics. The Contract will be swarfed to the lowest responsive and Section 9.312 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Section 3.3.1.2 of the Onlo Perises The Colomba Egicant Airport Ag-harity, in accordance with the provi-sions of Title V of the Cvin Rights Aet of 1984 (73 Stat. 220, 421 JS. C. 8, 2000) notifier all blackers that it will all thran-tively resure that any contract entered biologonalaged boths, enterprise or airport concession disadvantaged busi-ness enterprises will be allowed full response to this invitation and will not be discriminated against on the gin in consideration for an award.

giouns or net. Color, or national origin in consideration for an award. It is the policy of the CRAA that Diver-tity Basiness Partner 'DBP organiza-nity to participate in the provision of services as outlined in this request. A business entity recognized as a Disad-vervices as outlined in this request. A business entity recognized as a Disad-women Basiness Enterprise (MBE); Minority Business Enterprise (MBE); BusinessDiversity (Columbus Airports: SUBERTY REGUITEREVENTS: The Mathematical Statess Subarts ReguiterEvers The Mathematical Statess Mathematical Statess (MBE); Minority Business (MBE); Minority Business

com. SUBETY REQUIREMENTS: The bid-der must provide the required arety documentation at the time of the bid shall comply with the requirements in the Ohio Fersied Code (ORC) Sections the Ohio Fersied Code (ORC) Sections in the State of Chio, payable to the Co-lumbus Regional Arport Authority

Acceptable surety documents in an amount equal to 10% of the Bid Price including Alternates: An irrevocable Letter of Credit, or Certified Check, or Cashier's Check

Cashiel Scheck Acceptable survey document in an amount equal to 10% of the Bid Price, including Alternates: A Bid and Performance Bond exe-euted by the bidder and a surgety com-pany authorized to do business in the State of Ohio and satisfactory to the CRAA, in substantial compliance with the Ohio Revised Code Section 135,371.

Cuck, in substantial compliance with the buils breast code section 35371. If the bidder is providing a certified please mail the check to CIRAA. L 3480 (columbus, OH 33200, When sub-relations of the check to CIRAA. L 3480 (columbus, OH 33200, When sub-tact like project name on the check. The Columbus Regional Arport Au-tor the project name on the check. The Columbus Regional Arport Au-tor and the project name on the check. The Columbus Regional Arport Au-tor and the project name on the check and the project name on the check and the project name on the check BPT. To submit by EFT, please email Regional Arport Authority will issue a check to the bidder for the anomit has a submet of the check of the anomit has a submet of the check of the submet has a submet of the submet of the submet has a submet of the submet has a submet of the submet o

PRE-BID MEETING INFORMATION: A MANDATORY pre-bid meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 15, 2021 at 9:00 a.m., local time. This meeting, will be held by Webex. Below is the in-formation to attend this meeting.

https://craa.webex.com/craa/j.php? MTID = mfe0842b76df39f58d051284af2a 89833

Meeting Access Code: 132 940 2476 Meeting Password: 83RXf3U6fYw

If you wish to attend via telephone instead of WebEx, dial 408-418-9388

A MANDATORY tour of the work sites will commence immediately following

Dogs for Sale Wanted Mini Goldendoodle Puppies - Sweetest little bundles of furl Full of energy and adore children. Family raised & well socialized. 610-857-1025 www.LancasterPuppies.com \$2800



**PROOF OF PUBLICATION** STATE OF OHIO PICKAWAY COUNTY, SS

#### CIRCLEVILLE HERALD

Landrum & Brown 11279 Cornell Park Drive Cincinnati, OH 45242

Account: 170721 Ticket: 620663 RE: **Global Hearing Rickenbacker** Cost of Notice: \$371.40

I, SHERRIE BOSSART, ADVERTISING DIRECTOR OF THE CIRCLEVILLE HERALD, BEING DULY SWORN, DO SAY THAT THE NOTICE HERETO ATTACHED WAS PUBLISHED IN THE CIRCLEVILLE HERALD ON April 6, 2021, DURING ALL OF WHICH TIME SAID PAPER WAS PRINTED AND IN GENERAL GIRCULATION IN SAID COUNTY.

SHERRIE BOSSART

SWORN TQ AND SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME THIS DAY 4/6/2021

Da

STATE OF OHIO PUBLIC NOTARY

Lisa M. Hedrick Notary Public, State of Ohio My Commission Expires Section 147.03 R.C.

**Circleville Herald** 401 E. Main Circleville, OH 43113 FED ID 61-1731416

## COMMUNITY

## **Pickawav-Ross Career and** Technology Honor Roll

Pickaway-Rosa Career and Technol-ogy Center third nine weeks Honor Roll Grade 10

Sarra Ben Rejeb, Caden Carmona, Nevach Dewson, Medison Dingess, Linda Rinehart, Luvaya Wright Grade 11

Taylor Ackley, Ol-ivia Alexander, Taylor Arndt, Cheyanne Ater, Keaton Baird, Matthew Baker, Olivia Baldwin Bryce Baltzer, Jason Baxter, Jarod Bellar, Rebekah Bennett, Tabitha Benneti, Mackenzie Berry, Anna Betts, Leila Briggs, Hannah Brumbaugh Robert Bullard, Brook lyn Burgoon, Owen Burns, Collin Burton, Destiny Butterbaugh, Jade Caplinger, Kacle Carr, Sarah (Arwen) Carter, Dylan Carver, Lane Chaffin, Kayla Chapman. Esther Chappelear, Carly Christman, Brayden Clay, Emma Clemons, Modison Coker, Zachary (Mason) Colburn, Nathan Conkel, Shelby Cook, Emms Coomer, Landon Coonrod,

Katie Cupp, Atlantis Dairymple, Paris Daw-son, Brooklyn (Paris) Debord, Ellana Degarmo, Kalilyn Dickey, Gerald (Noah) Disantis, Dakota Donahue, Amber Eicholz, Abigail Eidenler, Ross Eisnaugle, Karen Elkins, Alden Estep, Grace Ev-ans, Marissa Farmer, Alden Fowler, Emma Fromm, Alison Fuller, Carter Gardner, Timo thy Gillfillan, Kalley Groves, Camie Harber. Nathaniel (Nathan) Hardin, Kaylin Barris, Owen Hartranft. Ladalyah Hatfield, Sydney Hill, Hunter Hines, Michael Hodge, Cyrus Horsley, Hailey Howard, Carolyn Hub-bard, Robert Hubbard, Briar Hunt, Dalton Hunt, Kels| Husted. Timberiee Jenkins Johnson Christopher (Gaige), Roy Ken-nedy, Lane Kingery, Elizabeth Kisner, Kyile Klichen

Mikayla Kittell, Caleb Layton, Autumn Lessure, Maranda Leasure. Jessica Lemaster. Joseph Lyons, James Marable, Kariyan Marshall, Madelya Mason, Benjamin (Asher) McBee, Hayli McClure, Juliet McFadden, Jonathan (Jon) McGarvey. Grant Meyer, Joseph Miller, Eli Mitchell, Palge Morris, Austin Nunley, Hannah Osborne, Joseph Osborne, Sidney Oyer, Chris-topher Parrett, Noah Pendergrass, Lynsey Peters, Kloe Poynor, Courtney Price, Taylor Pummel, Tina Quincel, Conner Rotcliff, Lucas Ray, Shelby Reynolds. Keicey Rice, Dilon Riffle, Blaks Roberts. Corey Rose, Alex Ru-nyon, Braden Sabine.

nyon, Braden Sabine. Lexie Saunders, Aidan Scranton, Sa-brina Sellers, Kalilyn Sexton, Hassan Sharif, Jake Shaw, Kylee

Sheets, Tabish Sheikh Keyshawn Shepherd, Kayley Slaughter, Andrew Smith, Jordan Smith, Kylie Smith, Harlie Snyder, Chey-enne Spears, Maddox Steinbrook, Haylee Stevens, Charily Stew art, Megan Stewart,

Gwendolyn (Gwen) Strausbeugh, Conner Temple, Joseph Thea-do, Amber Thompson, Austin Thompson, Braydon Thornion, Vincent Vanhorn, Abi-gail Wade, Frederick Wheat, Derek Wheeler, Jake Whited, Slakayla Jake Whited, Statayia Whitten, Madelyn Willis, Stason Willis, Devin Willoughby, Trinity Wright, Jack Wrinkle, Javier Yates, Lydla Yates, Maylee

Young Grade 12 Rainy Adkins, Sa-vannah Adkina, Aali-yah Aiflen, Chayenna Allen, Casey Bethel, Emily Blevins, Jordan Bolen, Chuse Cain, Samuel Capretta, Johnathon Cardenas-Simpson, Chad Chasdie, Binde Chrysler, Harlie Chrysler, Larry (Rusty) Collins, Damon Corrales, Kalis Cosby, Dalton Crowe, Jacob Delbert, Kyle Depugh, Blake Detty, Phil-

lip (Tommy) Dowler, Shawn Easter, Aaron Ellis, Caleb Eplin, Brooklyn Flannery, Artyana Fox, Grayson Freeland, Grace (Gracie) Frishie, Halley Gillette, Blake Halslop, Jalen

Harris, Aubrey Harts-born, Brianna Hill, Tyler Hines, Hudson Honline, Karighan Howard, Gabriel Hudson. Aden Juliar Elizabeth Kassuike. Jacob Kerscher, Hall Knapp, Joseph Kobel Mary Ann Lands, Travis Lane, Macker rie Lester, Couriany Linton, Emily Lott. den Mack, Coral Mar Alexis Meadows, Isa Mehrie, Angel Mende Aviles, Heather Milk Hayden Moore.

Kristopher Moss-barger, Jacob Muma Anna Nichols, Jalyn Nichols, Ronnie Oak

Johnathan Ogdin, Haley Parker, Madia Pederson, Chasidee Perry, Lilli Pontious Tamiah Pressley, Chloe Redden, Ashto Rister, Jacob Rose, Hunter Rowland, Savennah (Sid) Schmid Tyler Schmidt, Zack ary Schoonover, Gler Scott, Joseph Searles Baileigh Seitz, Austi Self, Dillon Sirney, Tabitha Skagga, Jail Snyder, Jason Sprin er, Jordan Sprouse, Susan Stewart, Abigail Strausbaug Victoria Thompson. seph Truman, Joseph Underwood, Lanette Valentine, Zach-

ary Vanhorn, Alona Ward, Jameson Ward Carly Walts, Kyle Weaver, Thomas Wit ley, Mallory Withers Sarah Wolfe, Daniell

Wolfurd, Gage Woods Noah Wright, Parker Young, Jacle Zickafor





Westfall BPA advanced to rationals receivity. The Small Buchness Management team strategiland and is a hypothytical business through a scenario. Seniers David Medited and Jack Latham, as well as ju-spent time putting lappeter their presentation to assist the hypothytical business evenue. They the project virtually and continued to make changes for the state compatibies. They face assess of sented throw to notionals. Senior Synchron placed threin the personal tenned an amangement oplans to help ine Othela B. d the then presented their id in Ohio, which adqualified for nationals. The national conference will be held virtue

## Spring exhibition at Ohio **University** – Chillicothe is in full bloom

CHILLICOTHE — The Ohio Chillicothe Bennett Hall Patricia Scott Memo-rial Art Gallery spring art exhibition, Near & Far Away, is a refresh-ing and inviting space to

A

explore. The exhibition contains vivid paintings, photography, textiles, collages and mixed media pieces meant to bridge together local and not-so-local artists.

Open during campus hours, Near & Far Away is free to the public and will run though April 25, 2021 For more information about this spring art

exhibition, please contact Dr. Tuny Vinci, Associate Professor of Arts and Sci-ences, at vinci@uhio.edu or Crcil McCloy. Ohio Chillicothe art student, at cm645416@uhio.edu.



Virtual Public Workshop / Hearing Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park

> Tuesday, April 20, 2021 5:30 pm to 7:00 pm

Pre-registration is required.

Register in advance and submit comments at:

#### www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ea

A Draft Environmental Assessment document is available for public review at the following locations. Please call prior to arriving at these locations to check hours of availability

If special accommodations, such as audio or visual assistance, are required to participate in the online meeting, or if internet access is not available.

**Columbus Regional Airport Authority** John Glenn Columbus International Airport Administrative Offices 4600 International Gateway Columbus, OH 43219 Please call (513) 818-0617 to set up an eppointment.

**Rickenbacker International Airport** Administration Building Operations Department 7250 Starcheck Drive, Suite 100 Columbus, OH 43217 Please call (513) 818-0617 to set up an appointment.

Website: www.airportprojects.net/lck-campus-ea

please contact (513) 818-0617 by April 16, 2021

**Columbus Metropolitan** Library Southeast Branch 3980 S. Hamilton Road Groveport, OH 43125 Phone: (614) 645-2275

Pickaway County Library Floyd E. Younkin Branch 51 Long Street Ashville, Ohio 43103 Phone: (740) 983-8856



G-15





G-17




















12





14

























26







This page intentionally left blank

# COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT EA

This section includes all comments received during the Draft EA comment period. Responses to comments are included in the following section.

This page intentionally left blank

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Ohio, FW3 <ohio@fws.gov> Friday, April 16, 2021 10:04 AM Ernest.Gubry@faa.gov Chris Sandfoss CRAA - Cargo Campus at Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Development, Franklin & Pickaway Counties Ohio



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Ecological Services Office 4625 Morse Road, Suite 104 Columbus, Ohio 43230 (614) 416-8993 / Fax (614) 416-8994



TAILS# 03E15000-2020-I-1500

Dear Mr. Gubry:

### **USFWS-1**

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received your recent correspondence requesting information about the subject proposal. We offer the following comments and recommendations to assist you in minimizing and avoiding adverse impacts to threatened and endangered species pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq), as amended (ESA). This letter supersedes our letters of September 21, 2020 and April 2, 2021.

The Service has reviewed your project description and concurs with your determination that the project, as proposed, is not likely to adversely affect any federally listed species. An acoustic survey for Indiana bats (*Myotis sodalis*) and northern long-eared bats (*Myotis septentrionalis*) was conducted in the summer of 2020 and did not detect either species. Negative survey results are valid for five years. No tree clearing should occur on the site after March 31, 2026 without further coordination with the Service.

This concludes consultation on this action as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. Should, during the term of this action, additional information on listed or proposed species or their critical habitat become available, or if new information reveals effects of the action that were not previously considered, consultation with the Service should be reinitiated to assess whether the determinations are still valid.

If you have questions, or if we can be of further assistance in this matter, please contact our office at (614) 416-8993 or <u>ohio@fws.gov.</u>

Sincerely,

Patrice Ashfield Field Office Supervisor

From:	Gross, Omri <omri.gross@hud.gov></omri.gross@hud.gov>
Sent:	Wednesday, April 21, 2021 1:45 PM
То:	Chris Sandfoss
Cc:	Leach, Thomas H; Castillo, Melanie H
Subject:	RE: Request for Comments on Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Development EA

Chris,

# HUD-1

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft Environmental Assessment and attend the public hearing/presentation for the proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park. HUD's Office of Environment and Energy has reviewed the content of the draft Environmental Assessment and has no comments to contribute at this time.

Once again, we appreciate and thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the project.

Let us know if you have any questions or have any other information you'd like to share.

Thanks!

### **Omri Gross**

Field Environmental Officer, Region V (OH)
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Environment and Energy
Columbus Field Office – Region V
200 N. High St., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
Ph: 614.280.6200 | Fax: 614.280.6175



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

May 5, 2021

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF: Mail Code RM-19J

Guadalupe Cummins-Sanchez Federal Aviation Administration Detroit Airports District Office, DET-ADO-600 11677 South Wayne Road, Suite 107 Romulus, Michigan 48174

### Re: Comments on the Environmental Assessment for the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park Cargo Campus Development Project, Franklin and Pickaway Counties, Ohio

Dear Ms. Cummins-Sanchez:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reviewed the Draft Environmental Assessment for the project referenced above. Our comments are provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA Implementing Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead agency under NEPA, and the Columbus Regional Airport Authority is the project proponent.

The Proposed Action includes developing an approximately 330-acre site with five commercial cargo and warehouse structures totaling 4.2 million square feet and extending Rickenbacker Parkway. EPA providing scoping comments on September 8, 2020. We again offer comments to assist FAA and the project team in protecting natural resources and human health while planning and implementing the proposed project. Please find EPA's recommendations within the enclosed Detailed Comments. We continue to recommend use of the enclosed Construction Emission Control Checklist.

When the subsequent NEPA document becomes available, please send an electronic copy to Jen Tyler, the lead reviewer for this project, at tyler.jennifer@epa.gov. Ms. Tyler is also available at 312-886-6394.

Sincerely,

KENNETH WESTLAKE Date: 2021.05.05 14:51:49 -05'00'

Kenneth A. Westlake Deputy Director Office of Tribal and Multi-media Programs

Enclosures: (1) Detailed Comments, (2) Construction Emission Control Checklist CC Via Email: Chris Sandfoss, Managing Consultant, Landrum & Brown Mark Kelby, Columbus Regional Airport Authority

#### ENCLOSURE 1: COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE RICKENBACKER GLOBAL LOGISTICS PARK CARGO CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, FRANKLIN AND PICKAWAY COUNTIES, OHIO

### **Project Need and Description**

The EA states that there is a need "for bulk distribution warehouse space in the Columbus area with convenient access to the Intermodal Terminal" (page 7). Data to demonstrate the need for additional warehouse space, in addition to what exists in the area, would help the reader of the EA to understand the need for the project. In addition, the project includes the "extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases: 3b and 4." Details are needed to understand what the phases refer to, whether state or federal agencies would need to approve the roadway extension, and how the roadway work would be funded. Further, it's unclear how the Norfolk Southern Railroad **USEPA-1** Rickenbacker Intermodal Terminal is considered in the analysis of impacts and calculation of expected operation truck trips.

### **Recommendations for the Subsequent NEPA Document:**

- Provide data to demonstrate the need for the proposed project. USEPA-2 •
  - Explain what the extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases 3b and 4 entails. Is this • part of a larger project, and are phases 1 and 2 complete? Would state or federal
- **USEPA-3**
- agencies need to approve the extension, and how is that portion of the project funded? A fuller description of the Parkway extension would facilitate a better understanding of project impacts and help support the EA's statements around Transportation Conformity.

### **Construction and Operational Air Quality**

As stated in our scoping comments, the project team has an opportunity to minimize construction air impacts through use of best practices, such as those in the enclosed Construction Emission Control Checklist. When the project is fully operational, the project team estimates that it would generate approximately 6,914 additional round trips, with 2,420 of those trips being tractor trailer trucks (Appendix E, page E-10), which would create emissions in the region.

### **Recommendations for the Subsequent NEPA Document:**

- Identify and commit to specific measures to reduce construction emissions. Options include: (1) requiring dust suppressant strategies, such as use of tarps and watering **USEPA-4** soils, (2) limiting idling time for construction trucks and heavy equipment, and (3) soliciting bids that require zero-emission technologies or advanced emission control systems. See additional best practices in the enclosed Construction Emission Control Checklist.
  - Consider measures to reduce operational emissions from the cargo campus, such as

**USEPA-5** 

requiring, incentivizing, or otherwise promoting the use trucks with cleaner engine technologies and minimizing idling.

### Contamination

For the safety of the public and project construction workers, it is important to investigate possible contamination in the construction area upfront. Investigating and addressing potential challenges early in the process can avoid future project delays or accidental exposures or releases. We understand that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers completing remediation on two munitions response sites (MRSs) in the project area, and remediation is expected to be completed before construction of the Proposed Action (page 32). The EA also states, "the level of other contaminants was tested, and that study determined that adverse health effects from human and ecological exposure to chemical munitions constituents in the soil are not expected" (page 60).

### **Recommendations for the NEPA Document:**

Discuss the study that determined site safety for areas other than the two MSRs currently being remediated. Clarify who performed the study, who approved the study, whether the **USEPA-6** USACE or other agencies were involved, and which standards for cleanup were met. We raise this to help ensure there are no unintended consequences with hazardous materials during construction.

### **Environmental Justice (EJ) and Community Impacts**

The EA explains that low-income communities are within the project area, which have the potential to be communities with environmental justice concerns. More information on outreach and engagement with residents would clarify whether they have been meaningfully involved in the project.

### **Recommendations for the Subsequent NEPA Document:**

- Discuss outreach and engagement with residents about increases in truck traffic and associated air quality, noise, and transportation safety impacts. Include residents in
- **USEPA-7** the mobile home park on Ashville Park and multi- and single- family homes on the proposed truck route (pictured on page 5-17). Are residents aware of the proposed increases in truck traffic and associated air and noise impacts? How has public input informed project decision-making?
  - The EA concludes that implementation of roadway projects from a 2018 Mid-Ohio • Regional Planning Commission report, "would be expected to improve traffic conditions and reduce any impacts of additional vehicle trips to and from the
- **USEPA-8**

proposed Cargo Campus development. Therefore, no significant traffic impacts would occur" (page 5-18). Are these roadway projects funded, scheduled, and certain to occur? If not, what would traffic impacts from the proposed cargo campus consist of absent the roadway projects? How does the timing of the roadway projects align with the timing of the cargo campus?

### **Aquatic Resources**

The EA explains that the project would directly impact approximately 4,900 linear feet of streams and 4.3 acres of wetlands (page 5-21). Recommendations below are in line with EPA's scoping letter as well as scoping comments from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Appendix page 237-239).

### **Recommendations for the Subsequent NEPA Document:**

- We continue to encourage the project team to provide information in a NEPA
- **USEPA-9**
- document that supports the project's compliance with the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines.

•

- **USEPA-10**
- Explain how the project was designed to avoid and minimize the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into Waters of the United States (Waters). Provided an
- analysis of siting and design alternatives the project team considered for (1) on-site avoidance and minimization of impacts to Waters and (2) off-site avoidance and minimization of impacts to Waters for borrow or spoil areas.

# **USEPA-11** • Discuss the location and availability of appropriate mitigation for unavoidable impacts.

# **Energy Efficiency & Building Design**

As discussed in our scoping comments, energy efficient design and material selection could reduce operations costs and promote a high-quality workspace, while also better protecting the environment.

### **USEPA-12** Recommendations for the NEPA Document:

- See examples and take best practices from efficient warehouses and distribution centers described on the U.S. Green Building Council's website at https://www.usgbc.org/projects?Rating+System=%5B%22Warehouse%20and%20dis tribution%20centers%20-%20Existing%20Buildings%22%5D
- Consider Green Infrastructure for managing stormwater. Guidance and tools are available at <a href="https://www.epa.gov/green-infrastructure">https://www.epa.gov/green-infrastructure</a> .
- Consider best practices for energy efficiency and sustainable building design for the new warehouses. Examples include south-facing skylights and windows, motion-sensored lighting, and use of Energy Star certified products. Consider incorporating solar power into the project design.
- Consider Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and other green building programs, as well as designing for net-zero energy usage. In addition to reducing the overall environmental footprint, green building certification programs promote health by encouraging practices that protect indoor air quality.
- Consider incorporating electric vehicle charging stations in new parking areas.
- Commit to recycle construction and demolition debris, which preserves valuable landfill space and makes use of materials that have high embodied energy.
- Consider replacing raw materials with recycled materials for infrastructure components.

### **<u>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</u>** <u>**Construction Emission Control Checklist**</u>

Diesel emissions and fugitive dust from project construction may pose environmental and human health risks and should be minimized. In 2002, EPA classified diesel emissions as a likely human carcinogen, and in 2012 the International Agency for Research on Cancer concluded that diesel exhaust is carcinogenic to humans. Acute exposures can lead to other health problems, such as eye and nose irritation, headaches, nausea, asthma, and other respiratory system issues. Longer term exposure may worsen heart and lung disease.<sup>1</sup> We recommend FAA consider the following protective measures and commit to applicable measures in the subsequent NEPA document.

### **Mobile and Stationary Source Diesel Controls**

Purchase or solicit bids that require the use of vehicles that are equipped with zero-emission technologies or the most advanced emission control systems available. Commit to the best available emissions control technologies for project equipment in order to meet the following standards.

- On-Highway Vehicles: On-highway vehicles should meet, or exceed, the EPA exhaust emissions standards for model year 2010 and newer heavy-duty, on-highway compression-ignition engines (e.g., long-haul trucks, refuse haulers, shuttle buses, etc.).<sup>2</sup>
- Non-road Vehicles and Equipment: Non-road vehicles and equipment should meet, or exceed, the EPA Tier 4 exhaust emissions standards for heavy-duty, non-road compression-ignition engines (e.g., construction equipment, non-road trucks, etc.).<sup>3</sup>
- Locomotives: Locomotives servicing infrastructure sites should meet, or exceed, the EPA Tier 4 exhaust emissions standards for line-haul and switch locomotive engines where possible.
- Marine Vessels: Marine vessels hauling materials for infrastructure projects should meet, or exceed, the latest EPA exhaust emissions standards for marine compression-ignition engines (e.g., Tier 4 for Category 1 & 2 vessels, and Tier 3 for Category 3 vessels).<sup>4</sup>
- Low Emission Equipment Exemptions: The equipment specifications outlined above should be met unless: 1) a piece of specialized equipment is not available for purchase or lease within the United States; or 2) the relevant project contractor has been awarded funds to retrofit existing equipment, or purchase/lease new equipment, but the funds are not yet available.

Consider requiring the following best practices through the construction contracting or oversight process:

- Establish and enforce a clear anti-idling policy for the construction site.
- Use onsite renewable electricity generation and/or grid-based electricity rather than diesel-powered generators or other equipment.
- Use electric starting aids such as block heaters with older vehicles to warm the engine.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Carcinogenicity of diesel-engine and gasoline-engine exhausts and some nitroarenes. *The Lancet*. June 15, 2012 <sup>2</sup> http://www.epa.gov/otaq/standards/heavy-duty/hdci-exhaust.htm

<sup>3</sup> https://www.epa.gov/emission-standards-reference-guide/epa-emission-standards-nonroad-engines-and-vehicles

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> https://www.epa.gov/emission-standards-reference-guide/all-epa-emission-standards

- Regularly maintain diesel engines to keep exhaust emissions low. Follow the manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule and procedures. Smoke color can signal the need for maintenance (e.g., blue/black smoke indicates that an engine requires servicing or tuning).
- Where possible, retrofit older-tier or Tier 0 nonroad engines with an exhaust filtration device before it enters the construction site to capture diesel particulate matter.
- Replace the engines of older vehicles and/or equipment with diesel- or alternatively fueled engines certified to meet newer, more stringent emissions standards (e.g., plug-in hybrid-electric vehicles, battery-electric vehicles, fuel cell electric vehicles, advanced technology locomotives, etc.), or with zero emissions electric systems. Retire older vehicles, given the significant contribution of vehicle emissions to the poor air quality conditions. Implement programs to encourage the voluntary removal from use and the marketplace of pre-2010 model year on-highway vehicles (e.g., scrappage rebates) and replace them with newer vehicles that meet or exceed the latest EPA exhaust emissions standards, or with zero emissions electric vehicles and/or equipment.

# **Fugitive Dust Source Controls**

- Stabilize open storage piles and disturbed areas by covering and/or applying water or chemical/organic dust palliative, where appropriate. This applies to both inactive and active sites, during workdays, weekends, holidays, and windy conditions.
- Install wind fencing and phase grading operations where appropriate, and operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions.
- When hauling material and operating non-earthmoving equipment, prevent spillage and limit speeds to 15 miles per hour (mph). Limit speed of earth-moving equipment to 10 mph.

# **Occupational Health**

- Reduce exposure through work practices and training, such as maintaining filtration devices and training diesel-equipment operators to perform routine inspections.
- Position the exhaust pipe so that diesel fumes are directed away from the operator and nearby workers, reducing the fume concentration to which personnel are exposed.
- Use enclosed, climate-controlled cabs pressurized and equipped with high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters to reduce the operators' exposure to diesel fumes. Pressurization ensures that air moves from inside to outside. HEPA filters ensure that any incoming air is filtered first.
- Use respirators, which are only an interim measure to control exposure to diesel emissions. In most cases, an N95 respirator is adequate. Workers must be trained and fit-tested before they wear respirators. Depending on the type of work being conducted, and if oil is present, concentrations of particulates present will determine the efficiency and type of mask and respirator. Personnel familiar with the selection, care, and use of respirators must perform the fit testing. Respirators must bear a NIOSH approval number.

# **RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**

This page intentionally left blank

### **RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**

Commenter	Number	Comment	Response
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	USFWS-1	The Service has reviewed your project description and concurs with your determination that the project, as proposed, is not likely to adversely affect any federally listed species. An acoustic survey for Indiana bats (Myotis sodalis) and northern long-eared bats (Myotis septentrionalis) was conducted in the summer of 2020 and did not detect either species. Negative survey results are valid for five years. No tree clearing should occur on the site after March 31, 2026 without further coordination with the Service. This concludes consultation on this action as required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. Should, during the term of this action, additional information on listed or proposed species or their critical habitat become available, or if new information reveals effects of the action that were not previously considered, consultation with the Service should be reinitiated to assess whether the determinations are still valid.	This comment has been included in the official record for this EA.
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development	N/A Discussion during Public Hearing	Question / comment about potential noise impacts related to construction and long-term operation of the proposed development and proximity to HUD properties northwest of the site.	As noted in <b>Section 5.1.10</b> of this EA, the Proposed Action would not cause a change in aircraft operations at LCK. Therefore, no increase in aircraft noise would occur. Noise levels from construction equipment during construction of the Proposed Action would be limited to construction time periods. During operation, noise from delivery trucks and employee vehicles accessing the site may be audible. It is anticipated that the noise from truck activity would be similar to noise from trucks that currently operate at the existing distribution warehouses to the west of the Proposed Action site. Trucks would follow established routes. Therefore, no significant noise impacts would occur. <b>Section 5.1.11.2</b> describes truck routes to and from the Proposed Action site.

Commenter	Number	Comment	Response
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development	HUD-1	Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft Environmental Assessment and attend the public hearing/presentation for the proposed Cargo Campus Development at the Rickenbacker Global Logistics Park. HUD's Office of Environment and Energy has reviewed the content of the draft Environmental Assessment and has no comments to contribute at this time.	This comment has been included in the official record for this EA.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-1	It's unclear how the Norfolk Southern Railroad Rickenbacker Intermodal Terminal is considered in the analysis of impacts and calculation of expected operation truck trips.	It is expected that access to the Intermodal Facility could reduce the need for some truck traffic as some users may ship goods via rail. However, shipping methods would be at the discretion of end users and unknown at this time. Therefore, the trip generation analysis was based on average trips per building size without any potential reduction in trips or distance traveled due to the proximity to the Intermodal Facility. This information has been included in <b>Section 5.1.11.2</b> of the Final EA (see Page 5-18).
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-2	Provide data to demonstrate the need for the proposed project.	Data has been added to the Final EA presenting projections of employment growth in the transportation & warehousing sector from the Ohio Department of Job & Family Services; and data provided by the developer on warehouse occupancy/vacancy rates. See <b>Section 2.1</b> and <b>Table 2-1</b> .

Commenter	Number	Comment	Response
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-3	Explain what the extension of Rickenbacker Parkway Phases 3b and 4 entails. Is this part of a larger project, and are phases 1 and 2 complete? Would state or federal agencies need to approve the extension, and how is that portion of the project funded? A fuller description of the Parkway extension would facilitate a better understanding of project impacts and help support the EA's statements around Transportation Conformity.	A description of Rickenbacker Parkway Phase 1 & 2 has been added to the Final EA (see <b>Page 1-1</b> , Footnote 1). Appendix E describes the Clean Air Act conformity requirements. Because no Federal funding is involved in the Rickenbacker Parkway extension, Phase 3b or Phase 4, and no Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approval is required, the project falls under the requirements of General Conformity.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-4	Identify and commit to specific measures to reduce construction emissions. Options include: (1) requiring dust suppressant strategies, such as use of tarps and watering soils, (2) limiting idling time for construction trucks and heavy equipment, and (3) soliciting bids that require zero-emission technologies or advanced emission control systems. See additional best practices in the enclosed Construction Emission Control Checklist.	These recommendations have been forwarded to the developer for inclusion in their construction planning. Best management practices and commitments for dust control have been included in the Final EA in <b>Section 5.1.1</b> (see <b>Page 5-4</b> ).
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-5	Consider measures to reduce operational emissions from the cargo campus, such as requiring, incentivizing, or otherwise promoting the use trucks with cleaner engine technologies and minimizing idling.	These recommendations have been forwarded to the developer for inclusion in their construction planning. Best management practices for emission reductions have been included in the Final EA in <b>Section 5.1.1</b> (see <b>Page 5-4</b> ).

RESPONSE	TO COMMENTS	6, (CONTINUED)
----------	-------------	----------------

Commenter	Number	Comment	Response
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-6	Discuss the study that determined site safety for areas other than the two MSRs currently being remediated. Clarify who performed the study, who approved the study, whether the USACE or other agencies were involved, and which standards for cleanup were met. We raise this to help ensure there are no unintended consequences with hazardous materials during construction.	Section 4.2.6 of the Final EA has been revised to note that the USACE conducted an airport-wide review to identify areas of concern for hazardous materials. As described in Section 4.2.6, that review identified areas that warranted further investigation and remediation. Approval of the report and remediation plan has not yet occurred. Section 5.1.6 of the Final EA has been revised to note that CRAA continues to coordinate with USACE to confirm site remediation is conducted to meet appropriate standards for future construction and use of the Proposed Action site.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-7	Discuss outreach and engagement with residents about increases in truck traffic and associated air quality, noise, and transportation safety impacts. Include residents in the mobile home park on Ashville Park and multi- and single- family homes on the proposed truck route (pictured on page 5-17). Are residents aware of the proposed increases in truck traffic and associated air and noise impacts? How has public input informed project decision-making?	The Proposed Action would cause an increase in surface vehicle traffic during construction and operation. As noted in <b>Section 5.1.1</b> , no significant impacts to air quality would occur during construction or operation of the proposed development. As noted in <b>Section 5.1.10</b> , noise from surface vehicles accessing the site may be audible within nearby areas; however, it is anticipated that the noise from truck activity would be similar to noise from trucks that currently operate at the existing distribution warehouses to the west of the Proposed Action site. Trucks would follow established haul routes. Therefore, no significant noise impacts would occur to residential areas. <b>Section 5.1.11.2</b> describes the truck routes to and from the Proposed Action site. No significant safety risks are expected to occur as a result of construction or operation of the proposed development. The Final EA has been updated to document the Public Hearing and notification efforts (see documentation in this <b>Appendix G, Pages G-1 to</b> <b>G-42</b> ).

Commenter	Number	Comment	Response
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-8	The EA concludes that implementation of roadway projects from a 2018 Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission report, "would be expected to improve traffic conditions and reduce any impacts of additional vehicle trips to and from the proposed Cargo Campus development. Therefore, no significant traffic impacts would occur" (page 5-18). Are these roadway projects funded, scheduled, and certain to occur? If not, what would traffic impacts from the proposed cargo campus consist of absent the roadway projects? How does the timing of the roadway projects align with the timing of the cargo campus?	The Final EA has been revised to include details of the level of service (LOS) analysis that was prepared (see <b>Section 5.1.11</b> ). The status of funding and timing of any regional traffic improvements are unknown at this time. Therefore, the LOS analysis presents conditions expected under the No Action and Proposed Action scenarios without any traffic improvements. Some of the affected intersections already score below satisfactory LOS (E or F). The LOS analysis shows that no segment or intersection would be downgraded from satisfactory to unsatisfactory based on Ohio DOT standards as a result of the Proposed Action.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-9	We continue to encourage the project team to provide information in a NEPA document that supports the project's compliance with the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines.	As noted in <b>Section 5.1.13</b> , coordination is ongoing with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) to ensure compliance with Clean Water Act Section 401 and 404.

Commenter	Number	Comment	Response
U.S.	USEPA-10	Explain how the project was designed to avoid and	The EA notes that one wetland and all of Stream 37
Environmental		minimize the discharge of dredged and/or fill material	and sections of Streams 20 and 39 would be avoided
Protection		into Waters of the United States (Waters). Provided an	(see Section 5.3.1). The Final EA clarifies that site plans
Agency,		analysis of siting and design alternatives the project	were developed to avoid aquatic features to the
Region V		team considered for (1) on-site avoidance and	extent practical (see Section 3.3). The Final EA has
		minimization of impacts to Waters and (2) off-site	been revised to note that the developer intends to use
		avoidance and minimization of impacts to Waters for	cut/fill from within the site; therefore, no offsite
		borrow or spoil areas.	borrow or spoil areas are expected (see Section 1.2).
U.S.	USEPA-11	Discuss the location and availability of appropriate	The mitigation plan for addressing unavoidable
Environmental		mitigation for unavoidable impacts.	impacts to wetlands and streams is currently being
Protection			formulated. Coordination is ongoing between the
Agency,			CRAA, USACE, and OEPA to develop mitigation
Region V			requirements. Potential sources of mitigation include
			wetland and stream banks, in-lieu fee program
			payment, and potential preservation of other
			resources on LCK and CMH property. Section 5.1.13 of
			the Final EA has been updated to note potential
			locations of mitigation (see footnote #46).
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-11	Discuss the location and availability of appropriate mitigation for unavoidable impacts.	Cut/fill from within the site; therefore, no offsite borrow or spoil areas are expected (see Section 1.2). The mitigation plan for addressing unavoidable impacts to wetlands and streams is currently being formulated. Coordination is ongoing between the CRAA, USACE, and OEPA to develop mitigation requirements. Potential sources of mitigation include wetland and stream banks, in-lieu fee program payment, and potential preservation of other resources on LCK and CMH property. Section 5.1.13 of the Final EA has been updated to note potential locations of mitigation (see footnote #46).

Commenter	Number	Comment	Response
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V	USEPA-12	<ul> <li>See examples and take best practices from efficient warehouses and distribution centers described on the U.S. Green Building Council's website at <u>https://www.usgbc.org/projects?Rating+System=%5B</u> %22Warehouse%20and%20distribution%20centers%2</li> <li>0-%20Existing%20Buildings%22%5D</li> </ul>	These recommendations have been forwarded to the developer for consideration. The Final EA has been revised to note that all buildings are expected to meet LEED certification and construction and demolition materials will be recycled where possible (see Section 5.1.9).
		<ul> <li>Consider Green Infrastructure for managing stormwater. Guidance and tools are available at <u>https://www.epa.gov/green-infrastructure</u>.</li> </ul>	
		• Consider best practices for energy efficiency and sustainable building design for the new warehouses. Examples include south-facing skylights and windows, motion-sensored lighting, and use of Energy Star certified products. Consider incorporating solar power into the project design.	
		• Consider Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and other green building programs, as well as designing for net-zero energy usage. In addition to reducing the overall environmental footprint, green building certification programs promote health by encouraging practices that protect indoor air quality.	
		<ul> <li>Consider incorporating electric vehicle charging stations in new parking areas.</li> </ul>	
		• Commit to recycle construction and demolition debris, which preserves valuable landfill space and makes use of materials that have high embodied energy.	
		<ul> <li>Consider replacing raw materials with recycled materials for infrastructure components.</li> </ul>	

This page intentionally left blank