



The Ohio State University Airport

Part 150 Technical Subcommittee

Meeting #2 – SUMMARY¹

9:30 – 12:30 a.m.

March 26, 2008

OSU Airport Administration Building
2160 West Case Rd., Columbus, 43235

This is a summary of the March 26, 2008 meeting of the Ohio State University Airport's Part 150 Committee's Technical Subcommittee.

Participants

Part 150 Technical Subcommittee Members Present

City of Worthington, David Zoll
Franklin County, Matthew Brown
Northwest Civic Association, Bill Carlton
We Oppose Ohio State University Airport Expansion, Jane Weislogel
Midwest (OSU) Air Traffic Control, Deral Carson
Port Columbus Air Traffic Control (FAA), Dennis Shea for Chris Lenfest
Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, E.J. Thomas
Columbus Flight Watch, Don Peters

OSU/Consultant Team Members Present

Cathy Ferrari and Elizabeth Ike (OSU)
David Full and Don Andrews (RS&H)
Steve Alverson (ESA Airports)
Marie Keister (Engage)
Bill Habig and Latane Montague (OSU consultants)

Public Observers

Kimberly Nixon-Bell, Riverlea Mayor Mary Jo Cusack, Rosemarie Lisko, Bob Tedrick, Vera Tedrick and Scott Whitlock

¹ This Summary is intended to provide a paraphrased overview of presentations made, materials discussed, questions asked and comments made. It is not intended to be a word-for-word representation of the Technical Subcommittee proceedings.

Materials Reviewed at the Meeting

- Agenda (*sent in advance*)
- Technical Memorandum (*sent in advance*)
- PowerPoint Presentation (*see web site*)

Meeting Summary

Meeting Introductions

Marie Keister, the facilitator, convened the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

Meeting Goals

At the Subcommittee's request, this meeting was convened to review FAR Part 150 noise model inputs, explain how each data source was used and respond to questions and comments raised during and immediately following the Technical Subcommittee meeting held on January 17, 2008.

Meeting Ground Rules

Ms. Keister reviewed the purpose and operating guidelines of the Part 150 Committee and the Technical Subcommittee, emphasizing that both committees are advisory in nature. The University and FAA have the statutory decision-making authority in the FAR Part 150 process. She stated that questions and discussion would be welcomed from members of the Technical Subcommittee at the end of each presentation segment. She said the public would have an opportunity to provide comment and ask questions at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Keister noted that Technical Subcommittee members had received a Technical Memorandum on March 20th. While today's meeting would review many issues raised in that document, it was not the purpose of this meeting to word-smith the document. If any wording issues were not addressed during the course of the Technical Subcommittee meeting, the consultant team would be available after the meeting to discuss those concerns.

Questions and Comments (OSU/Consultant Team Responses in Italics)

Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association representative E.J. Thomas also asked that questions be held until the end of each presentation segment. City of Worthington representative David Zoll asked when it would be appropriate to share his approximately 10 minutes of questions and comments on the document, particularly as they related to the Source Data and INM Inputs on Aircraft Operational Fleet Mix. *Ms. Keister explained that those comments should be provided during those two segments of the meeting.*

Agenda Review

David Full, RS&H Part 150 Study Project Manager, explained that the meeting would cover:

- Review of source data

- Review of jet arrival and departure altitude profile analysis
- Review of INM input aircraft operational fleet mix
- Review of new flight tracks
- Runway use percentages
- Next steps

Review of Source Data

Don Andrews, RS&H Part 150 Study Project Officer, recapped the source data and how it was used (*see Technical Subcommittee Presentation*) for to develop the INM inputs, which includes:

- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) and Air Traffic Activity Data System (ATADS) online databases
- Based aircraft and hangar waiting lists
- FlightAware
- AirScene
- Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) Noise Office

Questions and Comments (OSU/Consultant Team Responses in Italics)

Mr. Zoll asked if the noise model inputs would exclude aircraft that were listed within the 55,000 records provided by the Port Columbus Noise Office? *Mr. Andrews said no. From the 60,000 records collected by the team, some of that data were outside of the desired year of data that was dropped. However, there are two different data sources – FlightAware and Port Columbus Noise Office – so the team used the FlightAware data as a check on Port Columbus Noise Office data, but primarily used the Port Columbus Noise Office data to develop the noise model inputs.*

Mr. Zoll asked Mr. Andrews to clarify his comment indicating that there were about 80,000 total operations at OSU Airport in one year, but there were only 55,000 OSUA operations in the Port Columbus data. *Mr. Andrews said he would explain this in more detail later in the meeting, but basically the team had a good accounting for the approximately 30,000 flights not itemized in the Port Columbus Noise Office data and that these operations would be reflected in the noise modeling inputs.*

Mr. Thomas asked if there was there a statistical difference between the 80,000 total records and the 55,000 records from the Port Columbus Noise Office? *Mr. Andrews said there was not.*

WOOSE representative Jane Weislogel commented that she couldn't find the Hawker 800 in the Master Look-up Table. She hears it flying over her home, but it didn't appear to be in the source data. This is an aircraft that is based here. *Mr. Andrews said he would answer this in more detail later in the meeting, but that all aircraft were accounted for, even if they weren't specifically listed in the source data.*

Jet Arrival and Departure Altitude Profile Analysis Presentation

Mr. Steve Alverson, Part 150 Study Task Manager, recapped that the meeting purpose was not to review all of the information that was presented at the Jan. 17th meeting, but to respond to issues raised at and immediately following that meeting. Specifically, the Technical Subcommittee raised concerns regarding the effect of perceived hold downs to the east of OSU Airport on altitude profiles. Mr. Alverson said he examined actual Runway 9R departure and Runway 27L arrival aircraft jet altitude profiles. He then compared the actual altitude profiles in the Integrated Noise Model (INM). He found that:

- Business jets dominate noise exposure
- Beechjet 400 and Cessna 560 are the most common types of jets at OSU Airport – accounting for 42 percent of the business jets
- There are few hold downs on departure, with most occurring beyond four nautical miles from start-of-takeoff roll
- There are many hold downs on arrival, but most occur beyond four nautical miles from the touchdown point
- Hold downs do not influence noise exposure in areas of likely incompatibility

Mr. Alverson said he had looked into nearly 100,000 data points. The first two nautical miles from start-of-takeoff roll are likely to be particularly relevant to possible areas of land use incompatibility. After careful review, he is confident that for noise modeling purposes the MU3001 INM altitude profile is an accurate reflection of the actual departure and arrival altitude profiles for the BE400 and C560 flying at OSU Airport.

Questions and Comments (OSU/Consultant Team Responses in Italics)

Ms. Weislogel said her home is just two nautical miles from the start of the take-off roll on Runway 9R, so she is very concerned about the altitude used during the first two nautical miles – about 12,000 feet. A big source of noise is the Citation C560. On page 5 of the Technical Memo, Figure 2 shows that one aircraft is well above the M3001 profile, one is slightly above, one is at the profile and 25 or 28 are below the profile, many by 500 feet or more. At two nautical miles from start of the take-off roll some C560s are at less than 700 feet above the homes. Shouldn't you model on that basis? *Mr. Alverson said the team was not assuming these are straight out flight tracks. Instead, the team is assuming that aircraft are making turns. These are reflected in the profiles. Regarding whether the profiles should be moved down to a lower altitude, his concern with doing that is that the thrust of the planes would have to be reduced to lower the INM altitude profile. Lowering the thrust would reduce noise exposure. Although it would not be appropriate from a noise modeling standpoint, leaving the thrust setting the same and lower the altitude would require an increase in aircraft speed, which would likely reduce the duration of the noise event. This would also reduce the noise exposure, and it's premature to do that before the model can show us what is happening today.*

Mr. Zoll asked how many profiles were reviewed, since the team was showing just two here? Also, why is the team characterizing the hold downs as “a few”, when it shows there are many with the Citation 560? Why does the team refer to the earlier noise exposure study? *Mr. Alverson said to get a sense of where the 65 DNL contour might fall to assist with knowing where to focus our examination of the aircraft altitudes, the team looked at the most recently completed OSU Airport noise exposure study as well as the previous OSU Part 150 Noise Exposure Maps. In general, aircraft noise exposure does not change that much over time. If any change has occurred at OSUA, it is likely that the contours have become smaller due to the improvement in the jet aircraft fleet. However, this does not mean a conclusion is being drawn based on the old noise contours. New noise contours will be prepared based on all of the noise model inputs this Committee has been reviewing. The new noise contours will provide direction on what conclusions to make regarding land use compatibility.*

Mr. Zoll asked if the study area was being influenced by the former study – which in his opinion is contrary to FAA requirements. He also expressed his opinion that the incompatible land use areas will be within two to three miles of take off, noting that at two miles out most aircraft are below the INM profile. *Mr. Alverson said the present study area will not be determined by the previous noise studies. Changing an aircraft’s profile will have the most impact within the first two to three miles of take-off or landing.*

Mr. Zoll asked that Mr. Alverson look at the impacts within four nautical miles. *Mr. Alverson said no impacts have been assessed yet because the contours have not been run.*

Franklin County representative Matthew Brown asked about the effect of reducing an aircraft’s thrust. *Mr. Alverson said lowering an aircraft’s thrust reduces its noise exposure.*

Mr. Zoll said he wanted to address the issue that there are other ways in the INM to compensate for lower profiles. For example, by using a different stage length to indicate an aircraft may be carrying more fuel. *Mr. Alverson said there is only one stage length available (Stage Length One) for the business jets in the INM. Therefore, we do not have the option of choosing a longer stage length to represent lower altitude profiles.*

Mr. Zoll said Mr. Alverson was making an assumption that because an aircraft is going fast it will be there for a shorter period of time, and therefore have less noise. Mr. Zoll said he didn’t accept the assumption that no change in altitude profile is necessary. *Mr. Alverson said that Sound Exposure Level is based on both the magnitude and duration of a noise event. If the event is shorter, the Sound Exposure Level will be lower.* Mr. Zoll said he did not accept Mr. Alverson’s opinion. *Mr. Alverson said that the relationship between a reduction in the duration of an event resulting in a reduction in the sound exposure level was not his opinion, but rather a matter of physics.*

Ms. Weislogel asked how modeling is done for the years 2012 and 2027. Does the model take into account the primary reason for extending the runway – that at present some

aircraft can't take off with full fuel? Will the model take into consideration a flight by Cardinal Health from Columbus to Europe? Is it likely that after the extension of Runway 9L/27R would most of the approaches would be precision approaches? Should the model use the airport's Long-Range Master Plan? *Mr. Alverson said the model forecasts will include the runway extension cited in the Master Plan and that the INM profiles are representative of a precision approach.*

Ms. Weislogel also asked if a glide slope of 50:1 was being assumed in the Long-Range Master Plan? Mrs. Weislogel then distributed a map depicting the FAR Part 77 surfaces to the Committee. *Mr. Andrews explained that the 50:1 approach surface is not the glide slope, but rather an area below which obstructions such as trees, power poles, etc. must remain. Aircraft on the 3-degree approach are higher than the 50:1 approach surface.*

Operational Fleet Mix Presentation

Ms. Cathy Ferrari, External Relations Director for OSU Airport, noted that an earlier comment was made that a Hawker 800 was based at the airport. She said the one that was based at OSU was sold, and that there is no longer a Hawker 800 based at the airport.

Mr. Andrews then explained how the consultant team follows these six, industry-standard steps to arrive at the aircraft operational fleet mix:

1. Prepare a first-level sort
2. Create a Master Look-up Table
3. Reassemble Table B-1 at "Model Combination" level
4. Equalize arrivals/departures
5. Prepare allocations for FY 2007
6. Prepare 2012/2027 fleet mix

Mr. Andrews went into extensive detail on steps 5 and 6, explaining how allocations are conducted; how law enforcement, military, single/multi-engine and helicopter flights are accounted for; and how the team arrived at its conclusions (*see Technical Subcommittee Presentation*).

Questions and Comments (OSU/Consultant Team Responses in Italics)

Ms. Weislogel noted that the operations information from Port Columbus showed 478 nighttime jet operations, but only one jet operation is added in the normalization process conducted by the consultants. Is that reasonable? *Mr. Andrews said the team was confident that it had accounted for all the "high-end" operation; that is the business jets. The team also made adjustments on other aircraft types that don't send specific aircraft identification information to the radar data system. The team understands that most of these aircraft use a transponder code of 1200. The 1200 codes are aircraft operating under Visual Flight Rules (VFR) and primarily single-engine propeller-driven aircraft. The high-end or jet aircraft are almost always on Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and send their aircraft type information to the radar data system.*

Ms. Weislogel commented that some of the PA31s jump from OSU Airport to Port Columbus on a VFR flight plan. Could that be factored in? Also, the Ford Tri-Motor was not included in the tables in the Technical Memo. Why? *Mr. Andrews explained that these operations are accounted for under the category of “multi-engine unknowns”, and thus will be included in the modeling process. He noted there will be all sorts of aircraft not specifically listed in the tables, but they’ll be accounted for. “Unknown” indicates lack of tail identification numbers, but there is still enough other information provided under this category to make the modeling effort accurate.*

Mr. Zoll said his main concern was with Step 5 of the process, preparing allocations for FY 2007. He asked Mr. Andrews if he would agree that this study has a disproportionate number of “unknowns”? *Mr. Andrews said no. In a Part 150 study for a general aviation airport like OSU Airport, it is highly unusual to have this level of data available since many of the smaller aircraft don’t “squawk” – or provide tail identification. The higher volume of data the team was able to get from the Port Columbus noise office confirms the earlier conclusions the team made from the much smaller volume of data presented to the Technical Subcommittee in January. At a commercial service airport the percentage of non-squawking aircraft is very small, so there would be a much smaller number of aircraft falling under the “unknown” category.*

Mr. Zoll asked if there was any testing done to confirm that the vast majority of unknowns are single-engine aircraft. Could you take a period of time – like a week of data -- to reconfirm what the team was finding here? *Mr. Andrews said this isn’t necessary because unknowns had already been accounted for. For example, there were only 1,100 helicopter operations captured in the Port Columbus noise office data. But the team knew from interviews there were actually about 8,000 helicopter operations. So the team was confident it already had good data on any aircraft falling under the “unknown” category.*

Ms. Weislogel asked if LabCorp was consulted about their operations. *Mr. Andrews said yes, they were included in the interviews and their operations were accounted for.*

Mr. Zoll said his main concern when he received the Technical Memorandum was that he couldn’t determine if the team had allocated unknown aircraft, and that they might have been allocating unknowns to quieter aircraft. He said the presentation helped him understand this better. *Mr. Andrews said the “unknown” category heading is misleading, as there was much information that was provided on these aircraft, including arrival and departure times, altitude and so forth.*

Mr. Zoll asked if an aircraft is squawking 1200, does it rule out the fact that it could be a business jet? *Mr. Andrews said you couldn’t totally rule it out 100 percent of the time, but company operating procedures and insurance requirements require that they file an IFR flight plan. Therefore, he is confident it is a reasonable assumption that 100 percent of the jet operations are identified by aircraft type.*

Mr. Zoll asked for clarification on how one third each of the top three model combinations were calculated. The top three of what? *Mr. Andrews said the top three model combinations reflect those three aircraft types that use OSU Airport most in terms of aircraft operations*

Mr. Thomas commented that most business aircraft operations, if they fly IFR, will display a tail number or flight number in the radar data system. So it is a reasonable assumption that most of the unknowns will not be jets; they will primarily be general aviation, single-engine aircraft that are much lower in noise impact.

Mr. Zoll said he doesn't want to just challenge the information because he doesn't like it – it's because residents want to verify the underlying assumptions of modeling. He reiterated his concern was about the high number of unknowns, but he said most of his work has been at commercial airports where this hasn't been the case. Mr. Zoll said he understood now why the number of unknowns is different for a general aviation airport. He said at this point he was comfortable with the methodology to assign the unknown aircraft.

Mr. Zoll then commented that two citizens had taken the time and energy to review the Technical Memorandum and run a test on the Technical Memorandum's assumptions for a week's period time. Kimberly Nixon-Bell and Scott Whitlock looked at a week's worth of FlightAware data and the Port Columbus Noise Office data and found flaws. For example, they found higher jet operations than assumed in the Technical Memorandum, with as many as 20 to 21 flight operations that appear to have not been captured in the Technical Memorandum. Mr. Zoll asked if he could have Mr. Whitlock explain their analysis. *Ms. Keister said that only Technical Subcommittee members were authorized by the discussion ground rules to participate during this portion of the meeting, but that public comment would be allowed at the end of the meeting and Mr. Whitlock could present his analysis at that time.*

Review of New Flight Tracks Presentation

Mr. Alverson explained that the Technical Subcommittee had asked in January if there were different flight tracks for the nighttime period than the daytime period. As a result, the team reviewed the daytime and nighttime flight tracks from OSU's AirScene. They compared the daytime and nighttime tracks and created new nighttime tracks when there were differences. He presented them to the Technical Subcommittee (*see Technical Subcommittee Presentation*). The Technical Subcommittee had also asked if there would be different flight tracks for single-engine versus multi-engine propeller driven aircraft. After further analysis of OSU's AirScene, the team created new single-engine modeled flight tracks. These were presented to the Technical Subcommittee.

Questions and Comments (OSU/Consultant Team Responses in Italics)

Ms. Weislogel thanked Mr. Alverson for this additional review and addition of the nighttime flight tracks.

Runway Use Percentages Presentation

Mr. Alverson explained that itinerant runway use information was updated since January using the Port Columbus Noise Office data for OSU Airport. He noted that the future runway use remained unchanged. He then shared the updated tables of runway use information that would be used in the modeling effort (*see Technical Subcommittee Presentation and Technical Memo*).

Questions and Comments (OSU/Consultant Team Responses in Italics)

Ms. Weislogel asked for clarification on a local operation vs. an itinerant operation. For example, if a student is practicing and comes back to OSU Airport, is this considered a local or itinerant operation? *Mr. Alverson said that it is typically a local operation if the aircraft stays within five miles of the airport.* Ms. Weislogel commented that she sees Runway 5-23 being used and asked are these all itinerant operations? OSU Airport Air Traffic Control Tower representative Deral Carson responded that it's very rare for OSU Airport to use that runway for touch and goes, unless there are high winds or something else unusual. He said the tower usually considers operations itinerant when they don't know when the aircraft leave OSU Airport's airspace.

Mr. Zoll asked if touch and go flight tracks cover the Castle Crest Street area. *Mr. Alverson said that the flight tracks cover Castle Crest and showed him the visual.*

Next Steps Presentation

Mr. Full summarized the next steps in the study, which are to:

- Use the model to prepare draft DNL contours for 2007, 2012 and 2027
- Prepare supplemental noise metric contours
- Prepare for the Part 150 Committee meeting and public open house-meeting

Questions and Comments (OSU/Consultant Team Responses in Italics)

Mr. Thomas asked the team how many Part 150 studies it had completed. *Mr. Andrews noted he has personally done 10 to 12; Mr. Alverson said ESA Airports has prepared over two dozen, ranging from studies for the busiest commercial airport to busy general aviation airports throughout the U.S.*

Mr. Thomas asked how they would rate the drill down into data that's been done here compared to other Part 150 studies. *Mr. Alverson said he has personally never worked with this much detail before. Mr. Andrews agreed, saying that this level of information isn't typically available, but in this case it has reconfirmed that the work presented to the Subcommittee in January was accurate.*

Mr. Thomas asked if this additional work, even though it has resulted in some adjustments, has given the team a high level of confidence in this effort. *Mr. Alverson and Mr. Andrews said they have a very high level of confidence in the development of the noise model inputs for OSU Airport.*

Mr. Thomas asked what the likely impact would be if anything else is introduced that needs to be reviewed? Would that make the conclusions any less accurate? *Mr. Andrews said that there would be little or no impact in the modeling outcome.*

After confirming with Mr. Alverson and Mr. Andrews that the Cessna Citation 560 and the BE 500 are the two jet aircraft with the most noise impact at OSU Airport, Mr. Zoll asked if it would be worthwhile to look at the altitude profiles of the next most impactful aircraft to determine whether it would have an impact on the noise exposure? *Mr. Alverson said it would require more work and data collection, and the next aircraft that would have the most impact are split between multiple jets that represent roughly 10 percent of the OSU Airport jet operations.*

Mr. Zoll commented that Stage 2 jets have the largest impact on the noise footprint, then asked if the team has profiles for all of these? *Mr. Alverson said no, and confirmed that Mr. Zoll was correct that some of the Stage 2 aircraft are noisier. However, they have substantially fewer operations than the BE400 and C560. As other aircraft fall much lower in the percentage of jet operations, they have less noise impact on the noise exposure.*

Mr. Zoll asked if Mr. Alverson could show a slide that illustrates assumed departure flight tracks with the 50-degree heading, and what was assigned to that? *Mr. Alverson said this question came up at the January Technical Subcommittee meeting, and indicated how one of the slides presented at that meeting illustrated that the flight tracks on the 50-degree heading will be put into the model.*

Mr. Zoll commented that, based on the cases he's worked on in the past, there appears to be an unusually high amount of flight tracks. Will the team be reducing the number of flight tracks in the final model inputs? *Mr. Alverson said no, because these flight tracks*

accurately portray where aircraft are flying over the neighborhoods. Mr. Andrews noted that earlier versions of the INM that Mr. Zoll may be more familiar with did not provide the ability to enter in as many flight tracks to depict how aircraft disperse after takeoff as compared to the most recent version of the INM that the team is using. The most recent version of the INM has been upgraded based on citizen input, and allows the team to spread the flight tracks based on actual flight data instead of using estimates as in the past. This results in more flight tracks being used to model the noise exposure. Mr. Zoll commented that rather than concentrating the noise on a single flight track, the modeled flight tracks would disperse the noise over a larger area. Mr. Alverson agreed and said that is the way aircraft noise exposure really works.

Mr. Zoll asked what will happen to flight tracks in future years? Will most of the jets be put on the north runway? *Mr. Alverson said that, based on the Master Plan, the team assumed the more extensive runway usage would be on the north runway and reflected this in the projected flight track usage tables.* Mr. Carson confirmed this is what the tower would do in the future if the north runway were to be extended.

Mr. Thomas commented that it sounded like the new model provides a more accurate picture of what is happening. *Mr. Andrews confirmed that the new model was a major improvement over earlier versions of the model.*

Public Comment

Ms. Keister recapped the ground rules that everyone be respectful of each other's comments, that discussion be focused on issues and not on individuals, and that everyone be respectful of the time allotted for the meeting.

Questions and Comments (OSU/Consultant Team Responses in Italics)

Public observer Scott Whitlock offered to the Technical Subcommittee and consultant team a white paper for their review. The white paper, written by Mr. Whitlock and public observer Kimberly Nixon-Bell, provided analysis and comment on the Technical Memorandum. Mr. Whitlock summarized how they had looked at WebScene and FlightAware data during one week in June to see if they could verify the findings and conclusions in the Technical Memorandum (*See Whitlock-Nixon-Bell White Paper*).

Mr. Whitlock expressed his opinion that the Technical Memorandum had errors and, as a result, the INM will understate the noise problem. He and Ms. Nixon-Bell recommended that the Technical Subcommittee not accept the RS&H's Team Technical Memorandum's modeling recommendations until their White Paper is reviewed.

Mr. Andrews asked how Mr. Whitlock had come to his conclusions. Mr. Andrews said he could not respond to the specifics without thoroughly reviewing the White Paper, but that he was confident that the jet traffic is accounted for.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Andrews if he was confident that the work done to date would meet FAA guidelines. *Mr. Andrews said he was confident this Part 150 Study went well*

beyond FAA guidelines and best practices, and may in fact be one of the most thoroughly researched Part 150 studies for a general aviation airport.

Mr. Montague clarified that the Whitlock-Nixon-Bell paper used WebScene and FlightAware, while the consultant team used AirScene, FlightAware and Port Columbus Noise Office data. So there are different data sources being reviewed here.

Mr. Whitlock offered to review the White Paper's analysis of data. He said their analysis showed an extraordinary number of Hawker 800s, for example, compared to what was proposed in the inputs. He summarized these details, then said the consultant team's proposed inputs need more verification. *Mr. Andrews said further verification is not needed, and that Mr. Whitlock was using a completely different data source.*

Mr. Zoll said it was unfair to ask the RS&H consultant team to respond in a few minutes to a document they just received that took Mr. Whitlock and Ms. Nixon-Bell four days to prepare. He suggested the RS&H team should have time to respond. He said it seemed there ought to be some way to verify the validity of the data when there is a discrepancy between databases.

Mr. Montague said OSU Airport and the consultant team would certainly review the White Paper and take it under advisement (see Response Memo to Whitlock-Nixon-Bell White Paper).

Mr. Alverson thanked Mr. Whitlock and Ms. Nixon-Bell for their hard work. He noted it would be difficult for the consultant team to approach the Technical Subcommittee with a week's worth of data extrapolated out to one year and have it pass muster. The team has used a year's worth of data to conduct the noise modeling. Mr. Alverson also pointed out the White Paper noted some Airbus 320 operations at OSU Airport. The Airbus does not fly into or out of OSU Airport.

Mr. Whitlock said that Port Columbus Noise Office data does not agree with the FlightAware data. *Mr. Alverson reiterated that the team uses professional judgment to make decisions on how to use various pieces of data.*

Mr. Whitlock said he hadn't heard in presentations that the team had found aircraft in the FlightAware data that they did not include in the noise modeling inputs, which from his perspective would be a basic quality control mechanism.

Public observer and Riverlea Mayor Mary Jo Cusack said she would like to second David Zoll's proposal to allow the consultant team time to respond to the issues raised in the White Paper. She said at least four large jets a night go over her home.

Ms. Nixon-Bell said the team was asking the residents to accept a lot of assumptions based on professional judgment. She said that by doing this effort she was trying to be sure she would be able to accept and verify the consultant's information. The residents

want this to be right. Ms. Nixon-Bell said she understood that their review of one week may not reflect an entire year's worth of aircraft operations, but she didn't think there was enough verification of the consultant team's data yet.

Public observer Vera Tedrick explained that she lives under the 50-degree heading turn that pilots make to avoid Port Columbus airspace. She said her life is completely turned upside down. She uses ear plugs due to the noise and fears she might not hear a fire alarm. She expressed her opinion that the consultant team was expecting her to not understand what they were seeing in one week of analysis. Ms. Tedrick said at the public open house the consultant team will meet a lot of people whose lives have been turned upside down.

Mr. Whitlock asked for more clarification on the Cessna Citation 560 altitude on departure. With regard to MU3001 – is that a straight out departure or a turning aircraft? *Mr. Alverson said that the team used a straight out departure to develop the MU3001 profile.*

Mr. Whitlock said that could explain why one sees the actual Cessna Citation 560 profiles at lower altitudes. This is a discrepancy. Eliminating this discrepancy is important. *Mr. Alverson said this was a point well-taken and when the model is run, the MU3001 profile will be applied to the flight tracks that turn.*

Mr. Whitlock asked Mr. Andrews why the number of PA31 flights shown in January had now increased to over 1,500 flights. Why the difference between those numbers? *Mr. Andrews explained that the numbers shown in January were based on FlightAware data. Since then, the team has been able to access Port Columbus Noise Office data, which is more complete, so some of the numbers presented earlier have been updated accordingly.*

Mr. Whitlock asked Mr. Andrews to confirm that he assumed the Port Columbus data on jet operations at OSU Airport were correct. *Mr. Andrews said that is correct.*

Ms. Keister concluded the meeting by noting that the consultant team would review the Whitlock-Nixon-Bell White Paper and send a response. She also reminded the Technical Subcommittee that its role is to advise the OSU Airport. The Ohio State University and the FAA retain the statutory decision-making authority on the Part 150 process and would make a determination on whether further verification of the model inputs was required.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.