



**C&S Companies**  
20445 Emerald Parkway, Suite 100  
Cleveland OH 44135  
p: (216) 619-5449  
f: (216) 619-5453  
www.cscos.com

# Memo

**To:** Attendees  
**From:** Aileen Maguire Meyer  
**Date:** November 19, 2014  
**Re:** Kent State University Airport Master Plan  
Community Liaison Group Meeting Summary  
**File:** L80.001.001

---

The third meeting of the Community Liaison Group (CLG) for the Airport Master Plan project for Kent State University Airport was held at 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, November 19, 2014, at the Kent State University Student Center.

## ATTENDEES

### **CLG MEMBER**

1. Anne Brown, Kent State University, AVP for Business and Administration Services, Chair of Master Plan Steering Team
2. Dr. Richard Mangrum, Aeronautics Program, Representing Maureen McFarland, Member of Master Plan Steering Team
3. Mike LaForest, President, Commercial Aviation Corp.
4. Nayzaritza Morales, Kent State University, Student
5. Roy Howarter, Resident, City of Stow
6. Bernard Scheidler, Planning Commission, City of Stow
7. Doris Stewart, Executive Director, Stow-Munroe Falls Chamber of Commerce

### **STEERING TEAM MEMBERS**

8. Tom Euclide, AVP for Facilities Planning and Operations
9. Iris Harvey, VP for University Relations (Advisory Member)
10. Rebecca Murphy, AVP for University Communications & Marketing

### **CONSULTANT TEAM**

11. Aileen Maguire Meyer, C&S Companies
12. Mara Benovic, C&S Companies
13. Arnie Bloch, Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.
14. Lou Berroteran, The Berroteran Group

The purpose of the meeting was to update the CLG on progress of the master plan and summarize next steps. A copy of the presentation is included with this meeting summary and follows the agenda below:

- Introductions
- Pledge of Allegiance
- Airport Master Plan Process
- Issues and Needs
- Scenarios
- Alternatives
- Evaluation Criteria
- Discussion
- Next Steps

### **QUESTIONS DURING PRESENTATION:**

*(Aileen's responses are in italics)*

Q: Airport is working at a loss, what is the amount that the University is subsidizing to the airport? A: *I do not know the exact number at the moment and will need to get back to you. (Kent State University Airport expenses regularly exceed revenues by amounts ranging from approximately \$25,000 in 2012 to \$93,000 in 2014. The operating loss at the airport typically averages between 10 and 11 percent of the total operating cost.)*

C: The students that crashed the aircraft at Cuyahoga County airport was brought up. It was asked if the Cessna has a limited weight capacity. Aileen said yes and that it's up to the pilot, not the airport, to know the correct weight limit.

Q: What doesn't need to be replaced at the airport?

A: *Maintenance is required to everything – at some point all things need to be replaced at some point. Clarification was made that “No Build Plan” means that there is still maintenance needed to up keep the facilities. As the infrastructure ages more without maintenance, the cost to fix will increase over time.*

C: The estimate from earlier products that showed \$8.3 million in additional community revenue due to the airport is a poor estimate.

A: *Ohio DOT has developed a new draft economic impact report (<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Operations/Aviation/OhioAirportsFocusStudy/Pages/Draft-Recommendations-and-Findings.aspx>). I have shared your concerns with ODOT and am awaiting a response.*

C: How do deal with drone technology?

*A: For the Master Plan effort, the Cessna 172 is the critical aircraft. It was also noted that current training for drone technology takes place with simulators and does not include activity at the airport.*

C: This master plan needs to take into account the commitment made by KSU to endorse the prior plan's preferred alternative to move the flight training program and close the airport.

*A: That commitment was made subject to FAA's approval of the alternative, which did not happen.*

## **DISCUSSION ON ALTERNATIVES:**

Following is a summary of comments received/items discussed during the meeting. Comments are shown, without attribution or verification of their accuracy. Comments in support of a scenario/alternative are noted with a "+" and comments in opposition are noted with a "-."

### ***Town Gown***

- Inconsistent with prior Board Resolution Land Values--Impacted by Location of Flight Training Equal Impact- Stow v Portage/other.
- + University Ownership of the airport can control growth.
- + Student Safety--Set Rules 90% Controlled environment vs. Portage.
- Community Responsiveness to the flight school staying.
- Runway length--prefer to leave as is for training purposes.
- 3,500' runway limits GA activity and revenue generation
- Disagree that equal weight is given to all evaluation criteria – some should have greater weight?
- + Longevity of Airport
  - o Has been in the community for years.
- + Balance Community Benefit plus increased benefit opportunities for community engagement on Airport property.
- It doesn't seem to make sense to put parks and benches in a "designated crash area." Aileen indicated that this is not a designated crash area; and that the airport has an excellent safety record. Response: "I disagree that the airport has an excellent safety record."

### ***Balance Beam -Balanced Uses***

- Flight school stays
- Increase revenue by opening the Airport to additional GA aircraft.
- + Meeting center for the community
- Access to GA building can be an Issue with traffic flow
- Cost to build new access off of North River Road to the new GA facilities.

- + Community members would be able to use the space for activities outside of Aviation Day-Moms would bring kids if they could – learning center.
- Reasons why people would fly to Kent State-would investment be offset?
- Has it been looked into to why Kent State would be attractive for pilots to land?
- By having GA increase, operations for students will need to be looked into closer with aircraft movement.
- Fueling both sides of Airport? GA would need individual fueling
- Ground vehicle operations with additional GA access by more plane movement.
- Who will staff the general aviation operations when they are separated from University activity in Alternative B-4?
- + University will have control of “visitors”.

***Soar***

- Flight training benefits from University control to move the flight school will have negative impact on safety. Increase conflict.
- Runway configuration at Portage is not ideal–wind coverage
- Access- Two lane road to Portage
- + Portage through-the-fence operation lack of control
- + Lack of residences at Portage- safer/less activity at Stow, “It’s mainly cornfields.”
- + Have you looked at the safety record at Portage airport? Aileen said no.
- Akron-Fulton: concerns with student safety and community impacts
- Akron-Canton increase cost for flight training
- + Consistent with previous board resolution to move Flight School
- Corporate activity- noisier aircraft in Stow. How much more general aviation would take place at this airport if the flight training left and the runway was not extended? Aileen said it depends on the type of aircraft and the marketing; some estimates suggest an increase of 10,000—20,000 operations in a year.
- Impact on safety at existing airport due to more GA/transient activity.
- School needs enforcement of flight pattern
- Lack of University ownership may have negative community responsiveness