

PUBLIC HEARING - FEBRUARY 28, 1994

The public hearing session of the Ann Arbor City Council was called to order in the Council Chamber at 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Ingrid B. Sheldon.

ROLL CALL OF COUNCIL

Present: Councilmembers Tobi Hanna-Davies, Peter Fink, Jane Lumm, Robert Grady, Ulrich Stoll, Peter Nicolas, Julie Creal, Thais Anne Peterson, David Stead, Mayor Ingrid B. Sheldon, 10

Absent: Councilmember Larry Hunter, 1

Administrative Staff Present: City Administrator Alfred A. Gatta, Public Services Director William Wheeler, Transportation Division Manager John Awendt, Airport Manager Charles Ferguson, Administrative Assistant Dean Bowerbank

Participants from other organizations: Steve Benson, principal with the firm of Coffman and Associates, Mark Johnson, associate with Coffman and Associates and Jerry Trout representing SEMCOG - airport planner responsible for the Ann Arbor Facility; Edwin Thompson, MDOT, who oversees this particular grant and other developments.

INTRODUCTIONS

E.A.R. PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY

The subject of the public hearing/working session this date is the *Noise Compatibility Study and Airport Layout Plan* prepared by airport consultants Coffman and Associates. The presenters of the Plan were Steve Benson and Mark Johnson.

The Part 150 study was initiated in 1989. It received input from the Planning Advisory Committee and public information workshops and is FAA approved. The direction was to provide an airport layout plan that depicts the current airport runway length, width and weight carrying capacity.

Part 150 is a provision of FAA regulations, established in response to Congressional Legislation adopted in 1980, which set forth rules and guidelines to be followed when conducting noise compatibility studies. The advantage to performing the study is that it officially enlists the cooperation of the FAA and establishes eligibility for funding of recommendations that may result from the study.

The Noise Compatibility Plan includes a description of the planning issues, analysis of noise abatement options, and land use management analysis. The plan was developed as a result of complaints received from existing residential neighborhoods, and a concern for future development in close proximity to the airport.

The Noise Compatibility Program recommendations: (1) Continue the runway use

program now in effect at the airport which calls for preferential use of Runway 6-24; maintain City of Ann Arbor and Pittsfield Township existing compatible zoning in the airport area; Township/City adoption of airport compatibility overlay zoning; provide developers with sound insulation standards on an advisory basis; amend City/Township subdivision regulations to require the dedication of navigation easements within the overlay zoning; amend building codes to set sound insulation standards; comprehensive development review; and implementation of an informal fair disclosure program; disclose information about the presence of the airport and the potential for noise impacts; review and update the plan on a continuing basis.

PUBLIC HEARING

A public hearing was conducted on the Airport Noise and Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Ann Arbor Municipal Airport, based on the Requirements and Guidelines of Part 150 of the Federal Aviation Administration Regulations.

The following persons spoke at this public hearing:

Ed Worsham, 1775 Westridge Road, Ann Arbor, pilot, resident since 1940, pilots license earned in 1962, safety counselor with the FAA, said that one of the most significant drawbacks to the airport is the lack of an Instrument Landing System (ILS). The present runway 6-24 is too close to the NE T-hangars; to accommodate an ILS the runway must be extended. An area of non-visibility exists in the tower look-out where airplanes in the shadow of the hangars cannot be seen. The airport lacks proper parking, repair facilities, restrooms and accommodations for landing medical aircraft.

Kris Olsson, representing the Huron River Watershed Council, 1100 N. Main, Suite 210, works in conjunction with the City on the regional well head protection program. The wells, which are in the area of the airport, supply supplemental water to city and township residents. Pollution prevention strategies are being developed to protect the wells. The wells are threatened by new development because of potential pollution and are better maintained in undeveloped land.

Donald Musinski, business address: 3810 Varsity Drive, recommended that Council reject the Part 150 Study mandated by Council in *Resolution R-34-1-91*. The study is seriously flawed and does not meet current minimum FAA standards necessary to safely accommodate aircraft currently operating at the airport. The Coffman and Associates document ignores the safety concerns of Risk Manager Dan Cullen expressed in his memorandum dated 11-28-88, title: *Liability exposure at Ann Arbor Municipal Airport*. The safety concerns must receive primary attention because the City's exposure to claim arriving out an aeronautical accident are significant. The exposure is reenforced by the fact that remedies have been available to the City at virtually no cost and have not materialized. (Statement filed with the City Clerk.)

Grant Cook, 6075 Jackson Road, Washtenaw County resident since 1961, airport tenant since 1983, said that the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) fails to provide for long-term land-use capabilities. As presented the Plan forces most aircraft approaches/departures over

residential neighborhoods. The conditions that support the installation of an ILS are also not met because of the recommendation to continue to use the 6-24 runway. Adoption of the Plan would restrict operations of air ambulances and many of the businesses that are currently revenue producing assets.

Malcolm Warren, 5917 Willowbridge Rd., Ypsilanti, airport user, said that the airport is an important open space within an urban sprawl of minimal compatibility consideration. The present proposed Plan continues that tradition. The plan ignores land use and zoning considerations, it exposes neighborhoods to unnecessary safety hazards and noise, the basis for its creation. (Statement filed with the City Clerk.)

Elizabeth Tracey-Nicol, 5917 Willowbridge Rd., Ypsilanti, said that because some individuals would not like to see the development and maintenance of a well-designed airport, it has taken two decades to decide to upgrade. More attention should be paid to constituents' concerns. Development of a new and more modern airport is favored. The present airport's inefficient operation and design must be remedied and revamped to accommodate the influx of businesses ready to use it, for convenience to the community, and for profit. (Statement filed with the City Clerk.)

John Day, 557 Main Ave., Belleville, an attorney speaking on behalf of the Ann Arbor Airport Business Association, a group of individuals who operate businesses located on the Ann Arbor Airport, expressed concerns regarding the Airport Layout Plan and the impact they feel it will have on the airport, and their declining businesses. The airport should be viewed as a gateway to a world-class community, and a plan is needed to allow the airport to grow with the community or face a loss of revenue, jobs and taxes. The current Airport Plan does not reflect that kind of development. The lack of an ILS system, lack of clear zones, and weight restrictions will prohibit or discourage the type of aircraft which represent the growth of the area, and will lock the airport into its present mode.

John Solo, 3800 Grey Tower Road, Jackson, business owner at the Ann Arbor Airport, since 1985, cited a slow degradation of the facility. Today, broken asphalt litters runways and taxiways, hangars are rusting and are vacant. Airport maintenance staff has been cut resulting in infrequent snow removal and mowing. Empty t-hangars have not been leased. Rents are high. Flight instruction and fuel sales are down. All of this has a negative impact on his and other businesses. An airport that supported 231 aircraft in 1985, now holds 150. The proposed Airport Layout Plan proposes a runway and weight restriction that will not allow aircraft currently using the airport to land. This will mean fewer fuel sales and a further loss of revenue. However, it does not mean less noise because the newer quieter aircraft cannot meet the weight restriction.

Andy Rudnik, 924 Woodlawn St., said that objects to the airport layout plan because it limits the airport's ability to serve the current clientele. Specifically, it imposes unreasonable and unnecessary weight restrictions and limits the type of aircraft that can make instrument approaches to the airport. The user who will be prohibited from using the airport are those whose businesses contribute heavily to the City's economy. If noise abatement is really a concern, some of the effective alternatives in the Coffman study should be considered.

Beth Kirschner, 1505 Traver Road, Ann Arbor resident/pilot since 1986, said that the airport layout plan is opposed because it erroneously suggests that airport noise will be eliminated by limiting the size and weight of the aircraft that use it. Elimination of all jets into the airport will have no impact on eliminating airport noise. The weight limits are problematic because they may be unconstitutional as well as unenforceable. The plan ignores the advice of the City's planners and advisers.

Sandy Hubar, 3601-7 Partridge Path, resident of Ann Arbor since 1976, and who lives under the path of the airplanes at Stone School and Ellsworth Road said that the noise is pretty constant and questioned why airplanes will continue to fly over homes if it does not have to happen. She said that it also makes no sense to her why there is not a more compatible land use surrounding the airport. A more compatible use would protect the neighborhoods while maintaining the airport as an important and vital asset to the community.

Kathy Mayo, 1509 Pine Valley, resident/pilot, said that the airport layout plan continues the poorly designed instrument approach based on a radio beacon, 15 miles away, in Salem Township. The radio beam's course, which is spread a few miles wide by the time it gets to the Ann Arbor airport, is used to keep the plane on course to the airport. This "path" takes an aircraft over at least 40 thousand homes in Ann Arbor. In addition, because the beam is almost 30 degrees away from the center-line of the runway, a twisting turn is necessary to line-up. The beam does not give altitude guidance, so an altitude of at least 500 feet is needed and housing and local landmarks are used as guides. An Instrument Landing System would divert air traffic away from the residential areas and guide it straight to the middle of the runway.

George Hunt, 10 Manitou Ct., resident/pilot, said that the resource that the City has at the airport cannot be preserved in its present form because, in its present form, it is unsafe, will become less and less useful in the future and eventually the airport will have to close. He urged that the original airport layout plan recommendation be adopted, to install a runway which would redirect the air traffic over less heavily populated areas, and to have safety zones which are adequate to the FAA regulations.

William Simpson, 2004 Traver Road, pilot/resident, said that airport noise has been carefully studied and a variety of actions are available. Airports economically impact communities far beyond the money that is spent on that asset. They are valuable because of accessibility, which businesses prefer. Businesses locate where good access is available, and leave if it is not available. According to the State of Michigan, the Ann Arbor Airport has an estimated impact of \$33 million dollars annually. This figure includes people who maintain the airport and people who do business here. A design for reducing the noise impact upon the total community area has been offered

and was well received by the citizenry. However, what is being considered will not reduce noise. In addition, safety will be negatively impacted, local economics will take a hit, and medical transports will be delayed.

Richard Moore, 1 Medford Circle, resident/executive pilot with Ford Motor Company, said that the airport has been in a steady decline in the last 10 years. Executives who he has flown to Ann Arbor have noted the poor condition of the airport. If the current airport plan is adopted, and not the original one that showed proper maximum land use, the City should get out of the airport business.

William Pollard, 2139 Ascot Road, Airport Advisory Committee member, said that the airport noise study has been in the making since 1989. The study at that time proposed expansion of the airport by lengthening and redirecting the main runway. Since that time, whole neighborhoods have developed in the path of the planned runway redirection, so that now, moving the runway does not seem to be a good idea. The noise study showed that the louder noise was almost completely confined within the airport property limit. This being the case, the Council's decision to retain the current configuration is the correct one. He suggested that a new airport be built northwest of the City, in a more rural setting, and that the old one be closed upon its completion. Secondly, he suggested that the altitude limit be raised to 3000 feet and that aircraft flying under that altitude be restricted from flying within the expressway ring. If the weather is bad, air traffic should be diverted to Willow Run. General aviation is a declining industry, aircraft companies are going out of business, training of pilots is declining.

Danny Galloway, 1715 Mershon, objected to the Airport Layout Plan. Each time an airport study was initiated, the City has initiated it. The Airport layout plan is intended to reduce the risk to the City. He said that he is upset at the City's attitude towards the airport. The only reason he knows why the City would initiate the study is because it wanted to be in compliance with the FAA regulations. Another reason is to reduce the risk of liability. The City lost its courage to carry through with the original plans and political considerations clouded the issues.

Mark Roisen, 1522 High Hollow Dr., business owner at the Airport, said that he is glad that the necessary repairs at the airport will be made. The airport should be taken full advantage of as an asset and revenue generator. The Ann Arbor area is the home of two universities, hospitals and an attractive environment for "hi tech" businesses. These businesses need the accessibility of transportation within their own community. Non-accessibility could have a detrimental effect upon life-saving operations such as patient or medical transports. The type of aircraft that would be excluded from the airport would be the business type aircraft which are generally manned by professional pilots with better and safer equipment and which are low-noise engineered. The increase in hangar rates, actually generated lower revenues because of the loss of tenants and aircraft to the City. The fee structure has resulted in lower airport use and losses to businesses in Ann Arbor. Adoption of this plan is in conflict with the lease that he signed with the City and will result in the decline of his business.

Michael Fischer, 3585 Green Brier, resident/pilot, said that the airport is degraded. The

current weight restriction should be left at 20,000 pounds. This will allow aircraft to fly into the airport safely without affecting the neighborhoods. The runway length and alignment could be the cause of another accident and a deterrent to business aircraft landing here. Turbulence at the end of runway 6-24 makes it more difficult for even professional pilots to land here.

Dennis Tokarski, 921 S. Seventh, said that the November 28, 1988 memo from the Risk Manager described several liability issues. Chief among these was a concern regarding claims related to the Municipal airport. The exposure to liability claims is reenforced by the fact that landing aids have been available to the City at virtually no cost. The remedies have not materialized to meet minimum Federal Aviation Administration standards. The Council responded with a resolution which mandated an Airport Layout Plan that is unchanged from the current airport. This action was taken without a public hearing, and requires an LP which is contrary to public expectations that air traffic would be moved away from residential neighborhoods. The original Coffman plan was required to be in compliance with current FAA and state standards. By retaining the current runway configuration, the Council plan forfeits any opportunity to address outstanding noise concerns. Portions of the noise study under consideration tonight, and the airport layout plan, fail to address the very noise and safety concerns expressed by City staff. (Statement filed with the City Clerk.)

John Freitas, 1459 Burgundy, U of M Hospital Physician, said that adoption of the plan in its present form would impair the hospital's ability to deliver efficient health care in the area. By restricting the aircraft weight at the airport, patient transport will be eliminated, and the lack of a good ILS may delay the transport of critically ill patients, or vital organs, destined for the University Hospital because of the extra time needed to land at Willow Run and travel back to the City.

Elizabeth Copland, 3971 Waldenwood, physician/pilot, said that the current plan services neither airport users or non-airport users. An adequate solution could have been easily obtained and financed. It is irresponsible for the City Council to condemn residents to another 20 years of air traffic over their homes. The runway should be equipped with an ILS. To divert traffic to Willow Run will add time to the flight and once on the ground another 30 to 45 minutes in transport. She urged Council to consider these things when considering this plan. This is one of the premier cities in the Big Ten but the airport is one of the worst in the conference.

John Wolter, 1531 Jones Drive, past member and chair of the Airport Advisory Committee, said that during his tenure on the committee, the Part 150 Compatibility Study was begun with the highest of ideals to make it serve the Utility in a compatible manner. All of the plans produced were compatible. Businesses and neighborhood groups do not like the plan before Council this date. The plan does not serve the medical community. It is refuted by the City's own consultants who have said that the Plan as presented does nothing to abate noise in the community, and that noise is the issue. Neighborhoods are not served because the flight path is still over their homes. Airport users will not benefit because safety is not improved. Businesses are not served because the utility is not improved. Hospitals are not served because they won't be able to launch their teams of doctors from the facility.

This Plan needs to be reshaped or the problem will be back again.

The following written correspondence was received and filed:

James H. LaRosa, 2200 Independence, who lives directly under the instrument directional approach to the airport and is disturbed by low-flying aircraft, listed the following objections the Plan: He found the study difficult to understand and follow and suggested that an executive summary be distributed to affected residents; the plan does not provide determination/methodology of cost factors; "LDN" is not defined in the report; no comparison of the current noise level with other similar airports both current and projected; feels that the LDN contour is misleading and that noise limits should be based on 40 db; Alternate 5 is the only one that materially results in a noise reduction; is leery that any changes to the airport would result in increased usage; building or land use restrictions are not acceptable unless on city-owned property - citizens should not be subjected to land use restrictions; the report does not identify who paid for the study or where the money came from. (Communication filed with the City Clerk.)

Barbara Perkins, Secretary Airport Advisory Committee, urged approval of both the FAR noise maps and the Airport Layout Plan depicting the present runway alignment and category. Earlier versions of the present and future land use maps have been redrawn to reflect more realistically the current status of residential building in the area as well as proposed projects. These depictions demonstrate clearly the developmental pressure surrounding the airport. She concluded that the land use trends in Pittsfield and Lodi townships makes it imperative that City Council continue to monitor the situation very closely in order to protect public investment in the 700 acre plus property. (Communication filed with the City Clerk.)

Clan Crawford, Jr., P.O. Box 7046, noted the amount of development that has been approved and partly built in the airport area since the study was done. This includes housing between the airport and Textile Rd., housing across Lohr Road to the west of the airport, and the various residential projects south and west of the Meijer store on Saline. He also noted that only expensive condemnation procedures could prevent the residential use of these areas. (Communication filed with the City Clerk.)

John Avedt said that the report was available at the City Clerk's Office, the City Planning Department, Transportation Division, Ann Arbor Municipal Airport. The Transportation Department will be accepting, as required, written comments for another 15 days or until March 15.

Noting no further speakers, the Mayor declared the public hearing closed.

WORKING SESSION - FEBRUARY 28, 1994

The Working Session of the Ann Arbor City Council was called to order at 9:50 p.m. by Mayor Ingrid B. Sheldon.

ROLL CALL OF COUNCIL

Present: Councilmembers Tobi Hanna-Davies, Peter Fink, Jane Lumm, Robert Grady, Ulrich Stoll, Peter Nicolas, Julie Creal, Thais Anne Peterson, David Stead, Mayor Ingrid Sheldon, 10

Absent: Councilmember Larry Hunter, 1

PUBLIC HEARING/WORKING SESSION FOLLOW-UP

The Council designated this time on the agenda to ask follow-up questions and to request further information regarding the Coffman and Associates Study.

ADJOURNMENT

The being no further business, Councilmember Stead moved that the meeting be adjourned.

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Linda J. Wise
Acting Clerk of the Council
Recording Secretary