

# **APPENDIX N**

## **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SECTION 4(f)**

Additional information for the Department of Transportation Section 4(f)<sup>1</sup> and Section 106 resources can be found in Chapter 5.7 Department of Transportation Section 4(f) Lands.

### **N.1 NAME OF OWNER AND TYPE OF SECTION 4(f) PROPERTY**

The Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA) owns the Airport Golf Course. It is leased to the City of Columbus Recreation and Parks Department Golf Division (CDRPGD) to manage as the Airport Golf Course. The Airport Golf Course is considered a recreational use facility.

Pizzurro Park is located east of the Airport and owned and operated by the City of Gahanna.

### **N.2 SIZE**

The Airport Golf Course is an 18-hole facility and sits on approximately 135.6 acres.

### **N.3 VISUAL INFORMATION**

The Airport Golf Course is located to the east of the Port Columbus International Airport (CMH) and to the west of Big Walnut Creek. It is accessed via Hamilton Road. The location of the Airport Golf Course is shown in **Exhibit 1.1**.

### **N.4 USES**

The Airport Golf Course is owned by the CRAA and managed by the CDRPGD. The golf course is 18-holes and has a small club house and parking lot associated with it. The CRAA's proposed project will result in a physical taking of the Airport Golf Course with mitigation to make the Section 4(f) resource whole again.

The Airport Golf Course currently has a Medium Intensity Lighting System with Runway Alignment Lights (MALSR). This system is aligned with the centerline for the current Runway 10R/28L. The CRAA is proposing to relocate Runway 10R/28L and the associated MALSR 702 feet south of its existing location. The proposed system would be identical to the one that is currently on the Airport Golf Course. There could potentially be fewer equipment shelters. The number of light bars and spacing requirements for the replacement system is similar to the existing system.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 is currently codified as 49 U.S.C. Section 303(c). Consistent with FAA Order 1050.1E, Appendix A, paragraph 6.1a, Section 303(c) will be referred to as Section 4(f).

## **N.5 ACCESS**

The Airport Golf Course is a public-owned, public-use facility. Approximately 40,000 – 45,000 rounds of golf are played at the Airport Golf Course annually.

## **N.6 ASSOCIATED AREAS**

There are no other golf courses in the vicinity of the Airport. The CDRPGD manages seven golf courses throughout the City.

## **N.7 PRUDENT AND FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES**

As a part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed relocation of Runway 10R/28L the FAA is completing the DOT Section 4(f) consultation with the Department of Interior. As a part of the EIS process, an extensive review of alternatives was conducted. The alternatives were grouped into off-site and on-site alternatives. The off-site alternatives included the use of other airport/regional management alternatives and other modes of transportation and/or telecommunications.

The on-site alternatives that were evaluated were non-runway/terminal development alternatives; other technologies such as additional air traffic equipment; activity or demand management; runway development; and terminal development alternatives.

The off-site alternatives and on-site alternatives for non-runway/terminal development, other technologies, and activity or demand management can be found in Section 3.3, Off-Site Alternatives, Section 3.4.1, Non-Runway Development Alternatives, Section 3.4.2, Other Technologies, and 3.4.3, Activity or Demand Management Alternatives.

A summary of Section 3.4.4, Runway Alternatives is presented below, including the No Action Alternative.

Alternative A is the No Action Alternative and assumes that Runway 10R/28L would be maintained in place without a full reconstruction. Alternative A is depicted in **Exhibit 3-1**. The runway would continue to undergo smaller overlays and localized reconstruction on portions of the runway. This alternative would not impact the Airport Golf Course. There is one park (Pizzurro Park) located in the existing 65 DNL noise contour. While this alternative is feasible in the short-term, it does not address the need for a full reconstruction of the runway before pavement failure and it does not provide the Airport with an expanded terminal development envelope for actual and projected growth at the Airport. This alternative is carried forward and evaluated in the EIS under the requirements set forth by the National Environmental Policy Act.

Alternative B is to reconstruct Runway 10R/28L in place. There are two alternatives within Alternative B: B1 – Reconstruct Runway 10R/28L in Current Location and B2 – Reconstruct Runway 10R/28L in Current Location and Relocate Runway 10L/28R 700 feet to the North.

Alternative B1 would do a full reconstruction of Runway 10R/28L in its current location. This is depicted in **Exhibit 3-2**. The runway would maintain its current length of 10,125 feet. This alternative would not provide for an expanded terminal envelope for actual and projected growth at the Airport.

Alternative B1 would not impact the Airport Golf Course. Alternative B1 provides the Airport with a reconstructed Runway 10R/28L, but it does not provide the Airport with an expanded terminal development envelope and the ability to implement long-term delay reduction technology. Thus, Alternative B1 does not meet the purpose and need for the project. This alternative is not evaluated further.

Alternative B2 would include the full reconstruction of Runway 10R/28L in its current location, as well as the relocation of Runway 10L/28R, 700 feet to the north to allow for an expanded terminal development envelope. Alternative B2 is shown in **Exhibit 3-3** and **Exhibit 3-4**. Runway 10R/28L length would maintain its present length of 10,125 feet. Runway 10L/28R would maintain its present length of 8,000 feet when it is relocated.

This alternative (B2) would not impact the Airport Golf Course. This alternative is not prudent or feasible based on other environmental and design impacts. First, Bridgeway Avenue, which is a east/west throughway would have to be terminated or rerouted across Big Walnut Creek near the east end of Runway 10R/28L. The road is currently located in the floodplain to Big Walnut Creek. Relocating the road would require the raising of Bridgeway Avenue and the construction of two bridges over Big Walnut Creek to maintain airport and road design standards. Impacts to relocating Runway 10L/28R include potential height impacts to the runway approaches for I-670, I-270, and Johnstown Road. There would be impacts to the north airfield development area, including impacts to large corporate hangars, general aviation hangars and aprons, airport maintenance buildings, fuel farms, and airfield run-up barriers. A minimum of 18 commercial/industrial businesses would need to be acquired and relocated. There is no guarantee that these businesses would be able to relocate in the Columbus area. While, this alternative meets a portion of the purpose and need, it is unreasonable to carry it forward due to the environmental impacts to Big Walnut Creek and associated floodplain, socioeconomic impacts due to business removal and road termination or relocation, and the increased cost of between \$53 million to \$72 million, above the \$155 million for the Airport's proposed project.

Alternative C1 relocates Runway 10R/28L 1,500 feet south of its existing location. See **Exhibit 3-5** and **Exhibit 3-6**. This alternative was evaluated because it would provide 4,300 feet separation between the two runways, the minimum runway

separation required for dual simultaneous instrument arrivals without any additional air traffic control equipment required. The length for Runway 10R/28L would be maintained at 10,125 feet.

This alternative (C1) would not impact the Airport Golf Course. There are additional environmental and financial impacts to this alternative that do not make it prudent or feasible. The first environmental impact would be the acquisition and demolition of major industrial development, such as the Columbus International Air Center (Air Force Plant 85), Seven-Up Bottling Group of Columbus, and the Airway Industrial Park. There is no guarantee that the businesses would be able to relocate in the Columbus region. The original Airport Terminal Building, which is listed on the NRHP, would need to be removed. This project would also include the acquisition of 48 residential properties. The cost of this alternative is an additional \$167 million more than the CRAA's Proposed Project.

Alternative C2 relocates Runway 10R/28L 800 feet south of its existing location. **Exhibit 3-7** and **Exhibit 3-8** depict this alternative. The runway length would be 10,113 feet.

This alternative (C2) would impact the Airport Golf Course. Thirty-six residential properties (35 homes) would be acquired. Pizzurro Park is located in the 65 DNL noise contour.

Alternative C3 relocates Runway 10R/28L 702 feet south of its existing location. **Exhibit 3-9** and **Exhibit 3-10** shows this alternative. This is the minimum the runway can be moved and still provide for sufficient space for dual simultaneous instrument arrivals with additional air traffic control equipment and provide a sufficient terminal envelope. The runway length would be 10,113 feet.

This alternative (C3) will impact the Airport Golf Course. Pizzurro Park is currently located in the existing 65 DNL noise contour. The Sponsor's Proposed Project will not have any physical impacts to the park. Thirty-six residential properties (35 homes) would be acquired. This is the CRAA's proposed project.

## **N.8 MITIGATION**

The CRAA and CRPDGD have begun outlining the framework in which a Memorandum of Understanding can be executed. On October 18, 2007, the CRPDGD sent a letter to the Federal Aviation Administration indicating the areas where levels of concurrence have been reached between the two parties and items that are still under discussion. They are summarized below.

The two entities have concurrence on the following items:

- The Airport Golf Course will be returned to an 18-hole facility that is comparable to the character, distance, and style of the current course and conforms to all relevant FAA guidelines concerning airport design

standards, safety, and maintenance of approach light systems. The course layout shown in Layout Option "A-1" of the golf course reconfiguration report satisfies all of these requirements.

- The Airport Golf Course will remain within the boundaries of the current course.
- The CRAA will fund and manage the reconstruction of the Airport Golf Course.
- There is a desire by both the CRAA and CRPDGD to compress the schedule of the reconstruction as much as possible to reduce the amount of time the Airport Golf Course is less than an 18-hole facility.
- There is a desire by both the CRAA and CRPDGD to maintain at least nine playable holes during the reconstruction. The feasibility of this will require further analysis during the design phase of the project.
- The CRPDGD will participate in the reconstruction process in the following areas: selection of the design consultants and contractors; development of construction specifications; sign-off on final design; and sign-off on delivery of the finished course.
- CRPDGD will be compensated for loss and/or revenue attributed to impacts of reconstruction of the golf course.

The entities are still working through resolving the following items:

- The determination of how much and by what means compensation for loss and/or revenue will be made is yet to be determined.
- Development of a Memorandum of Understanding between the CRPDGD and the CRAA outlining the responsibilities of each party throughout the reconfiguration process.
- Evaluating the feasibility of maintaining a right-of-way either on or near the Airport Golf Course for a future hike/bike path. The CRAA and FAA will not participate in the funding of a hike/bike path, but would consider the possibility of a hike/bike path in final design and grading plans if requested by the City of Columbus provided that it does not impact the final outcome of the Airport Golf Course reconfiguration being comparable to the existing course.

## **N.9 CONSULTATION WITH THE CITY OF COLUMBUS**

### ***Airport Golf Course***

Additional information for the Airport Golf Course, including meeting minutes and correspondence can be found in Appendix I, Airport Golf Course.

The CRAA started coordination with the CRPDGD in 2004 when the CRAA was doing initial planning for the proposed relocated runway. To that effect, the CRPDGD has participated in the presentation of a study that assessed alternative golf course layouts. The CRPDGD understands the purpose of relocating Runway 10R/28L and

the resulting need to relocate the approach lights, which will cause the golf course to be reconfigured. The first meeting took place on July 8, 2004. Participants were the CRAA, CRPDGD, Landrum & Brown, and URS (consultants). The meeting included a project overview, the Airport Golf Course and Future Approach Lighting System, Environmental Items, and a Q&A.

At this meeting, the CRPDGD provided the CRAA with golf course architects that could be used in the planning study phase of this project. CRAA did retain the recommended golf course architect.