

# Appendix E

## Agency Correspondence



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Aviation  
Administration**

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

Mr. Richard B. McQueen, President & CEO  
Akron-Canton Regional Airport Authority  
Akron-Canton Regional Airport  
5400 Lauby Road, NW #9  
North Canton, OH 44720-1598

Dear Mr. McQueen:

Akron-Canton Airport  
North Canton, Ohio  
Airport Layout Plan Approval  
Airspace Case Number 2015-AGL-1675-NRA

The Master Plan (MP) documents for the Akron-Canton Airport are acceptable from a contractual standpoint with respect to the terms and conditions of the grant agreement. The contents of the MP reflect the views of the Akron-Canton Airport, who is responsible for the accuracy of the document. The MP does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and the determination of acceptability does not imply the FAA agrees with the MP conclusions and recommendations.

Enclosed is one conditionally approved copy of the subject Airport Layout Plan (ALP), dated September 2015. This letter cancels or supersedes all prior ALP approvals. The ALP approval is based upon recognition of and adherence to the following:

The approval is not to be considered a commitment of Federal funding for the proposed development. The FAA has concurred with the proposed development for planning purposes only based on current safety, utility, and efficiency standards. Actual development should comply with approved standards applicable at the time of construction.

No design standard modifications have been granted.

It is FAA policy that the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) should be acquired in fee simple. It appears that the Airport Sponsor does not currently own small parts of the RPZs for Runways 1, 5, and 23. The Airport Sponsor has partial to complete aviation easements for the RPZs where fee simple ownership is not currently identified. The Airport Sponsor should review the land use in the area and ensure that it had adequate controls in place. The Airport Sponsor should ensure that there is no congregation of people within the RPZ.

Sheet 17 entitled *Exhibit 'A' Property Map* has been included for informational purposes only and does not replace the required Exhibit A for grant assurance purposes.

If any of the design critical aircraft or aircraft groups change, this ALP must be reevaluated.

Our approval does not infer or imply that the land in the airport vicinity is considered compatible with airport operations. Federal requirements stipulate:

1. All development programs should be reasonably consistent with the plans of local and state planning agencies for the development in the airport vicinity.
2. That fair consideration has been given to the interest of communities in or near the airport.
3. That development programs provide for the protection and enhancement of the environment.

The FAA offers no objection to the proposed ultimate airspace utilization as depicted on the ALP based on considerations of safe and efficient use of airspace. The ALP has the status of "Plan on File" for the purpose of 14 CFR Part 77, Obstruction Evaluation, and 14 CFR Part 152, Airport Aid Program. A review of the airside landing area development was conducted according to the following 14 CFR's Part: -77, -152, -and -157, Notice of Construction, Alteration, Activation, and Deactivation of Airports (reference Aeronautical Study Number 2015-AGL-1675-NRA). It should be noted that FAA cannot prevent erection of any structure near an airport. Airport environs can only be protected through state and local zoning ordinances, building regulations, and like requirements.

All development depicted on this ALP must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. FAA environmental approval is required for all airport development actions depicted on this ALP. This would apply to development projects, even if there was no FAA funding involved in the project. Additional requirements concerning FAA NEPA approval can be found in FAA Order 5050.4B "*National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*".

To avoid conflicts with future development, we recommend you utilize the ALP when preparing leases. We further recommend you provide copies to the local and state planning zoning boards and county and city officials and encourage them to adopt compatible land use criteria in and around the airport. Copies should be distributed to Fixed Base Operators (FBOs) and airport users.

The Airport and Airway Improvement Act (49 USC 47107(a)(16)(D)) requires the sponsor to eliminate any adverse effects on Federal facilities, or bear all costs to relocate those facilities, that are a result of an airport change. However, if AIP eligible construction/development items adversely affect FAA facilities, the cost of relocating the facilities may be eligible under AIP.

This approval does not include a detailed evaluation of actual construction. Prior to constructing any development on the airport, notice (FAA Form 7460-1) consistent with 14 CFR Part 77 must

be filed with this office. This approval does not include approval for temporary construction equipment, which may be used during actual construction, e.g., cranes, equipment staging areas, site access routes, etc. A separate construction safety/phasing plan for any project should be reviewed by the FAA no less than 60 days prior to beginning any project.

If development is planned without aviation trust fund investments that will change the status or geometrics of runways, taxiways, aprons, or other operating airport surfaces, notice (FAA Form 7480-1) must be filed with this office consistent with 14 CFR Part 157.

We trust this letter provides a clear explanation of the conditions and terms of our approval. If you desire further clarification, please contact this office at (734) 229-2900.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John L. Mayfield, Jr.", is placed over a light blue rectangular background.

John L. Mayfield, Jr.  
Manager  
Detroit Airports District Office

Cc: CHA Companies  
AGL-620  
ODOT/OOA



August 28, 2015

Katherine S. Delaney  
Community Planner  
FAA Detroit Airport District Office  
11677 South Wayne Rd, Suite 107  
Romulus, MI 48174

CC: Rick McQueen, Akron-Canton Airport

Subject: CAK Draft ALP – response to FAA comments dated July 28, 2015

Ms. Delaney:

On behalf of the Akron-Canton Airport Authority, CHA Consulting has evaluated the July 28, 2015 review comments on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that was submitted in November 2014. Each of the comments is addressed below (in **bold green text**) where we have responded with actions taken or additional clarification/rationale of why things were presented as they were. After you review these responses, I suggest we discuss any outstanding issues, questions or concerns before the Master Plan and ALP are finalized.

#### Airports Division Comments

1. Future Taxiway D may need to be re-evaluated once apron development occurs to eliminate any direct access from the apron area to the runway.  
**Noted and understood. Taxiway “D” will remain until an apron development project occurs. Sheet 6 “West General Aviation Area Plan” has been updated and shows the removal of pavement concurrently with the apron development. A note was also added to explain (Note 8 on Sheet 6).**
2. Review new Taxiway from Runway 23 to Taxiway F. it appears as it may be a high-speed taxiway. If this is a high-speed taxiway, additional taxiway evaluation will be required to determine the correct placement and angle. If this is not a high-speed taxiway exit, what is the added benefit over and above Taxiway F2?  
**We agree that this project provides little benefit and it has been removed from the ALP. As it is stated in the Master Plan, this “angled” exit taxiway could reduce runway occupancy times and allow traffic controllers to better manage traffic. However, it is estimated that this taxiway would only capture approximately 9% of large aircraft traffic for Runway 23 landings. It was collectively decided amongst the planning team and airport sponsor that this project was likely not needed and would be a low priority for the Authority. Therefore it was removed from the ALP.**
3. Review Taxiway K between Runway 1/19 and A. Should this pavement be removed to be consistent with the pavement removal of Taxiway K between Runway 5/23 and Runway 1/19? What is the added benefit?  
**This pavement provides an angled exit for aircraft landing on Runway 19. The planning team and sponsor agree that this portion of pavement provided little additional benefit and could cause pilot confusion or an accidental runway incursion. The ALP set has been updated to show this piece of pavement removed.**
4. Prior to construction of the Taxiway E realignment the FAA and airport sponsor will need to evaluate the necessity of the additional pavement shown to remain. It may be determined at the time of construction that this pavement will be required to be removed.  
**Noted and understood. Some pavement removal is shown. It is understood that this will need to be evaluated further upon design of this project. Jet blast impacts should also be considered.**

### **ATO – Technical Operations Comments**

1. Further review will be required to evaluate the CAK RTR LOS analysis due to future apron expansion, parking garage, etc. We will require exact dimensions of apron, parking garage, deicing pad, and future aeronautical development to conduct studies on CAK RTR impact analysis. Some proposed building construction e.g., future parking garage, terminal expansion/reconstruction, mixed use development area(s) depending on the exact height/location of the facilities.  
**Noted and understood. Impacts to the RTR will be evaluated prior to the design of all apron expansions, parking garages or aeronautical developments.**
2. Changes in taxiway configurations that affect the current ASOS Field Sensors (CGS) will become the responsibility of the Sponsor to be relocated in accordance with the sitting order 5650.20B under a MOA with the FAA.  
**Noted. Projects that could impact the ASOS are assumed to occur in the long-term timeframe. At the time of those projects, alternatives will be evaluated for preservation or relocation of the sensor, in accordance with the siting requirements in Order 5650.20B.**
3. This is not a construction permit.  
**Noted and understood.**
4. Radar should not be compromised with this plan.  
**Noted and understood.**

### **Central Services Flight Procedures Team (CSA FPT) Comments**

1. Review of the ALP update does not constitute an automatic request for amended or new procedures. A request may be submitted to the CSA FPT via this website: [https://www.faa.gov/air\\_traffic/flight\\_info/aeronav/procedures/ifp\\_initiation](https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/procedures/ifp_initiation). The Airport Manager or ADO request amendments or new IAPs. If at the same time the proponent wishes to cancel some of the currently published procedures, the letter should include which procedures should be cancelled.  
**Noted and understood.**
2. Publication of the IAPs could take from 18 months up to 2 years.  
**Noted and understood.**
3. Review of this ALP does not result in newly identified obstructions being added or removed from this obstruction database. (Noting on the ALP that an obstruction will be removed does not constitute an official request that an obstruction has been removed).  
**Noted and understood.**





U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Aviation  
Administration**

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

July 28, 2015

Mr. Richard B. McQueen, President & CEO  
Akron-Canton Regional Airport Authority  
Akron-Canton Regional Airport  
5400 Lauby Road, N.W., Suite #9  
North Canton, OH 44720-1598

Akron-Canton Airport  
Airspace Case Number 2015-AGL-1675-NRA  
Airspace Approval

We have completed an aeronautical study of the proposed Airport Layout Plan (ALP) dated November 2014 – Draft Final. Based on that study, the ALP is approved from an airspace utilization standpoint with the following comments.

Airports Division comments to be addressed are detailed below. I've also attached an 11x17 of the ALP with the comments embedded in the appropriate areas:

1. Future Taxiway D may need to be re-evaluated once apron development occurs to eliminate any direct access from the apron area to the runway.
2. Review new Taxiway from Runway 23 to Taxiway F. It appears as it may be a high-speed taxiway. If this is a high-speed taxiway, additional taxiway evaluation will be required to determine the correct placement and angle. If this is not a high-speed taxiway exit, what is the added benefit over and above Taxiway F2.
3. Review Taxiway K between Runway 1/19 and A. Should this pavement be removed to be consistent with the pavement removal of Taxiway K between Runway 5/23 and Runway 1/19? What is the added benefit?
4. Prior to construction of the Taxiway E realignment the FAA and airport sponsor will need to evaluate the necessity of the additional pavement shown to remain. It may be determined at the time of construction this pavement will be required to be removed.

Air Traffic has no objections.

Flight Standards offers the following:

No objection to the proposed airport layout plan. No requests for modifications of standards or determinations of no hazard noted.

ATO – Technical Operations offers the following: No Objection with Provision.

1. Further review will be required to evaluate the CAK RTR LOS analysis due to future apron expansion, parking garage, etc. We will require exact dimensions of apron, parking garage, deicing pad, and future aeronautical development to conduct studies on CAK RTR impact analysis. Some proposed building construction e.g., future parking garage, terminal expansion/reconstruction, mixed use development area(s) depending on the exact height/location of those facilities.
2. Changes in taxiway configurations that affect the current ASOS Field Sensors (CGS) will become the responsibility of the Sponsor to be relocated in accordance with siting order 5650.20B under a MOA with the FAA.
3. This is not a construction permit.
4. Radar should not be compromised with this plan.

The Central Services Flight Procedures Team (CSA FPT) identified the following including an IFR effect.

1. Review of the ALP update does not constitute an automatic request for amended or new procedures. A request may be submitted to the CSA FPT via this website: [https://www.faa.gov/air\\_traffic/flight\\_info/aeronav/procedures/ifp\\_initiation/](https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/procedures/ifp_initiation/). The Airport Manager or ADO requesting amendments or new IAPs. If at the same time the proponent wishes to cancel some of the currently published procedures, the letter should include which procedures should be cancelled.
2. Publication of IAPs could take from 18 months up to 2 years.
3. Review of this ALP does not result in newly identified obstructions being added or removed from the obstruction database. NOTE: Noting on the ALP that an obstruction will be removed does not constitute an official request that an obstruction has been removed.

If you desire further clarification of these comments, please contact Katy Delaney, of this office, at (734) 229-2958. When all comments from this airspace approval letter and subsequent phone conversations have been incorporated onto the final ALP, please submit 1 signed copy of the ALP for final review and approval. The ADO will work closely with the Airport Sponsor and/or consultant to provide an unsigned electronic ALP approval letter to be scanned onto the final ALP. We will then request the appropriate number of copies of the ALP with the scanned ALP approval letter. One copy will be returned to the Airport Sponsor for their files. If you

desire more than one original, please add the appropriate number of ALPs and state the number of copies to be returned to the Airport Sponsor.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Katherine S. Delaney". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name.

Katherine S. Delaney  
Community Planner  
Detroit Airports District Office

cc: CHA Consulting





U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation  
Administration**

**Detroit Airports District Office  
11677 South Wayne Road  
Suite 107  
Romulus, MI 48174**

February 13, 2013

Mr. Richard B. McQueen, President & CEO  
Akron-Canton Regional Airport Authority  
Akron-Canton Regional Airport  
5400 Lauby Road, N.W., Suite #9  
North Canton, OH 44720-1598

Dear Mr. McQueen:

Akron Canton Regional Airport (CAK), Akron, Ohio  
Master Plan Update  
FAA Review and Forecast Approval

The Detroit Airports District Office has reviewed Working Paper #2, Forecasts of Aviation Demand. Based on our review we offer the following comments:

1. Table 3-40, Preferred Forecast Summary includes the forecasts for each category.
2. Table 3-41, Air Carrier Enplanements and Total Operations vs. CAK Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) show a comparison of the proposed forecasts to the TAF and were developed with generally acceptable methodologies.
3. The General Aviation Total Operations for the Preferred Forecast are 47,641 for the base year (2011). The CAK TAF 2012 states General Aviation Operations (2011) are a total of 37,700. Although there is an approximate 10,000 operations count difference the growth rates applied in both scenarios is similar.
4. The preferred forecasts presented in Table 3-40 and Table 3-41 are approved and can be used for for the remainder of the master planning process.
5. The final 2012 TAF is attached for your reference.
6. The FAA may have additional comments at the completion of the master plan and/or require validation of the use of these forecasts for the Part 150 Study, dependant on schedule. Please coordinate the schedule for the Part 150 Study so the most recent data available is reviewed and used as appropriate.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (734) 229-2958.

Sincerely,

Katherine S. Delaney  
Community Planner  
Detroit Airports District Office

# APO TAF Quick Data Summary Report - Facility

## For National Forecast 2012 -- 2012 Scenario

Region State: AGL-OH  
 City: AKRON

LOCID: CAK Radar Towers  
 Airport: AKRON-CANTON RGNL

2011 Based Aircraft: 133  
 -- TRACON --

-- ENPLANEMENTS --

-- AIRPORT OPERATIONS --

-- Itinerant Operations --

-- Local Operations --

Fiscal Year	Air Carrier	Commuter	Total	Air Carrier	AT & Comm	GA	Military	Total	Civil	Military	Total	Total OPS	Total OPS
2008	412,102	297,236	709,338	23,084	7,810	47,157	2,206	80,257	24,109	776	24,885	105,142	152,072
2009	419,110	298,102	717,212	21,981	3,770	34,215	1,800	61,766	18,251	556	18,807	80,573	132,620
2010	413,904	343,888	757,792	22,363	6,718	35,635	2,056	66,772	15,608	501	16,109	82,881	134,999
2011	488,374	299,784	788,158	12,464	16,727	22,386	1,661	53,238	15,314	1,058	16,372	69,610	99,994
2012	616,526	271,915	888,441	15,776	14,194	22,620	960	53,550	17,583	551	18,134	71,684	103,634
2013	738,493	227,310	965,803	15,903	14,375	20,629	960	51,867	17,345	551	17,896	69,763	99,189
2014	763,300	234,471	997,771	16,945	13,974	20,592	960	52,471	17,414	551	17,965	70,436	99,766
2015	788,941	241,857	1,030,798	18,028	13,547	20,555	960	53,090	17,484	551	18,035	71,125	100,355
2016	815,443	249,476	1,064,919	19,152	13,093	20,518	960	53,723	17,554	551	18,105	71,828	100,922
2017	842,836	257,334	1,100,170	20,319	12,612	20,481	960	54,372	17,624	551	18,175	72,547	101,503
2018	871,150	265,440	1,136,590	21,531	12,102	20,444	960	55,037	17,694	551	18,245	73,282	102,074
2019	900,416	273,801	1,174,217	22,789	11,562	20,407	960	55,718	17,765	551	18,316	74,034	102,653
2020	930,664	282,426	1,213,090	24,094	10,991	20,370	960	56,415	17,836	551	18,387	74,802	103,241
2021	961,929	291,322	1,253,251	25,448	10,388	20,334	960	57,130	17,907	551	18,458	75,588	103,841
2022	994,244	300,499	1,294,743	26,852	9,752	20,298	960	57,862	17,979	551	18,530	76,392	104,450
2023	1,027,645	309,965	1,337,610	28,308	9,082	20,262	960	58,612	18,051	551	18,602	77,214	105,070
2024	1,062,168	319,728	1,381,896	29,818	8,376	20,226	960	59,380	18,123	551	18,674	78,054	105,698
2025	1,097,850	329,800	1,427,650	31,384	7,633	20,190	960	60,167	18,195	551	18,746	78,913	106,335
2026	1,134,732	340,188	1,474,920	32,199	7,733	20,154	960	61,046	18,268	551	18,819	79,865	107,384
2027	1,172,853	350,904	1,523,757	33,035	7,834	20,118	960	61,947	18,341	551	18,892	80,839	108,459
2028	1,212,254	361,958	1,574,212	33,893	7,937	20,082	960	62,872	18,414	551	18,965	81,837	109,563
2029	1,252,980	373,359	1,626,339	34,774	8,041	20,046	960	63,821	18,488	551	19,039	82,860	110,698
2030	1,295,073	385,120	1,680,193	35,678	8,147	20,010	960	64,795	18,562	551	19,113	83,908	111,862
2031	1,338,582	397,251	1,735,833	36,606	8,255	19,974	960	65,795	18,636	551	19,187	84,982	113,058
2032	1,383,553	409,764	1,793,317	37,558	8,364	19,938	960	66,820	18,710	551	19,261	86,081	114,286
2033	1,430,035	422,672	1,852,707	38,535	8,475	19,902	960	67,872	18,785	551	19,336	87,208	115,546
2034	1,478,078	435,986	1,914,064	39,538	8,588	19,866	960	68,952	18,860	551	19,411	88,363	116,840
2035	1,527,734	449,720	1,977,454	40,567	8,702	19,830	960	70,059	18,935	551	19,486	89,545	118,167

## APO TAF Quick Data Summary Report - Facility For National Forecast 2012 -- 2012 Scenario

2036 *	1,579,059	463,886	2,042,945	41,623	8,818	19,795	960	71,196	19,011	551	19,562	90,758	119,532
2037 *	1,632,110	478,498	2,110,608	42,707	8,936	19,760	960	72,363	19,087	551	19,638	92,001	120,932
2038 *	1,686,943	493,571	2,180,514	43,819	9,056	19,725	960	73,560	19,163	551	19,714	93,274	122,371
2039 *	1,743,618	509,119	2,252,737	44,960	9,178	19,690	960	74,788	19,239	551	19,790	94,578	123,847
2040 *	1,802,197	525,157	2,327,354	46,131	9,302	19,655	960	76,048	19,316	551	19,867	95,915	125,361
GR1	4.60	1.95	3.80	4.61	-2.00	-0.44	-1.87	1.23	0.80	-2.22	0.66	1.11	0.78
GR2	3.90	2.37	3.49	3.90	-1.49	-0.50	0.00	1.26	0.33	0.00	0.32	1.04	0.68

GR1: Growth Rate from 2011 to 2040  
Report created 2/6/2013 08:05

GR2: Growth Rate from 2012 to 2040