



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

Meeting Summary

The second Public Meeting for the Airport Master Plan project for Kent State University Airport was held at 6:00 pm on Thursday, November 20, 2014 at Stow-Munroe Falls High School, located at 3227 Graham Road in Stow, Ohio.

The purpose of the meeting was to provide attendees with an opportunity to review and provide comments on the alternatives' development and evaluation. Fact Sheets and informational displays were provided and project staff were available to answer questions. Attendees were encouraged to share comments directly with staff members or submit them in writing at the meeting, by mail or e-mail or through the project website, <http://ksuairportplan.com/>. Written comments were accepted through November 30, 2014.

There were 80 attendees at the meeting. More than half of the attendees were affiliated with the University or were users of the airport. 30% of attendees were residents or municipal/agency representatives.

56 comments were received. Approximately 65% of the comments were in support of the airport in its existing location. 25% of the comments were in opposition to the airport activity and supported relocation of flight training. The remaining 10% of the comments were about specific features of the airport or alternatives. Alternatives 2-A, Town Gown, and 3-B, Balance Beam, received the most positive feedback. Issues with the alternatives focused on the recommended location of the Automated Weather Observing Station (AWOS) and terminal building and concerns over the flight pattern and noise. Following are the comments submitted:

Comment
<p>has any thought been given to using ksu and the airport facilities for a training and or certification center for unmanned aerial systems otherwise know as drone technology? this could open up a whole new major area of study (and revenue stream) for the university, as the commercial market for this application is in its infancy. The FAA is under congressional mandate to integrate drones into civilian manned airspace in 2015. A recent study says the industry will create almost 3000 jobs and have over a 2 billion dollar impact in Ohio alone by 2025. I think ksu is uniquely positioned to get in on this ground floor opportunity for the development, teaching and application of this sky's the limit technology (no pun intended). I guarantee if they don't, someone else will position themselves in the region as the leader in drone technology research sooner rather than later. maybe all of these kids and their video game playing will actually lead to something worthwhile after all...!</p>
<p>I became a Senior Guest of Kent State when I retired in 2000 and have been continuously active as a student and benefactor of the university since then. In 2008, I began flight training at age 65. Since KSU began flight training in 1947, I am the only one to begin at such a ripe age and make it all the way to full licensure as a pilot. Thus, I earned the title The Flying Deuce of KSU ... too damn old to ever be a flying ace!</p> <p>The airport in Stow is one of the oldest continuously operated airports in the world. And as it appears today is not far from how it was when it was originally laid out, constructed, and put to use. That's quite a distinction and certainly one worth considering upholding. Ever since I began overhearing conversations about what might be done to improve the airport's utility for the university, the same idea has run again and again through my mind. But even before I had been hearing those ideas, I was well aware of the complaints that arrived regularly by local Stow residents about activity at the airport ... most having to do with noise, low flyovers, etc. It seemed that the Stow residents were only to be seen in a happy mood at their airport when it was Aviation Heritage Day when they not only came themselves but with their families and guests in tow. So, about five years ago, I came to two conclusions about any big change that the university might implement at their 1G3 facility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">* If the past and future feelings of the local Stow residents are to be considered in any changes to the airport, built into the plan needs to be something in it for them. That would mean that the airport would have to be an object of local pride as is the annual Aviation Heritage event. Further, the plan would have to be something to not only draw the local residents to visit the airport but to draw other visitors, too, thus making the airport a destination marked by both local and farther-reaching pride and interest.* What a fun-filled challenge it would be to restore the airport to a pre-World War II appearance and, at the same time, modernize it in such a way to enhance its utility for KSU's flight training, etc. The net outcome would be to make the whole place into a Living Museum, a complimentary contrast to the rest of KSU's modern campus in downtown Kent. <p>So, I offer to you the out-of-the-box thinking of a 72-year-old codger. To pull this off would be a non-expected surprise for all, both now and as the future unfolds, and an enhancement to the standing of C&C Companies. What do you think???</p>
<p>I have done all my flight training since 1998 with CAC at 1G3. Most recently I flew exclusively a Cessna 182 from CAC. I plan to continue flying with CAC once they return to full operation. After attending the meeting on Nov. 20, 2014 I studied the four proposed options of the master plan for 1G3. Here are my comments based on my observations since 1998.</p> <p>Option 1 might work for another three to five years but will not satisfy the objectives in the long term.</p> <p>Option 4 seems to me to be totally impractical. Certainly the community will be very unhappy with regular jet traffic. I am also concerned about the safety of a short 4219' runway proposed in option 4A for this kind of airplane.</p> <p>Option 3. The runway does not need to be extended for 172,182, and similar planes. I do not see the advantage of separate flight training and other GA buildings. Option 3A might be considered, however. This leaves 2A and 2B. 2B makes no sense to me. Why would the runway be shortened?</p> <p>My choice in terms of best fulfilling the requirements of the KSU Aeronautics Program, the needs of other GA operations, and the effect on the surrounding community is 2A.</p> <p>Preferred option: 2A.</p>

I have a question, as well as a comment. WHY does the FAA require that this airport remain open? My preference is that the whole thing be closed down. As a nearby resident, we are extremely tired of the CONSTANT noise from airplanes flying above our house. There is never a break. (We have young children who need to take naps and the noise really is a problem). One of the plans needs to include plans for what will be done to reduce the noise from the planes, if we are being asked to put up with planes flying overhead all day long.

In reviewing the November 2014 proposals of solutions of what to do at the Stow Airport, I see that IN MY OPINION none of the proposed solutions fulfill the contract made by the Trustees of KSU in 2004.

While none is what, In My Opinion, the Trustees agreed to, #1 (“No Build”), is the closest to what, In My Opinion, the Trustees agreed to. At that time KSU agreed to “. . . decommission the Kent State University Airport and transfer air operations to a nearby airport; and . . . recognizes that since the process to decommission the airport will be lengthy and is not likely to occur for several years, the University will continue its past practice of working with area residents and elected officials to minimize the impact of flight operations on the nearby communities . . .” At that time the nearby and “out of flight pattern” residents agreed to: stop public protesting the dangerous and disturbing KSU flight operations, and to stay in and/or buy homes in the areas affected (A mass exodus of homeowners then would have collapsed the home values to a fraction of what was paid for them). An unpleasant choice, but the lesser of the two evils. KSU has not in my observation and IN MY OPINION not made a sincere effort to live up to the agreement made in 2004:

1. “Then Congressman” LaTourette told us that KSU never made an appeal of the refusal of a LOW LEVEL FAA official to close the airport.

2. IN MY OPINION KSU has improperly worded statements so as to imply that the FAA prevents Flight School from being moved. By my understanding, NO FAA approval is needed to move the Flight School as promised, but although they have had ten (10) years to do it, this has not been done.

3. IN MY OPINION, KSU rather than “. . . working with area residents . . . to minimize the impact of flight operations on the nearby communities . . .” KSU has continued to teach flight students that they have the right to fly out of the “Touch and Go” pattern, and that people who bought homes “Near” the airport have no right to complain when they fly “touch and goes” more than a mile and a quarter from the airport.

November 19 after the Committee Meeting I met with some KSU Non-Flight School Students – they were adult, well mannered, and ready for their place in society.

November 20 at the “Community Open House” I talked with some Flight School students, IN MY OPINION, they were, like many Flight School students, like four (4) year olds: self-centered, arrogant, ‘it’s your fault not mine’, ‘we have the right to fly anyplace we want’, a far cry from being ready to take their place in society, let alone fly an airplane that could endanger both passengers and other people.

4. IN MY OPINION Living in the area affected by the Flight School is like living in the “Old West”: There are few laws and no effective law enforcement agency. IN MY OPINION, the FAA and the Flight School are a law unto themselves. There is no independent agency to call if there is a problem. A case of “the Fox guarding the Hen House”. We have petitioned the Provost’s office for minor changes, but nothing was ever done. I do not find this acceptable in our society, and IN MY OPINION do not feel KSU has done an acceptable job of policing itself.

5. AIRPORT PETITION #1. Copy attached. At the November 20 “Community Open House” (which was primarily attended by people who had a financial interest in the airport (Students, Pilots, airport/Flight School employees, etc.) I asked the pro-airport people that I talked to, who did not live in Stow to sign a petition to have the airport moved to the city where they live. NO ONE WOULD SIGN THE PETITION. When no one wants something near where they live, it is a good indication that it shouldn’t be where other people live!

6. AIRPORT PETITION #2. I also brought a “Petition to Relocate KSU Flight Training”. One person seemed IN MY OPINION to reflect the community attitude, he said “I went to school with [Consumer Attorney] Tim [“I’LL-MAKE-THEM-PAY”] Misney, I think we should talk to him”. While I haven’t yet decided if that is a good idea, I think there is, IN MY OPINION, good cause for a community action lawsuit, I would not be able to stop one. In considering the cost of the airport staying, IN MY OPINION this should be considered.

7. Regarding buying “Near” to the Airport – If a person buys a house a mile and a quarter from a Golf Course, then the Golf Course builds a driving range next to his house and golf balls keep entering his yard, missing but endangering his family, Does he have the right to ask a court for protection, or was it his fault since he “should have known a driving range might be built there”.??? IN MY OPINION of course not, the Golf Course would be considered a Bully, with no ethics.

8. IN MY OPINION, KSU has had ten years to arrange to move the airport and Flight School, but has not acted responsibly in those ten years and should not expect the Stow residents to bear the burdens of their inactions.

I just learned of the new Master Plan and renovation efforts at the KSU Airport.

I strongly suggest that this plan examine and then implement the planting of three large prairie grass islands, indicated on the attached document.

I am a prairie grass expert and design and help manage prairie grass plantings around the state. Please scrutinize the URL in the document, describing new prairie grass plantings at Dayton International Airport.

It would be most appropriate for the KSU Airport to begin to demonstrate the ecological sustainability of these innovative landscape elements. Please give me a call or an email, where I might discuss in much greater detail such a project, pro bono. It is suggested that approximately 86 acres of prairie grasses be planted in the turf periphery of the KSU Airport.

Installation of appropriate tall prairie grasses would have a number of beneficial outcomes:

- Reduced mowing costs.
- Reduced attraction of grazing Canada geese.
- Reduced water runoff.

Prairie grasses are being planted for these reasons at Dayton International Airport.

(<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/next/space/airport-prairies-make-flying-safer/>)

Kent State could be a leader in demonstrating the usefulness of low-maintenance peripheral prairie grasses at smaller general aviation airports.

A suggested design for three prairie grass islands at the airport are shown in Fig. 1.

Area A is approximately 28.9 acres, Area B approximately 5.4 acres, and Area C at approximately 52.5 acres; a total of approximately 86 acres.

A 10- to 20-ft mowed boarder would encircle each island at forest and fence line edges.

After establishment, mowing of the prairie islands would be once a year, in April or May, by a large rotary agricultural mower.

Just for the record, here is my opinion on KSU. I think expansion in this location is crazy. Suppose it'll take a plane landing in someone's family room to wake everyone up. My recommendation is that they move it onto the KSU campus. Be a good lesson in an institution taking actual responsibility for they're actions. Wonder how long support would last with planes flying over their homes, classrooms and business offices?

Ms. Warren,
Kent State is my alma mater, the cornerstone of a city that I have come to love, and a value to the community. However, as I write this letter, there are planes flying overhead at a rate of about one every two minutes. They grind their way – continually - over the bike trail near my house, the parks I hike in, the Cuyahoga River, local businesses, three schools and a number of senior citizens homes. Now a study is being conducted that could lead to increasing, or possibly doubling, the takeoffs and landings.
I know all of the arguments supporting this facility, the educational need, the business value, etc.. But the fact is that this facility pollutes with noise. It endangers. It interferes with the ability of many, many people to live in some semblance of peace. All the PR releases sent out in support of this program do not negate the fact that this program, and the people running it, make it impossible for many others to walk outside and get a breath of fresh air without the perpetual grinding of engines over their heads.
Is this truly what you want in the spirit of educational advancement and community service? Sure, the airport has been there for a long time, and people living here shouldn't complain about a little noise. But that is not what this is about. It's about expanding way beyond what is reasonable for the conditions.
As the leader of this University, I hope you do in fact listen. Come here and experience this noise for yourself on a nice day and consider what it's like to listen to this 40,000 times a year, with 100,000 takeoffs and landings planned on the horizon. Watch the airplanes fly over schools and consider the potential for unspeakable damage. And ask yourself whether it is fair and right for the University to wash their hands of what their doing to their neighbors under the banner of financial need and educational growth.
Please consider these facts as you work with the people making this decision. You noted on your web-page letter that you want Kent State to be more than an institution. There is nothing more "institutional" than an institution forcing their pollutants and danger on others, with nothing personal at stake. These planes aren't flying over your homes, your classes, or your offices.
Thanks for your consideration and good luck in guiding KSU.

Attached is 25 pages with 347 Signatures of people who want the Flight School moved. I am told that there were many more petitions signed, but not turned in. This does not include the many letters submitted asking for the Flight School to move. *NOTE: Signatures are based on 2004 Master Plan Alternative #7. Original submission was in March 2004 and is included in Master Plan Report Draft June 2004 - Revised November 2006, Public Response Appendix 3 Part 2.*

I am very upset and concerned to know that the airport in Stow, Ohio, Rt 59, might enlarge! I have been hoping for 18 years, when I moved here, that it would close. It starts with planes early and still flying after midnight. Recently I noticed how low they are to my sr. housing and go right over the Woodland School playground! They are students coming in for a landing. It seems like some days are training days and one plane after another is going over the area all day long! The field does not belong in this area. It is too residential and too many businesses to be safe for even more planes. Surely there is another place they can locate.

Move awos to the other side of runway or to another location so it does not limit hangar development.

There are concerns with the academic programs development of an unmanned aerial vehicle program, specifically drone aircraft flown by student pilots.

Need to consider operational changes; look at alternative flight patterns

Should go back to former flight pattern - "Racing Map"; less impact on residential uses

Concern over actual operation of the traffic pattern in comparison to previous commitments to modify operations to avoid impact to residence.

Development of commercial lots n either side of Runway 1, apartments in particular, is a concern.

Need to have more than two weeks notice for public meetings
Concern regarding growth in operations (forecast).
Holding bay at end of runway when runway length is reduced
Displace threshold instead of shortening runway.
Need to thinking about terminal/classroom building location relative to the existing hold bay.
Improved shoulders will be used as a deceptive technique to bring in larger aircraft.
We bought our house because we like aviation and the house is close to the airport
I am and many members of the Stow City Council are supportive of the Airport - it is a local institution.
The idea about upgrading the fence because of the wildlife that we see sometimes in the runway, taxiway and other. I personally almost hit a deer a couple of times. Also for security purposes. The other thing is the terminal, as with time there are more and more students attending the school, and the terminal seems very small and old which I guess it needs to renew. Which can be extended to maintenance building and move maintenance to behind the hangar. The AWOS system would really help students to get an accurate weather condition. Thanks a lot.
The shortening of the runway in plan 2B would cause more problems than it solves. The shortened runway would make it harder for aircraft to turn off at the taxiway, causing aircraft to go around, increasing disturbance to homes. It would also increase the chance of a runway overrun. Plans 4-A and 4-B do not take into consideration the costs and work associated with moving the flight school. There would have to be new facilities and runway rehabilitation at the new airport. The business jet aircraft would present an even higher risk and noise level to local residents. In all of the plans, the AWOS and the new classrooms are in only one location. I would consider moving the AWOS closer to the compass pad to prevent limited future development. The classroom, located just behind the run-up area, is a noise and safety hazard. Debris, such as rock, snow, or dirt could be thrown at students and faculty causing injury, and possibly breaking windows. I recommend looking at different locations to prevent safety risks. Also, the current student hangar does not fit all the current aircraft. With projected growth, a new, second hangar should be considered.
Placement of new terminal building isn't a good location. Run up area right in front will create noise when trying to learn. Also can blow snow and other debris into sidewalk. Plan 2-B or the #1 option at this point in time isn't well thought out. Shortening the runway is a bad idea to begin with. When shortening runway 1 the chances of an aircraft making the taxiway "C" are slim. This will result in more go-arounds and more noise. Also when the taxiway is chopped off the run-up area goes away. I think that option 2B is a terrible idea that isn't thought out well. Also the AWOS, to me, isn't in a good location. It can easily be moved down 200 or so feet. It will be better placement for both runways and better future expansion. It's hard to tell if in the drawings but if the hangar stays the same it will be a big issue. It's too small as it is and with more aircraft and more students it is ways too small.

All plans: (with growth)

- AWOS Location: limits growth due to no-build circle, should be moved to south towards compass calibration leaving more room for growth near parking/hangars.

-New terminal location: different locations for the new terminal or academic building should be considered. Placing the building at the bottom of a run-up area is a safety hazard (possible deflection of particles/FOD) and the noise would be counter-intuitive to academic learning

-Aircraft hangar: maintaining the current hangar would not be appropriate size. Currently all aircraft do not fit in the hangar overnight, combined with no/little fencing, anyone could wander out to the airplanes - a safety/security hazard.

-Alternative 2-B: The FAA would likely not approve shortening of a runway. This plan leaves no run-up area for the aircraft departing runway 1. Another issue of plan 2-B is aircraft would have a lot of trouble making the taxiway turn off midfield, likely leading to more go-arounds and noise over the houses of the residents off the south end of the runway 19.

-Alternatives 4A/4B: These options seem poor-sighted. Private/corporate jet aircraft can already serve the airport on a limited basis. Larger airports near by (AKR/CAK) can easily serve this aircraft.

-Overall: Incorporating AWOS, fencing, and new terminal/hangar structures are positive benefits of the airport, flight program, and the surrounding community/economy. Some short-sighted planning as noted above should be addressed to prevent future issues and ensure success.

Plan 2B is very short sighted. Shortening the runway would create more go-arounds and more noise related issues. The terminal in all plans should be moved away from the run up area near Runway 19 due to noise and debris that could cause safety hazards. Consider moving the proposed AWOS and the new terminals to better allow for new growth. Moving the flight school airport to Portage county should not be an option because Portage Airport is rundown and would require extra money. Keep runway 19 VASI repaired.

All but no: AWOS location. New terminal location. 2-b: no run up (compound no shorten = power on A. Hangar too small.

2-A is definitely best. Don't like 2-B however; it would make more sense to use a displace threshold than to remove pavement.

My favorite plan would have to be the Town Gown 2-A with the runway staying at 4,000. I really like the sustainability aspect of all the plans. A new facility would help draw in more customers as well as community members. The airport landside buildings are an eyesore currently and some are even falling apart. Adding a taxiway between RWY 1 and the taxiway at the portion between the compass rose and the main ramp area would be beneficial. Adding an observation area for community members would be beneficial as well. I always see people sitting in the grass with their lunch watching the aircraft, it would be nice to have a safe place for people to sit and visit. I do not believe that moving flight training off KSU airport will benefit anyone.

I am supporting 2B. I do NOT want the flight school to move to Portage or anywhere else. We live at the 18th tee box of Roses Run. We love the planes, they come right over our condo. We are so impressed with Kent now offering "Intro" to flight at the high school. We personally know a student that loves his class. We would be just sick if the flight school moves -- we would lose our home. I would love to see a building available to the community for use: e.g., special meetings (scouts), etc. Keep up the good fight Kent State. You have worked so hard to produce a wonderful program.

I liked 3B because it would allow more revenue for the airport while still accommodating the students.

I think the balance beam (3-B) plan would benefit the community as well as the university greatly. Kent students take pride in saying they have an airport that's part of KSU, so taking the flight school totally out of the picture will greatly impact students' interest in the aero program.

First choice 3-B. The university should be utilizing the airport to not only support aeronautic, but should also market the airport to support other university programs. Fashion school: (3rd in nation, only one outside of NYC) how often do name brand designers travel to Kent? If they do not, they should. School of Technology: HP, Google, Yahoo, Microsoft maintain entire fleets of corporate jets. They maintain these jets to investigate new markets. Hotel/Hospitality management: a restaurant located at the airport, but accessible to the general public from Kent Road.

Balance Beam plan is a great idea to help generate revenue and landing fees. Maybe creating a food truck or something small to be stationed there is a great idea, allowing students, instructors, and GA pilots who are landing to grab a bite to eat. Having an FBO and fuel service is also attractive to pilots, helping the airport become self-sustaining. Walking trails and picnic areas can also engage the community, allowing them to see the greatness that is aviation everyday.

<p>I liked town gown, I just think the airport building needs to be expanded and I liked what one man said to me that the building would be more visible from the road, showing the words "Kent State Aeronautics Flight School".</p>
<p>Balance Beam is my preferred plan because it has the most positive actions. Bringing a food truck to the airport or having a restaurant located on the airport will attract more GA. Separating the flying club portion and flight school will minimize congestion on the airport while still holding the aviation community centrally located at 1G3.</p>
<p>We live right over the flight pattern and have no problem with the airport in its current mode of operation. After reviewing the 4 alternatives, I personally agree with option 2-B. Soar alternative should have been named "crash". The general public should be made aware that since it is a public airport, it must accept traffic 24/7. While that does not happen that much, they should know that KSU cannot control that.</p>
<p>I see various benefits to 3-A, balance beam with integrated GA and flight training, although I see more strategic benefit with the town gown option, with the majority of the marketing going towards flight training as opposed to a split between the two. I'm curious what about our airport or location appeals to GA pilots, or what would "draw them in" per se. I see surrounding infrastructure as something that would need to be marketed to bring in GA pilots, i.e., bringing in tourist destinations or the like. Meanwhile, the flight program has an established presence and, due to its accreditation and opportunities, a larger source of revenue over GA. I see community engagement as very important, and if we can increase people's interest in aviation, we can continue to bring in more flight students, instructors, and GA pilots in the long run. Adding community-based infrastructure to the airport, such as walking trails could greatly assist in bringing "outsiders" closer to aviation and the aviation community. Honestly, children can be fascinated by airplanes at a young age, and anything to bring families and communities to the airport I see as beneficial.</p>
<p>Alternative plan 3A- Moving the terminal closer to the road wouldn't be the most beautiful due to the fact the location of the terminal would be placed directly behind the aircraft run-up area. God forbid FOD flies back and damages the building. Another suggestion that I have is for the AWOS; you should make a clearing of the trees and move the AWOS over to give the airport and GA building more room to work with instead of being so restricted to a small area.</p>
<p>Add a taxiway between the middle taxiway and the north exits because currently when Rwy 1 is in use, pilots usually stop halfway down the runway. This forces pilots to taxi the remainder of the runway, which at Kent -- with multiple aircraft in the pattern -- means that if a plane is still on the runway an approaching aircraft must go around. This means more noise pollution and congestion.</p>
<p>Create a living museum- still operating the airport and to preserve history. Open & engaging for public/community, old & new. Heritage day would be a natural extension of every other day.</p>
<p>Kent State's president and its Board of Trustees said flight training would be relocated. The university needs to keep its promise. What ever happened to honesty and integrity in our public institutions?</p>
<p>Move the flight training out of Stow.</p>
<p>After speaking with several of the disgruntled community members, it has become apparent that many of the people are misinformed. I briefly described many of our noise abatement procedures and they were not aware of many of the things we do. Many people were relieved when they spoke with students and realize that we are doing everything we can to keep them in mind. Also, all the pictures in the fact sheets labeled "Cessna 172" are actually Piper Seminoles. This is misleading as the Seminole is the largest aircraft we operate.</p>
<p>In my opinion doubling student number is not good idea because of some reasons. First, noise concerns. People who live around want to be happy. Second, they have to be very prepared to get that 600 students and have the ability to train them and find more instructors for them.</p>
<p>I disliked both options for alternative 4. This option was not beneficial for the student body. This airport has operated for educational purposes for so long that it would be detrimental to the aviation program to change it.</p>

I believe that it would be a great idea to invest in a public viewing area for the airport. This open air area could be a free open invitation for the public to watch planes and get their kids interested in aviation -- and for one day, have them attend the Kent flight program. In addition, this open air viewing area could host educational programs for Kent and area schools . Ultimately, it would be a little investment that could have a large positive feedback for the airport program and Kent State.

Alternative 2-B suggests the shortening of the runway. The advantage to this is to shorten the amount of runway protection zone. While this may be better for the community, with current runway and protection zone, we are only still dealing with the same amount of space. There is no benefit in shortening the runway.

I believe it would be in best interest for the runway to be extended or add another somehow. For the amount of students that they plan to double, there is simply no way one runway could be enough for 1200 students. The pattern gets congested as it is during flight periods. I also believe the airport should not be owned by the university due to different charges charged. Students could save much more money if the airport was not part of the university being it is \$10,000 just for a private license and at Akron-Canton or Burke lakefront it is only \$4,000.

A crosswind rwy would add the choice for pilots who are flying small aircrafts. And there's enough space for a crosswind rwy. Suggest the airport facilities to be moved to the center of the field beside RWY 01-19 for fuel conservation. Get a fuel truck to fuel aircrafts while they're parked.

I would like the airport to stay. Deer breed in the woods and eat in the fields. I have lived in the house on Kauffman for 58 years. There is a piece of land at the top of Kauffman Rd. about 600 ft. to 1st house on east side of road. I would like houses to be built to go with the rest of the area.

Thank you for presenting the airport master plan in this manner. I for one enjoy the airport. I am glad that you are providing this program to the students. Please build new hangers or permanent buildings for the students. If you want to extend the runway. I believe the best option is to extend to the north. Thank you for your time.

I am a supporter of this airport. It should not be closed or reduced in services. I personally think growth and bigger airplanes are ok because it will benefit business in the community.

The flight program at Kent State is only going to grow. The facilities to support the program must grow with it to ensure quality flight training. It will be supportive not only to Kent but to the community as well.