



**LAKE ELMO AIRPORT FEDERAL EA / STATE EAW**

# Community Engagement Panel

## Meeting #4 Minutes

Baytown Community Center

October 19, 2017

6:00 P.M.

### **Panel Attendees**

John Renwick  
Marlon Gunderson  
Mary Vierling  
Dave Schultz  
Kent Grandlienard  
Stephen Buckingham  
Keith Bergmann  
Ann Pung-Terwedo  
Chad Leque  
Neil Ralston  
Michael Madigan

### **Other Attendees**

Dana Nelson  
Joe Harris  
Gary Schmidt  
Patrick Hogan  
Brad Juffer  
Evan Barrett  
Colleen Bosold  
Todd Streeter

### **Public Observers**

Laura Kaschmitter  
Mick Kaschmitter  
Tom Vierling  
Pat Schultz  
Molly Olson

### **Representing**

Airport Tenant/User  
Airport Tenant/User and City of Lake Elmo Resident  
West Lakeland Township Resident  
West Lakeland Township Supervisor  
Baytown Township Supervisor  
Baytown Township Resident  
City of Lake Elmo Resident  
Washington County Public Works Planner  
Metropolitan Airports Commission Director of Environment  
Metropolitan Airports Commission Airport Planner  
MAC Commissioner District F

### **Representing**

Metropolitan Airports Commission  
Mead & Hunt  
Mead & Hunt  
Community Collaboration

### **Resident of**

West Lakeland Township  
West Lakeland Township  
West Lakeland Township  
West Lakeland Township  
West Lakeland Township

# Meeting Minutes

## **Absent Panel Members**

Emily Becker  
Robin Anthony

## **Representing**

City of Lake Elmo Planning Director  
Greater Stillwater Chamber of Commerce

*The attached report represents this writer's interpretation of items discussed during the meeting. Any corrections or additional information should be brought to our attention for clarification.*

## **The purpose of the meeting was to:**

- Conduct a debrief of the August 17<sup>th</sup> public event and get the Community Engagement Panel's (CEP's) feedback on what went well and what could be improved for future public events.
- Present the preliminary results of the environmental effects of the proposed development (preferred alternative) and get feedback from the CEP on the material presented to incorporate into the presentation for the upcoming November 6 public event.
- Continue to equip CEP members to be the point of contact for information sharing, both to and from the community and MAC, and to respond to inquiries from their constituent groups.

## **The presentation was as follows:**

A copy of this presentation can be found at: [metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Lake-Elmo-Environmental-Assessment/21D-CEP-Meeting-Presentation-Slides-10-19-2017.aspx](http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Lake-Elmo-Environmental-Assessment/21D-CEP-Meeting-Presentation-Slides-10-19-2017.aspx)

Dana Nelson, MAC Environment Department, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking Kent Grandlienard for allowing the group to use the Baytown Community Center for the CEP meeting. She then reviewed the agenda, saying that she would debrief the second public event, then turn it over to Evan Barrett, Mead & Hunt (MAC's consultant) Project Manager for the project, who would talk about the environmental effects overview. Evan noted that the team has set up the CEP meetings in a linear fashion to mirror the structure of the environmental review process, and walked through the topics covered so far (February – introduction to NEPA process; May – Purpose & Need and justification for the project; August – Alternatives). He stressed that tonight's meeting is focused on the environmental effects of the preferred alternative and the results of the analysis completed over the past several months. Dana then continued with the agenda overview, stating the project's next steps would be discussed next, followed by the Panel discussion and ending with the 10-minute public comment period.

Dana stated about 60 people showed up for the first public event and about 42 for the second. Community members from West Lakeland Township, Baytown Township and Lake Elmo comprised most of the attendees, with others coming from Stillwater, St. Paul, Pine Springs and other communities around the metro area. She noted that 18 written comments were received at the first public event, and only one at the second event. During the first public event, 37 people signed up for the project update email subscription list, with 17 additional signing up during the second event. She said that indicated there were likely new people at the second event that hadn't been at the first.

Dana showed a slide recapping the agenda for the August 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. She then talked about some of the new things tried at the second public event and asked the CEP for feedback on how they worked, noting input was desired as the team prepares for the next public event on November 6 at Oak-Land Middle School. The items mentioned were: new venue – Oak-Land Middle School; hard copy agendas and presentation slides – Dana had heard at the meeting that was helpful for people in following along; "Top Concerns" board to facilitate some feedback at the onset of the meeting to bring into the large group discussion and address the primary concern of attendees at that meeting; scrolling FAQ slide

## Meeting Minutes

about the project for the people that entered the auditorium early; facilitated presentation and Q&A; one-on-one engagement session/open house following group Q&A. Dana thanked all the CEP members who attended and helped out at the public event. She then asked for feedback as well as any tools or materials the CEP would like to see from the MAC to help with information-sharing with constituents, neighbors and community members.

Dana asked if the group liked the venue. The general consensus was favorable.

Mary Vierling asked if the format and presentation for the third event would be the same as the second. Dana said that was the plan. The doors will open at 6:00 with a presentation at 6:30. She said the Top Concerns board was not planned for the third event, but noted the plans haven't been finalized so nothing is set in stone, and reminded the CEP that was part of the purpose of these meetings, so the group can talk about how the previous public event went and what could be done to improve it. As there are still several weeks before the next one, she stated that things can still be adjusted.

Evan asked if the group thought the segmented format of the meeting was effective, noting that was the team's attempt to respond to previous comments from the CEP for having different opportunities for interaction. Ann Pung-Terwedo asked if they had a lot of people stick around for the one-on-one engagement session after the meeting. Evan responded that a lot of people stayed and asked questions. Ann confirmed that people got their questions answered? Evan said yes. Dana added that she knew at least one person arrived late and so they were able to talk with the project team to catch up on what they missed during that one-on-one time. John Renwick asked if the team learned anything at the one-on-ones? Evan replied that he had learned more about the concerns the community has and where they're coming from. He couldn't recall specifics but thought it was worthwhile to hear what people had to say and what questions they had. John said he was just wondering if any lightbulbs came on for anybody. Chad Leqve recalled that a lot of the questions went back to the justification and efficacy of the project. Stephen Buckingham noted that's nothing new and said we've been saying that for two years. Chad responded that he was just noting it was still part of the dialogue. To that point, Chad asked the CEP if they felt there was information that could be shared from discussions in the CEP meetings or things the project team could be doing differently to help better improve the public's understanding of the answer to that question. Stephen said don't ask me to help give more understanding because I don't know the answer to that question; I still don't think it's justified.

Chad noted one of the primary goals is to make sure the MAC is being transparent in these discussions, and is respecting people's positions, understanding they might not be able to change those positions, but are being as transparent and clear as can be in their communications. Chad mentioned the project team has had several individual meetings and discussions with some of the nearby property owners, including those who may be most impacted by some of the 30<sup>th</sup> Street realignment alternatives, as well as with Molly Olson [West Lakeland Township resident]. He said those have been helpful, and noted Molly brought up a good point about listening and making sure people are feeling heard and that they're being listened to. Chad reported this was a key takeaway for him from the meeting and expressed interest in any feedback in this area from the CEP.

Dana wrapped up the debrief discussion and invited the CEP to share any additional feedback they think of at any time with her via email or phone. She then turned the presentation over to Evan for the overview of environmental effects.

## Meeting Minutes

Evan then reminded the group of the funnel graphic depicting the alternatives evaluation process shown at the last CEP meeting and public meeting and recapped how the team arrived at a preferred alternative. He reminded the group of the no-action alternative (if the MAC were to maintain the current airfield configuration, with no upgrades, changes or expansion), which was located outside of the funnel as it does not meet the project's Purpose & Need.

Stephen Buckingham asked why the CEP was never given an opportunity to comment on the Purpose & Need in the first place. Evan replied that was the topic of the second CEP meeting in May. Stephen said no, you told us the Purpose & Need at that time; we were not given the chance to have input into that. Evan replied the project team will have a draft environmental document in early 2018 and there will be a public review and comment period, a public hearing, and another CEP meeting after that has been released. Stephen said, no, Evan, you've based this entire evaluation on the basis of the Purpose & Need, but the Purpose & Need were established before this group was ever put together and we never had a chance to comment on whether we felt that Purpose & Need were appropriate. Chad Leque stated that this group had a discussion about the Purpose & Need during the May CEP meeting. Kent Grandlienard said the discussions on the Purpose & Need started over two years ago. Dave Schultz said the Purpose & Need wasn't clarified or classified as such two years ago. Kent said, but we discussed the cost effectiveness and the money being spent. Stephen said, Evan has put out a set of purposes and needs and has said that any plan they come up with has to satisfy these purposes and needs and those have pretty well defined what has to be the result. Stephen further said that perhaps if we'd had community input into it, there might have been some other purposes and needs that would have been included. Kent said that we [Baytown] had input but there wasn't much response from the community. He reported that Baytown got one comment between five board members over a one-to-two-year period [noting that the one comment was from Stephen Buckingham's wife] and two comments in favor of it. He said Baytown didn't get much public comment, but West Lakeland did, and we had a meeting with the governor. Kent didn't know what more there was to say on the topic as he felt that there was opportunity for public comment. Stephen said he was talking about something different. You're talking about a generalized what should we be doing, but when we came into the first meeting of this panel, Evan presented a set of purposes and needs and said whatever we do has to satisfy these, and that was the first time we'd ever seen a specific list of criteria, and we had no opportunity to have input into what should be on that list of purposes and needs. Chad reassured Stephen that during the CEP meeting, when the Purpose & Need was discussed, if there would have been somebody that said we need to talk about these more, we need to have a discussion, the team and CEP would have had that discussion. Stephen asked, but did you suggest that we could do that? It was presented as though it was a done deal. Chad disagreed that was the case. Stephen reported that was the impression that he got at that CEP meeting. Dave added that his recollection was that it was a 2-hour meeting, and the project team took about 1/4 of it, leaving about 15 minutes at the end for discussion. He thought what would help is if the no action alternative was included in the Purpose & Need – to maintain the existing footprint as it is today.

Evan Barrett then noted that the MAC had a LTCP process where a lot of these same issues were discussed, and there was a generalized project that came out of that process – the preferred alternative – based on analysis of what the needs are at the airport. Dave Schultz said if you go back to 1966, your need back then was two parallel runways with two crosswind runways; if you'd done that back in 1966 we'd be sitting here today talking about right-sizing this airport and removing two runways, like you're doing at Crystal. Stephen Buckingham said you keep talking about the needs for the airport and you say

## Meeting Minutes

you're taking into consideration the needs of the surrounding community but we don't hear anything about that. Evan said the presentation planned for tonight, which is on the environmental effects, is intended to provide transparency in terms of what this project means for this community, what it means for the resources in this community, for the environment and the community itself. That's what this process is all about. We've designed the stakeholder engagement process so we're talking to the community and providing information about what the effects of the project are, and that's what we're here for tonight. The foundation of the environmental assessment is the Purpose & Need, which grows out of the planning process. The planning process determines what those needs are, we took a fresh look at those needs that the MAC had identified and didn't find anything that was fundamentally changed or should be reconsidered, because the needs were based on real data and real facts. Stephen replied, no, they were based on some data, perhaps some facts, some opinions, but again, it's only taking into account aviation considerations; it's not taking into account the surrounding community. Chad Leque said, but that's part of what this process is intended to do. Stephen said, but the facility is part of the community. Chad said the environmental review process is structured to meet federal requirements to make sure that the MAC does a couple of different things through the decision process as to what the final action might be. The first is the Purpose & Need – why are we even contemplating changes to this facility? It's to provide safe, efficient and effective aviation facilities for the people that use it, which we've spelled out in the Purpose & Need. Then you look at all the different alternatives and options that we might be able to implement to meet that Purpose & Need. As we evaluate those, we have to look at all the environmental categories that Evan's going to talk about tonight and see if there are areas that meet a level of significance in terms of impact such that they need to be mitigated – either as a component of the project or as other actions. If there is, is there a way to meet that Purpose & Need without creating that impact in the first place. If you can't, and the impact is still there, and it's to a level of significance, then you have to mitigate it. That's what this process is intended to determine. One of the concerns early on was increased travel time on 30<sup>th</sup> Street. As we go through this process, clarity of issue is so important. Otherwise it's like bad information in equals bad product out. Really honing in on the issues from the community is imperative to make sure that community discussions are as productive as they can be. We go back to the travel time issue on 30<sup>th</sup> St. That was held up as a big concern, and that's why we did the extra work we did, had Evan's team look at if there were any alternatives that moved the needle in the right direction with travel time. We went through the exercise, and at the end of the day decided that the spot we're at is where we're going to stay. The other issue that came up last night with Molly Olson was noise. We're hearing that as a big concern for the community. As we go through this process, we will learn tonight from Evan what the noise impacts are based on the federal criteria and what we have in our toolbox that can help us address it. Realizing that, as an airport, we are heavily regulated, and the way we can use our funds is heavily regulated, sometimes can create a difficult dynamic, but it doesn't mean that there aren't things we shouldn't be doing to reduce that impact. We have a commitment to do that. Clarity of what the real issues are as we have this dialogue is so valuable so that we can do the best job we can to address them as best we can.

Stephen Buckingham said, I'll reiterate my point, and that is if you look at the Purpose & Need everything in there is oriented toward aviation, not to the surrounding community. There are a lot more people in the surrounding community than there are aviators using that airport. There are a lot more automobiles travelling on 30<sup>th</sup> Street every day, than there are aviation operations at the airport. And yet, there was no consideration of anything but the aviation considerations. I think one of the needs should have been no rerouting of 30<sup>th</sup> Street. But that was not considered. Evan Barrett explained that one of the criteria was that there had to be a viable 30<sup>th</sup> Street realignment alternative that minimizes

## Meeting Minutes

environmental impact – that criteria was considered. Stephen further stated, you didn't give us a chance to have input into that. Stephen then asked Evan what he considered his job in this to be, asking, is your job to do an independent environmental study to see what is best for the community or is it to justify what it is that Chad and Neil want to do? Evan replied that his job is to comply with federal and state regulations in terms of an environmental review of a project that the MAC has proposed, and to help them do it in a way that considers community input, and ultimately results in an environmental document that's based on fact, solid reasoning and a full consideration in the spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act. My intention here tonight is to present all the information we've collected on the environment that the airport exists within. We understand the airport exists within a complex community – West Lakeland Township, Baytown Township, and the City of Lake Elmo – but also in terms of the environmental resources. Stephen replied that from his perspective, it appears Evan considers his job to be to justify what it is the MAC has proposed doing.

Chad Leque asked Stephen what he would like us to do at this point. Stephen replied that personally he'd like to stop and go back to square one and let us have input into what the Purpose & Need for this airport redesign are. Mary Vierling said the Purpose & Need were never mentioned in the LTCP. Evan explained that in the LTCP process, it's referred to as Facility Requirements. There's a different set of terminology used in the planning process versus the NEPA process, but in a lot of ways it's the same thing. The Purpose & Need provides the basis for what comes out of the forecasts in the LTCP, interviews with people who operate at the airport. A lot of the product of the planning process was distilled into the Purpose & Need statement, but there wasn't a lot of new information there that hadn't already been made public. Neil Ralston said you'd find very close alignment between the goals and objectives that were set out to address in the LTCP and the Purpose & Need that was built for the environmental process.

Evan thanked Stephen for his comments and reminded the group that any public comments received during the comment period would be included in and responded to in the final environmental document. In the interest of time, he then proceeded with the presentation on the environmental effects. Neil added that he understands that the preferred alternative for many of the community members is to repave the runway as-is with no expansion, but pointed out the original concept of the plan was the original alternative with a 3,600-foot runway and a different realignment of 30<sup>th</sup> Street N. that we heard was particularly unpopular and of concern. We did adjust the plan based on community input. I understand it's not to the full extent of what some of the community wanted, but we tried to find closer to some middle ground on how do we address some of the biggest community concerns while still doing what we believe is in the best interest of the aviation facility that we are tasked to ensure its future prosperity. He said he understands we didn't go nearly as far as some would like, but struggles with the statement that there has been no community input.

Evan discussed the method for determining environmental effects. The project team uses the no-action alternative as the baseline for comparison with the preferred alternative – the difference between the two are the resulting environmental effects. He reminded the group that the no-action alternative does not meet the Purpose & Need identified as part of this environmental assessment but is still being considered throughout the document. He explained that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is an umbrella that requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions. There are several special purpose laws under the NEPA umbrella, such as the Clean Air Act or the National Historic Preservation Act. The FAA identifies significance thresholds and factors for the different NEPA categories to help determine if an effect (or impact) is considered significant.

## Meeting Minutes

Evan then went over the NEPA categories that were evaluated, how each was evaluated and the results of each area:

- Air Quality – minimal impacts during construction, but neither operational nor construction emissions would exceed the FAA thresholds
- Biological Resources –
  - Approximately 20 acres of on-airport trees will likely need to be removed to clear airspace surfaces associated with the new runway (unlikely FAA will determine this to be a significant impact).
  - Project team identified two federally-listed species (northern long-eared bat, a threatened species, and rusty patched bumblebee, an endangered species); northern long-eared bat may be present in the tree removal areas, so impacts will be avoided and minimized using US Fish & Wildlife/USDOT-recommended measures; the rusty patched bumblebee has documented habitat within 2 ½ miles of the airport, however there is no suitable habitat for this bee in the project impact area.
  - Project team identified a state-listed threatened species (Blanding’s turtle) that may be present in both wetland and upland areas, so impacts will be avoided and minimized using MnDNR-recommended measures.
  - With the avoidance and minimization efforts, there are no significant impacts per NEPA guidelines in this category.
- Cultural Resources –
  - Architectural history – Project team identified 13 historic age (50+ years) properties, but 12 were determined not to meet criteria of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The railroad corridor may be eligible for the NRHP but is not affected by the project.
  - Archaeology – Project team identified two sites that may be eligible for NRHP, but they are not affected by the project. The FAA is also conducting nation-to-nation consultation with Native American Tribes as required for NEPA actions under federal law.
  - The FAA makes a determination of the effect based on these findings and sends it to the State Historic Preservation Office for concurrence. We anticipate they will make a determination of “no historic resources affected” in this category.
- Farmlands – approximately 43 acres of farmland would be converted permanently to aeronautical use; project team is consulting with US Department of Agriculture to determine significance of effects.
- Hazardous Materials & Solid Waste – project team identified 17 known hazardous materials sites within one mile of the Airport (on and surrounding), but none will be affected by the project. Groundwater contamination plume would not be affected due to water table depth.
- Land Use –
  - Residential – there will be minor changes to visual flight rules traffic pattern area (where aircraft circle when landing under visual flight rules conditions – this area extends about 1.2 miles off the end of each runway in all directions), but in terms of overall flight patterns over the area, there’s not a lot of difference. With the proposed development, there would be five houses in the current State Model Safety Zone A (typically prevents new structures), and 20 houses in the State’s Model Safety Zone B (typically imposes density restrictions, i.e., prohibiting small lot, high-density development or large

- congregations of people). However, the MAC will convene a Joint Airport Zoning Board (JAZB) in the near future consistent with Minnesota Statutes. What comes out of that process is unknown at this time, but the zones could look different than the State's model safety zones.
- Ground Transportation – design of realigned 30<sup>th</sup> Street N. can accommodate forecasted traffic volume and type; travel time will increase an average of 46 seconds in either direction; FAA will need to approve new road right-of-way because the road is on airport property.
  - Wildlife Attractants – no new wildlife attractants created by project; tree removal and agricultural lease reductions are expected to reduce wildlife attractants on the airport.
  - Ann Pung-Terwedo asked if it would be appropriate to talk about the Manning Avenue expansion in relationship to this expansion, that this project won't have any impact on the expansion of Manning Avenue? Evan replied that he would discuss this when he gets to the Cumulative Impacts slide, as the team is aware that the Manning Avenue expansion is planned for the reasonably foreseeable future.
- Noise – The threshold for significance of noise is a 65-decibel day night average sound level (DNL). The 65 DNL contour is entirely contained on airport property for both the 2025 no-action and preferred alternatives. This is based on detailed modeling of specific aircraft types, specific runway use percentages, day-night splits, a lot of different assumptions and analysis that go into developing these contours that are based on flight tracking data the MAC maintains and supplemented by our own observations. Because the 65 DNL is entirely on airport property, there is no significant impact that needs to be mitigated in terms of aircraft noise associated with the project.
  - Visual Effects – there will be lighting systems relocated and new lighting systems installed as part of the project. Evan showed and explained the three different types of lighting systems used on the airfield. Some of the lighting systems will move closer to the residential areas; however, lighting systems will only be fully operational (on and at full brightness) when activated by pilots. John Renwick stated some of these lighting systems are already on the runway today. Evan confirmed yes, on one or two of the runway ends (depending on the system in question), but the project is evaluating adding them to all four runway ends. He mentioned that the runway edge lighting is always on but set to low intensity and pilots can remotely activate those to be brighter when they need them. Keith Bergmann mentioned they are only on at night. Evan confirmed that was correct. The project will relocate and extend primary runway lighting systems, and will add these systems to the crosswind runway, which is currently unlit. Light screening benefits of trees along Neal Ave. are being evaluated. John Renwick said the runway edge lights are on all the time and asked if that was going to change. Evan responded that the facility directory lists them as set to low-intensity. Joe Harris confirmed the runway edge lights are on all the time at low-intensity. John stated there is currently no lighting on the crosswind runway and asked if it was really needed, then commented that he hesitates to ask the question. Evan replied that because that runway does not have any GPS approaches, at least runway edge lighting would be needed to get GPS approaches for the runway. To get the best possible approach procedures, the full lighting systems are typically needed for a full non-precision instrument runway (today it's a visual runway). John joked that there's one advantage to not having runway lights, as he's heard from flight instructors doing tailwheel training: they use the crosswind runway because the student isn't going to take out a runway light. Neil added

that another benefit to having a lit crosswind runway is that it can be used at night to balance out nighttime operations better, so that the ideal runway for any given wind and weather conditions can be used. Stephen Buckingham asked how many nighttime operations are there? Evan responded the team has estimated about 4 percent of operations are nighttime. There are also about 10 percent that take place during instrument flight rules conditions – when it's really foggy or low ceilings where sometimes those lights would be keyed on because pilots need them to land. We've estimated about 15 percent of operations actually need the lights. The other 85 percent are flying in when it's clear sky and they don't need lights at all. Commissioner Madigan asked if the lights have been an issue for the neighbors? Have they been intrusive? Mary Vierling answered the strobes sometimes are intrusive. Dana asked whether Mary meant the airport beacon light (the white and green) or the strobes? Mary and Dave Schultz said the strobes. Dave clarified the white lights – the runway end identifier lights (REILs). Dave then asked if there could be an issue with the lights along Manning Ave. with triggering epileptic seizures with flashing lights and asked if there have been any studies done on that? Evan responded that was a good point but he didn't know the answer to that question. Mary added that she has astigmatism and noted if she's coming down Manning Ave. and if those strobes are on, she has to shield her peripheral view while driving. Dave noted it's worse if you're on 30<sup>th</sup> Street. Mary added they shoot right across the fields on 30<sup>th</sup> right into the homes. Commissioner Madigan asked if it was possible to screen that at all. Evan responded that's what the team is exploring. Some of the trees identified for removal because they penetrate the airspace surfaces at the end of the runway, we are exploring to see if those trees could be left. The team is also looking at potential other mitigation efforts. Keith Bergmann asked whether the PAPIs and REILs are visible at ground level since they are angled up and aimed into the approach. Joe Harris said they are visible at ground level, but there are tolerance limits that affect where they might be seen from. Evan responded there are certain areas they're aimed at but the light envelope is sufficiently large so you can see it on the ground. Same with the PAPIs – they're aimed up but they're not flashing like the REILs and typically aren't as much of an issue. Ann Pung-Terwedo asked if the MAC could incorporate some berming or something with the topography to help shield the light effects? Evan responded, potentially. Neil Ralston said he'd be interested to see if there are some shielding options for REILs. He said he doesn't know the answer to that but he'd be surprised if that issue hasn't come up somewhere else before and wonders if someone else has found a better way to mitigate that. Evan offered there are fencing options too, depending on if the MAC could put a fence along 30<sup>th</sup> Street that isn't an airspace issue, there might be a certain type of fence that also shields the light.

- Water Resources
  - Wetlands – from a regulatory perspective, wetlands are the primary impact associated with the project. About two acres of wetlands will be filled and those will need to be replaced elsewhere at a ratio of 2:1. Coordination is ongoing with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Valley Branch Watershed District and other regulatory agencies for concurrence with boundary determination and jurisdictional determination. Expecting U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to take jurisdiction.
  - Surface Water – net increase of 550,000 square feet of impervious surface, meaning a lot more stormwater coming off the pavements and not infiltrating right where it lands. Structural controls and best management practices will be implemented to meet permit requirements from FAA, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and Valley Branch

Watershed District. No anticipated significant impacts anticipated in this category that can't be mitigated.

- Cumulative Impacts – looks at things that have happened to date in the vicinity of the airport, things that are happening on and around the airport right now, and reasonably foreseeable development on and around the airport. When you add those all up with the proposed project, what is that incremental impact? That's what the cumulative impacts are. 1,720 parcels developed since 1964 within two miles of project. Continued urban development expected, along with Manning Ave. expansion from two to four lanes. Because wetlands are the primary impact from a regulatory standpoint associated with the project, the wetland impacts of the project will be compared with wetland impacts and permitted actions associated with past and reasonably foreseeable activity. This category is still being analyzed.
- Other NEPA Categories
  - Climate – limited potential for the preferred alternative to affect future climate conditions. There are some greenhouse gas emissions associated with this project but the Climate category does not have a hard significance threshold, so project team didn't do detailed greenhouse gas emissions analysis further than what was covered in the Air Quality category.
  - Coastal Resources – none present
  - DOT Section 4(f) – this category includes public recreational or cultural resources the DOT has considered to be significant, such as parks, wildlife refuges and historic sites, but none of these resources are present on or adjacent to the airport.
  - Natural Resources and Energy Supply – this category evaluates if there are adequate resources locally to construct and operate the project, such as fill material, asphalt, energy required to move airplanes and construction vehicles, etc. Demand won't exceed supply so there won't be an issue in terms of natural resources.
  - Socioeconomics – no expected shifts in population, public service demands or economic activity; no low-income or minority populations in the area adjacent to the airport; no potential disproportionate health or safety risks to children.
  - These five categories will be discussed in the document but there was no detailed analysis completed for them.

Evan then directed the CEP to the table in the back of the slideshow handout summarizing the environmental effects. The items in green are the categories for which the project team has definitively identified the effects/impacts AND any required permitting, mitigation and/or associated actions. He said that, going forward, the discussion will focus in on the items in white, as the analysis for those categories wraps up and it becomes clear what those impacts and associated actions will be.

Evan wrapped up the presentation with next steps:

- Public Event on November 6 – the presentation material will be similar to what was presented tonight
- Next two CEP meetings were planned for November and January, but based on the amount of material the team has to cover, they don't believe there's a need for two more meetings prior to the draft environmental document being published, so Evan proposed cancelling the November meeting and holding the next meeting in January. The CEP then compared schedules and settled on January 16<sup>th</sup> for their next meeting.

## Meeting Minutes

- Early 2018 – publish draft EA/EAW for public review and comment

Dave Schultz asked what the timing is between publishing the draft EA/EAW and the public comment period close date. Evan said best practices are usually to put the draft document out for about 45 days, then have the public hearing about 30-days into the comment period, and have another 15 or so days for public comment.

Evan then opened up the meeting for CEP discussion.

### **The CEP discussion occurred as follows:**

Kent Grandlienard said he thought a JAZB already existed. He was on one 10+ years ago with a gentleman named John [from West Lakeland Township Board] and someone from Lake Elmo that met at the Lake Elmo City Hall. Neil verified that he was referring to a Joint Airport Zoning Board and Kent confirmed that's what it was. Neil said this was news to him but he would look into it. Kent said it was when Bridget [Rief, MAC staff] was in charge of that aspect. Kent said they put together a formal board. Ann Pung-Terwedo didn't recall formal establishment of the board or an official joint-powers agreement. Kent said they met for over two years, and thought Ann or one of her colleagues from Washington County was also involved. Ann said she didn't think it was a formal joint-powers board, but a more informal, regional board. Kent said he thought it was a formal board. Neil said he would check in with Bridget Rief to find out more. Neil said whether it's reconvening an existing JAZB or creating a new one, it will be a board with community representation as outlined in state statutes to develop a safety and land use zoning ordinance. Neil said he would go back and see if he could find any documentation. Kent said a lot of the same items were being discussed at the time, including the runway expansion, although a longer runway was being considered at that time, and although it was not the primary focus there was discussion of diverting some commercial and/or corporate traffic from MSP and St. Paul Downtown to some of the smaller relievers.

Ann Pung-Terwedo said regarding cultural resources, the County has historic resource policies in the context of the current Comprehensive Plan 2030 and offered to share them with Evan and the project team. Evan thanked her and invited anyone aware of any other local regulations that it doesn't appear the team has considered, to please let him know, so they can cover all the bases.

Kent said they were told by their attorney, Dave Magnuson, that when this process began a couple years ago that it didn't require formal town board approval from West Lakeland to do any of this, but that township approval would be required to abandon a segment of the road. He suggested the team might want to look into that. He said part of 30<sup>th</sup> has to be vacated. Neil clarified it's a prescriptive easement that has to be vacated. Kent said they were told that had to have town board approval. Evan asked if he said town board approval was required by both townships? Kent believed so, because they share the road right down the middle. Kent suggested the team look into what was required. Neil believed there have been discussions between the MAC's attorney and the township's attorney but he didn't know the exact details, but knows it was regarding vacating a prescriptive easement, as there's no right-of-way established for 30<sup>th</sup> Street.

Dave Schultz noted there was an article a few months back in the Minneapolis paper about Airlake and Lakeville that MAC would like Lakeville to annex the entire airport so they can provide sewer and water.

## Meeting Minutes

In talking with the township supervisor down there for the township, his impression was there were behind-the-scenes discussions going on between the MAC and Lakeville. Dave asked whether those same types of discussions going on out here with Lake Elmo regarding annexation of the airport out of the township and into Lake Elmo. Gary Schmidt [MAC Director of Reliever Airports] stated there were no behind-the-scenes discussion between the MAC and the City of Lakeville trying to work out a deal. He explained what happened was the airport commission wants to provide sewer and water to the airport, which Eureka Township can't provide. The City of Lakeville does have sewer and water service. The MAC approached the City of Lakeville and asked if they would be willing to consider an annexation if the MAC petitioned the City. That was the extent of the discussion. From there, the MAC went directly to Eureka Township to try and work out an agreement. The MAC is about to petition Lakeville in the next 30 days to consider annexation.

Kent commented on that, saying it has long been a point of contention for Baytown Township and the City of Lake Elmo regarding discussions on airport sewer and water. They ended up not installing sewer/water along Manning and came down 17 instead. He said the Baytown town planner from TKDA is also the town planner for Eureka Township. He said they were told that Eureka Township and the City of Lakeville have a joint-powers agreement worked out like Baytown's joint-powers agreement with the City of Bayport to provide water because they're in the TCE contamination plume and they also have it for sewer for the St. Croix Prep School, and if that ever were to happen, those joint-powers agreements are an option without annexation. Gary said the MAC went down that road and Lakeville entertained the joint-powers agreement idea but Lakeville said the terms set by Eureka Township were not acceptable. Lakeville went back to the township and said if you're willing to revise the terms, we're willing to consider the joint-powers agreement, but Eureka Township would not change the terms. Neil added that there are no active negotiations right now to annex Lake Elmo Airport into the City of Lake Elmo. He said that Airlake is a unique situation because there is a hangar development area that people are interested in building if there were sewer and water, otherwise they're going elsewhere so there's a specific need there. He stated that is not the situation at Lake Elmo Airport. Dave Schultz added it looks like the FBO at Airlake is in Lakeville but most of the hangars are in the township. Neil confirmed that was correct due to a previous annexation.

Upon no further comments from the Panel at the time, Evan opened up the public comment period, stating the CEP could hold further discussion following the public comment period, if needed.

### **The public comment period occurred as follows:**

Molly Olson stated the information comes at us like a firehose. She suggested there's got to be a better way – perhaps taking questions throughout the presentation? She said back to Mr. Buckingham's question about the impact on the community, she keeps hearing that the MAC is engaging the public, but stated what she's seeing is the MAC just giving information and then defending its position and said that's not what real engagement and real listening is all about. She asked where are the people, where are the residents, where is the community in all these slides? They're clearly absent and have been in every single presentation. She said what she's learned from one of the previous presentations is that the community and people are not part of your requirements and you really don't care about the community; you really only care about the things that are required by state and federal law to look at. Yes, you've said you've done some tweaking here and there, but how much are you listening? She suggested for the next public meeting that it would help demonstrate some human concern to put up a

## Meeting Minutes

slide of the comments and concerns the MAC has heard from the community to help the public feel heard. She noted hearing slides about bats and turtles but nothing about the impact on property values and 30<sup>th</sup> Street. She stated noise is a big concern – her number one concern – but there are a lot of other concerns, too, and noted the community has a long list of concerns. She said it was insulting at the last public meeting to be given a sticker and told to choose only one top concern. And now, those things are off the table for further discussion. She mentioned some of the concerns that should be on that slide are quality of life, safety and many others that she and others in the room could help put together.

Molly Olson also said that the Easton Village residents across the street from the airport haven't even been told about the airport development. Kent Grandlienard said yes they have; that's absolutely not true. Molly said that's not what they're hearing from the residents when they're buying the properties. She then asked Evan to go back to the slide showing all the new development around the airport since the 1960s and said she didn't see Easton Village on there. She noted she's not part of Easton Village but she cares about all her neighbors. Evan said it was based on County GIS data indicating when the parcels/lots were recorded, and that area in question has been subdivided since this data was compiled. Kent said every adjoining community is allowed to make public comment to the City. From Baytown's perspective, on every single development along Manning Ave. in Lake Elmo, we've made it clear in our public comments that residents need to be aware about potential airport expansion, Manning Ave. four-lane expansion, and the trains, railroad whistles and train tracks. He said they call it "planes, trains and automobiles" and they've made that very clear in every comment to the City of Lake Elmo. If the developer or City isn't sharing that with the residents, aside from them looking at the airport or the train tracks when they go out to potentially purchase a house, then that's on Lake Elmo – not on the airport or MAC. Molly said, "Isn't it convenient to defer that responsibility to somebody else – people that are probably not even in this room – it just tells me that there is no cumulative care about the cumulative community." Kent said that Lake Elmo should be caring about the residents of their city. Molly agreed, but said is there no responsibility for anyone else in this room? Kent reiterated that Baytown gave comments. He wasn't sure what West Lakeland did, but they know that as soon as all those houses are built, that Kent's phone is going to ring. He gave the example when they built Inspiration in Bayport, which used to be in Baytown, he had people screaming at him over the phone because the train whistles were keeping them awake at night, and they were told when they bought their houses that those tracks weren't used anymore. Kent told those people they were seriously misinformed. Those are the kinds of things that happen in developments that come up against airports, railroad tracks and now Manning Ave. – and they're all going to complain about busy traffic and there will be stoplights that don't exist today, and the train tracks are heavily used. He said he didn't know what the solution is. He suspects that West Lakeland probably made similar comments. Dave Schultz noted he thinks there's a loophole in this situation, where realtors are required by law to disclose this information, but he thinks the sales are being made by a developer or builder and they're not required under the same statute to disclose some of this stuff. He said they've had two people come from Easton Village say they were not aware this was going on, and noted this has been going on for many years. Stephen Buckingham said that for all he's said against the MAC tonight, he's not blaming this one on them, but there was one person from Easton Village who was told the airport may be expanding or there's a possibility of an expansion at some point in the future but was not told there were active discussions going on concerning it. Kent said, well they were lied to. Stephen agreed and said it was the developer. Kent said, "Some of it is buyer beware." Chad Leque weighed in saying there is responsibility on all sides of the table on an issue like this. He said he's not shrugging responsibility, but the MAC doesn't control the land use decisions around the airport,

## Meeting Minutes

and that Neil Ralston is the person at the MAC that reviews those plans and comments on them, and he touches on things like airspace zoning, noise and things like you're talking about, and trying to convince the people who do have the authority to invoke some of the requirements. He said the MAC views its responsibility as trying to empower people to have the information available. For instance, he said if they know they're moving in next to an airport, if they were to contact the airport, they would be directed to all the information the MAC has publicly available on their website for people to do evaluations of different properties around the airport. He said that in the hypothetical situation of a city that does not provide the information and disclosures they're required to provide, the MAC still wants the plans for their airports out there and accessible to the general public so people are empowered to do their due diligence if they're so inclined. He stated the MAC provides this information for existing operations and for what's planned. He referenced a woman at the last public meeting who was concerned about the airport as it exists today, who just moved into a neighborhood near the airport. He noted her expectations of moving in across from an airport did not align with reality and she was quite frustrated. He said that's unfortunate to hear, but Kent's comment about responsibility resonates and he thinks that responsibility goes all the way around the table. He commented that everybody has a different influence and ability to do some of the specific things Molly is talking about as far as real estate transactions, noting that the MAC can comment and try to convince the city to do what they're supposed to do, but the MAC doesn't have the authority over those disclosures, and he suspected it was the same with the townships. Kent agreed it's the responsibility of the realtors, the buyer and the communities. Kent gave an example of the TCE (groundwater contamination), he said they had to fight the real estate lobby to get a requirement that when someone purchases a piece of land in Baytown within a Special Well Construction Area, that they be made aware of that groundwater contamination (it's a Superfund site) and the County agreed to put it on their deeds. But before that, the real estate lobby fought that, so people were building half a million or million-dollar houses and the last thing that goes in is the well, and they're finding out they're drilling the well into a contaminated aquifer with trichloroethylene (TCE) and carbon tetrachloride. And they'd say, well my realtor never mentioned it. He said, we couldn't get them to require that as a disclosure on land before the house was built, and then the County came through and it's required as part of the deed now, and West Lakeland has the same ordinance. Chad noted the MAC has dealt with this same thing at MSP when they opened up Runway 17/35, an 8,000-foot runway, in 2005. He noted the whole south metro area (Eagan, Bloomington, Apple Valley) for all intents and purposes didn't know they had an airport north of them, and we took about 37% of the departures from MSP and put them on that runway going south and it was a similar thing. We tried to get out to the realtors to let them know about this.

Molly Olson empathized with the road blocks lobbyists create, but said her main point is the MAC needs a slide that acknowledges they're aware of the concerns of the community. She said initially she stated Easton Village people are not being told and she understands now that should maybe be rephrased to say Easton Village people are not getting the message that this expansion is in full force. She offered she could help create that laundry list of concerns if the MAC had difficulty creating it.

Marlon Gunderson suggested that the Easton Village residents may end up better off with the runway moving further away from them. Kent offered that they're not going to like the beacon. Marlon asked if that was moving. Neil asked if he meant the runway end identification lights? Kent said no, the beacon. Neil confirmed the beacon would not be relocated. Kent mused they wouldn't like it as it would shine right in their windows. Neil said that's an existing condition at the airport today.

## Meeting Minutes

Dave Schultz said to Lake Elmo's benefit, they fought that and lost at the Supreme Court to the Metropolitan Council. He noted development has been forced on Lake Elmo. They look at where do you have a seller of open land. Stephen Buckingham noted it went to the Supreme Court twice. Molly Olson agreed that they fought the huge bureaucracy of the Met Council. Dave said if it wasn't because of that, we wouldn't be talking about Easton Village today.

Pat Schultz asked, regarding 30<sup>th</sup> Street, what number was being used to determine the traffic count and the forecasts and who are you going through? She noted that a car condo came into the township and they were using state numbers for what the count was on that road, and those numbers were significantly less than the study actually performed on that road, so it would be interesting to know which numbers the MAC used. She advised the team to be aware that there are numbers out there that are not accurate. Dave Schultz said this was the Chanhassen AutoPlex that was looking to place a facility like that south of 30<sup>th</sup> Street and they were using MnDOT numbers that accounted for 225 cars a day on 30<sup>th</sup> Street, and noted that is way low. He said Washington County did a traffic study that showed 1,500 cars a day on our side of 30<sup>th</sup> and over 100 an hour at rush hour (between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.). Neil said they used the County's data from Manning, which was in the 1,300-1,400 range in 2010, growing to 2,000 by 2030, and 1,500 cars in 2017 fits in that curve very well. Neil confirmed that data was for a 3-day period and the 1,500 was the average of that period? Dave confirmed that was correct. Stephen asked Dave if when he said "our side" he meant eastbound only on 30<sup>th</sup> Street? Dave said that was eastbound and westbound on the east side of Manning. Neil reiterated the team used the County's data. Kent Grandlienard explained that the Met Council counts residences of people impacted by that road, so that if one person takes 25 trips back and forth on that road during a day, they're not counted 25 times. Dave noted the Washington County study was done during the summer months, when school was not in session, so he wasn't sure how that skewed the numbers.

Marlon Gunderson noted the team received a lot of criticism tonight and he wanted to state he thought the team was doing a great job and he appreciated the effort. As far as the Purpose & Need goes, he said it seems like, and noted maybe he was oversimplifying it, that the only Purpose & Need is to get the airport into federal compliance, and they've gotten away without having to do it for many years, because the runway has been fine, but now it's at the end of its life, and so now you have to bring it into compliance or you won't get your funding. Is the Purpose & Need anymore complicated than that? I'm not sure how you could take public input and change that Purpose & Need. Evan responded there are components of the Purpose & Need that are based on FAA standards in terms of the runway protection zones. If you are going to reconstruct a runway, and you can construct it in a location that has clear runway protection zones, the FAA is going to pursue that option, due to the size of the investment of constructing a brand new runway. The runway length is based both on FAA guidance and the needs of the types of aircraft using the airport. When we talk about the Purpose & Need, there's pieces of it that are based on FAA standards, but the standards function in the context of what makes the most sense for the airport long-term. That's what the LTCP determined was the right long-term plan to not only comply with standards but also invest the public money in a way that makes sense long-term. Chad Leque pointed out that previous plans had the proposed runway as long as 3,900 feet, with the original preferred alternative in the LTCP previously 3,600 feet, and noted that over time there have been changes to what's proposed at the airport to meet the needs of the operators, while balancing the concerns of the community, most recently going from 3,600 feet to 3,500 feet. Chad also looked up the May 25<sup>th</sup> CEP meeting minutes and noted there was a detailed discussion on the Purpose & Need. Stephen replied that there was a big discussion but you didn't give us a chance to have any input. It was

## Meeting Minutes

presented as this is the Purpose & Need. Chad said he thought it was more of a discussion like we've had tonight. Marlon asked what there was to discuss if the Purpose & Need is to bring the airport into compliance, and asked Stephen if he was saying the MAC shouldn't? Stephen said he thinks the Purpose & Need should take into account not only aviation interests, but also the concerns of the surrounding community. Marlon suggested Stephen was confusing the Purpose & Need with the plan. Stephen said no. Marlon said if you try to address that, you're boxed in with what property do I own, how am I going to meet that Purpose & Need – there are a lot of ways to do that with messing around with the variables and they've been doing that for a couple years now, but you've never changed the Purpose & Need at all. The Purpose & Need is very simple: FAA compliance. And enhancing safety. Mary asked Marlon what's your definition of FAA compliance? Marlon replied runway protection zones that don't cross roads – it's as simple as that. Dave Schultz stated the roads were here before the airport and runway were here.

Commissioner Madigan said the issue the MAC has is we're trying to balance conflicting interests. One interest is increasing the margin of safety for the pilots operating at the airport. I think that's an interest we all support and acknowledge. Second interest is minimizing the impact of the operation of the airport on the neighbors and accommodating their interests to the extent that we can. The third interest is increasing the efficiency and functionality of the airport, because that is something the MAC is charged with doing. We'll probably never have agreement on how we balance those interests, but that is what this process is all about – it's trying to balance those interests and minimizing the impact to the neighbors to the extent we can. Stephen said that goes back to the point a lot of us have made: you're increasing the safety of the airport – that's probably true – but you're decreasing the safety of ground traffic on 30<sup>th</sup> Street for a lot more users. The people who have airplanes at that airport knew the length of the runway when they moved in – they knew what they were getting. They could have put their airplane somewhere else but they chose to put it at that airport. We're not saying shut down the airport or make it less safe than it is; we're saying keep it the same so we can keep 30<sup>th</sup> Street the same. Commissioner Madigan acknowledged Stephen's argument and said you're balancing it a certain way, but I'm just talking about what the process is.

Marlon pointed out that these expansion plans have been in place at the airport since the 1960s. Kent said you have to acknowledge that part is true. Stephen said the 1964 plan was based on projections that have not happened. Kent said, I know, but the airport owned that property. He said he heard a woman once say, when they were at a meeting at the governor's office, "well how would I know that the airport owned that property on the south side of the road?" Kent said, you'd look at a plat map. Kent further said this parallel quandary we're in about trying to talk about the environmental impact and the airport expansion is a whole other issue as far as he's concerned that needs to continue to be waged on a different level, but it's confounding the purpose of this committee as far as the environmental impact part of it. He said, if people want to continue to advocate with their legislators or whoever that the expansion isn't necessary, that's a different avenue, but he doesn't think that was supposed to be the intent of this committee. He noted it seems like every meeting, that's all we talk about – "should the expansion be allowed?" and whether you agree with it or not that's really not the purpose of this environmental impact committee, right? Evan Barrett responded the purpose of the committee is stakeholder outreach, education, and making sure the MAC is transparent in what the plans are and what the environmental impacts of the plans are. Purpose & Need was one of the topics of one of the meetings; Alternatives was the topic of one of the meetings; and that's all wrapped up in this question of "Is the project needed?" Evan said he thinks the purpose of the committee is dependent

## Meeting Minutes

on what the committee feels the purpose of the committee should be. Kent noted the long-term comprehensive plan has gone on before this as part of the whole argument either for or against expansion. Stephen said the name of this committee is community engagement panel and noted he didn't hear anything about environmental in that. He said he thought this was to get input from the surrounding community into what was going on with the expansion plans. Kent noted the committee was specific to the EA/EAW. Chad Leqve said it serves both purposes and that Commissioner Madigan stated it well. He said if people have concerns, that's what we want to talk about. He said it's a balancing act and he doesn't know that we'll ever be able to balance them in a way where everyone around the table says, "I love it; looks great." But at a minimum, we can have a dialogue to get to the best spot that we can get. He said that's what the MAC is trying to do in this process. He acknowledged that involvement on the CEP doesn't guarantee that we're not going to hear comments and objections from some of the CEP at the end of this when we take public comments, but it's important that we have the exchange, share information and try to work together to get the best scenario as part of this process. He said he doesn't know that it's reasonable to expect that any discussion like this, when there are concerns and views that are polar in some circumstances, is going to result in everyone being happy at the end. At a minimum, the MAC wants to make sure people have the information, that peoples' thoughts and ideas are considered, and to the degree possible, that the team can try and do something to address those, like the additional work done on 30<sup>th</sup> Street or the noise concerns. Chad mentioned there are some things the MAC would like to look at with the pilot community and the noise abatement plan and continuing relationships with the tenants at the airport while working together with the community residents to have that dialogue – and noted these are good things that come out of these processes. He acknowledged Stephen's concerns but said in fairness to the group and the dialogue that the CEP has talked about it, but that's not to say that everyone agreed or was happy about it, but there's value in the dialogue.

Mick Kaschmitter said the frustrating thing about this whole thing is why does the airport trump the community? Chad offered his thoughts on the MAC's legislative charge to maintain transportation assets to provide a certain level of safety and utility. The MAC comes to the dialogue with this responsibility. That's not to say that the aviation community and the airport are the only people that we consider in the process. Of course we consider the communities, but when we have our legislative responsibility, it's very difficult to give everything to both sides of the discussion and to make everybody happy. For instance, he noted that initially the runway length was proposed to 3,900 feet, which was great for the aviation community, but then it was reduced to 3,600 feet, and now we're at 3,500 feet. He noted there's a little movement there, but he knows that doesn't satisfy some of the community concerns. He noted, however, that he doesn't believe we've been doing this exercise over the years in a way that's been completely ignoring one part of the dialogue or discussion. Now if you're saying you're not hearing me or listening to me unless you do exactly what I want, then I could see how that might be a conclusion one would get to. But again, to the Commissioner's point, it's a balancing act and we're trying to do the best job we can in balancing all these interests.

Molly Olson reiterated her idea to put up a slide with all the community concerns heard. She said that a few of us sitting in a corner could probably come up with a list of 25 concerns and you keep talking about only two.

Laura Kaschmitter said we've submitted over 180 letters to you – where are those letters saying our problems with it? They've never shown up on a slide. You say you welcome public comment, great, but

## Meeting Minutes

where is it on a slide? Marlon said every single one is available on the website. Laura replied we don't want it on the website; we want it where you guys can see it. We're having to look at all your slides; why can't you look at our concerns on a slide? Mary Vierling asked where are the pros and cons? Laura asked where are the checks and balances of this? Chad Leque said that's a fair question and noted we're roughly about at the halfway point of this process. He said we will get to a point where there's going to be a formal review, a formal public hearing, and opportunities for everybody to submit comments and they're all going to be responded to in writing and dealt with formally as part of this process. Laura said but you keep going forward but our concerns are never going forward. We're having to submit the same complaints and concerns over and over again that are never being addressed publicly. You say you'll get a letter and you read it. Okay, that's nice, but why is it not being addressed? Chad offered that as part of this exercise we're trying to address what we can while still fulfilling our statutory obligation for aviation infrastructure in the metropolitan area. To the degree that there is overlap between what you're saying a segment of the community might want to see and what we can and are trying to do, while still meeting the Purpose & Need of the project, there are some areas where we may not be able to address some of the concerns that are raised. Keith Bergmann said I'm not sure if you're hearing her though – she's not saying you necessarily have to address all the concerns, just show that we've heard them. Laura said she just wants acknowledgement of what we are asking. Molly again reiterated her idea to show a comprehensive list of concerns on a slide. She suggested two sides of the slide: "here are the two things the MAC has considered (the road and the length of the runway) and here are the 25 others that are not within our Purpose & Need to care about these so we are ignoring these." She said that's basically the message she's been getting. Keith said some of the meetings we've gone over some of these. For example, the road. At one meeting, we looked at five different plans for the road, and whether or not Baytown wanted a road for roundabouts or cul-de-sacs, then they got filtered and moved on. Not that they address all the concerns at every meeting, but they try to go back to some of them sometimes. Now, the MAC has moved forward past it and at this meeting, we're not talking about those five different road proposals. Like it or not, they've moved past. Some of them have been addressed in different formats but not shown every time. Molly again reiterated, we want a comprehensive list of what has been presented and what you're aware of that the community is not happy with, and what you're going to address on that list and what you won't. She said, I'm pretty confident that your pat answer that will be shown for most of them is "considered and not an issue," which is pretty insulting, but at least acknowledge the concerns.

Kent asked the Kaschmitters, saying he knows they were impacted by the original road configuration, if they thought the people that are now on the north end of Neal and the south side of 30<sup>th</sup> on the corner like the new configuration better than the old one? He said his guess is probably not. Laura said they don't like either. They don't want the road changed at all – it's not safe for us to have it changed and we don't want it changed. It's that simple. So Kent confirmed the option in their minds is don't do anything with the road? Laura said you can repave the runway, you can do whatever you want just stay within the confines of the fence. Kent said he just wanted to find out because he figured the people on that corner probably like that the least, because now all the cars are going to come out in their area. Laura said, we're right there as well. Kent said you guys have been gracious about being active and you got the initiative to have that change made through this process. Kent said he's been disappointed at the turnout for the last public meeting. He acknowledged he's heard the dots on the top concerns board may have been offensive to some, but he counted the dots on the board because it's one way to gauge, and there were 34 dots on the board, and 17 were for the "no concern" of the proposal. He asked where

## Meeting Minutes

are all the other people who you're saying are going to be so impacted by this? He said from his perspective, from Baytown, that they don't care, because in 2 or 3 years the Township has heard nothing. He said he's disappointed if there's people who have feelings about it and opposing it that don't come forward, because he doesn't know how else we're going to get public feedback, because we've got none on the Baytown side. He said he doesn't know how you account for that. Referring to the last meeting, he said there were very few people there and only four from Baytown. Stephen said he and his wife weren't there because they were on a vacation. Kent said even if you were there, that'd only be six people from Baytown, and there are over 1,600 residents. And again, your wife was the only person who ever made any comment to us during the comprehensive planning process, or came to a meeting.

Evan Barrett closed the meeting at 8:10 P.M. He thanked everyone for attending, for the comments, questions and discussion and invited everyone to the public event on November 6<sup>th</sup> at Oak-Land Middle School.