

FLYING CLOUD AIRPORT JOINT AIRPORT ZONING BOARD

Thursday, October 26, 2017
Eden Prairie City Center – Heritage Rooms 1 & 2
8080 Mitchell Road, Eden Prairie, MN

MEETING MINUTES

Brad Aho, Chair, convened the Flying Cloud Airport Joint Airport Zoning Board meeting at 9:02 a.m. The following were in attendance:

Members: Brad Aho, Chair
Kate Aanenson, City of Chanhassen, Board Member
Bob Barker, City of Eden Prairie, Alternate (voting)
Michael Beard, City of Shakopee, Incoming Board Member
Joseph Helkamp, City of Shakopee, Outgoing Board Member
Rick King, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Board Member
Julie Klima, City of Eden Prairie, Board Member
Mark Noble, City of Shakopee, Alternate
Gary Schmidt, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Alternate (voting)
Eric Weiss, City of Shakopee, Board Member

Others: Rick Getschow, George Esbensen, City of Eden Prairie; Rylan Juran, Mn/DOT; Bridget Rief, Evan Wilson, Neil Ralston, Brad Juffer, Andrew Hanson, Chad Leque, Mike Wilson, Jenn Felger, Shelly Cambridge, MAC Staff

1. APPROVAL OF 09-21-17 FCM JAZB MEETING MINUTES

Chair Aho opened the meeting by requesting a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the Flying Cloud Airport Joint Airport Zoning Board meeting held on 09-21-17.

IT WAS MOVED BY HELKAMP, SECONDED BY AANENSON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 21, 2017 FLYING CLOUD AIRPORT JOINT AIRPORT ZONING BOARD MEETING, AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.

2. INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Aho stated the City of Eden Prairie intended to appoint Keith Tschohl as the new JAZB board member representing the City of Eden Prairie, although Keith was not able to attend today's meeting. Bob Barker is in attendance today as Keith Tschohl's alternate.

Chair Aho then asked each person to introduce themselves, as Bob Barker is new to the group. Board members introduced themselves; also in attendance were Bridget Rief, Evan Wilson, Neil Ralston, and Shelly Cambridge and Jenn Felger who will be providing staff support to the Board.

3. PROPOSED UPDATES TO 2010 DRAFT FCM AIRPORT ZONING ORDINANCE

Because it has been a number of years since the last FCM Airport Draft Zoning Ordinance was proposed, some changes have been recommended. Neil Ralston, MAC Staff, gave an overview of the proposed changes for the group.

Before beginning his presentation, Mr. Ralston asked Chair Aho if there was a formal action that needed to occur with the Shakopee Board representation. Commissioner King stated it's his understanding that the affected municipality makes the appointment as opposed to the Board, and the Board should recognize the appointment but doesn't need to approve it. Chair Aho concurred, and recognized Mike Beard as taking Joseph Helkamp's spot on the Flying Cloud Airport Joint Airport Zoning Board as a representative for the City of Shakopee going forward. Resolution from the Shakopee City Council confirming that appointment is forthcoming.

Mr. Ralston, MAC Staff, began with a brief overview of the goals of the Flying Cloud Airport Joint Airport Zoning Board, touched on at the previous meeting. The primary goal of the group remains the same as it was back in the 2009-2010 time period, which is to develop an airport zoning ordinance for Flying Cloud Airport for review and approval by the Mn/DOT Commissioner of Transportation and subsequent adoption by this Board and local communities surrounding the airport. Supporting goals for the group include updating the relevant sections of the draft ordinance to reflect current baseline conditions and to ensure an appropriate level of stakeholder/community engagement occurs. Mr. Ralston stated today's presentation would focus mainly on updating relevant sections and supporting analyses from the draft ordinance to a current baseline condition. Additional information and/or detail on any particular item covered can be discussed in an offshoot meeting, by request.

Mr. Ralston reviewed the three main categories for these updates – changes to the airfield configuration itself, updates to the Safety Risk Study that was done, as well as updates to the associated Economic Impact Study.

His presentation addressed airfield configuration updates first, indicating that some conditions on the airfield have changed or will be changing, so we need to be sure the updated ordinance accounts for those changes. When envisioning changes to the airfield configuration in 2010, the draft ordinance foresaw a need to shift and extend Runway 18-36 by approximately 100 feet, out to around 2800 feet. That concept has since been discarded; the updated ordinance will reflect the runway in its present state. This modest change does, however, affect several of the zones associated with the zoning ordinance and results in a need to rework the analysis for Runway 18-36 because the zones are technically changing their locations.

Mr. Ralston clarified some of the more frequently used technical terms for today's presentation. Chair Aho then recognized Mike Beard, who asked for clarification on whether or not the safety zones could extend from a displaced threshold. Mr. Ralston responded that the State Safety Zones are based on the physical end of pavement which was verbally affirmed by Rylan Juran from Mn/DOT. Board Member Beard noted the clarification.

The second airfield configuration change involves the north parallel Runway 10L-28R. While no physical changes are being proposed to the width, length or position of this runway, staff proposes to change its designation from “other than utility” to “utility”. The distinction between designations pertains to the type of aircraft using the runway on a regular basis. The re-designation is being proposed to reduce the number of runway incursions as a result of moving the runway hold lines. From a zoning and land use perspective, that change will result in smaller runway protection zones and a less restrictive approach surface slope.

With regard to the last Safety Risk Study, it was prepared to evaluate the probability of aircraft accidents occurring adjacent to the airport including those in the FAA Runway Protection Zone and the State’s Model Safety Zones A & B. Mr. Ralston’s discussion focused on the input data for the study’s calculations, which MAC is proposing to update. The historic accident rate for this study will be drawn from a different timeframe, using data from 1997 to 2016 rather than 1989 to 2008. This calculation amounts to a small increase in the overall result, based on fewer aircraft accidents along with fewer aircraft operations. Of the 23 aircraft accidents that occurred from 1997 to 2016, 14 were located adjacent to airfield pavements; 3 were in Runway Protection Zones; 1 was in State Safety Zone A beyond the Runway Protection Zone; 1 was in State Safety Zone B; and 4 were off airport outside of State Safety Zones A and B.

Since this study evaluates accident probability in the State Safety Zones, the geographic areas used in the study remain the same as in the 2010 Study.

Use of the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook for general aviation accident locations is also unchanging. While not 100% complete, the data set is still considered to be the best currently available. For Flying Cloud, two data sets will be used; one showing accident locations for runways under 4,000 feet in length (for Runways 18-36 and 10L-28R) and one showing accident locations for runways between 4,000 and 5,999 feet in length (for Runway 10R-28L). Mr. Ralston explained that the next step is to take the data from the California source study and superimpose those accident locations onto a base map for each runway end at the airport. Mr. Ralston then displayed an example of that, using the Runway 18 end at Flying Cloud. Next it must be determined how many aircraft operations are projected for each runway end for a future year; MAC recommends using the year 2040. This is accomplished by combining actual runway use percentages with forecast airport operations extrapolated out to the year 2040 to arrive at the estimated number of aircraft operations per runway end, which filters into the probability calculations.

Chair Aho asked about the estimated number of aircraft operations today at Flying Cloud; approximately 85,000 was Mr. Ralston’s response. Chair Aho noted it is then estimated that the total number of aircraft operations will increase by 10 to 20 percent and Mr. Ralston confirmed that estimate, over the 22 year study period. The 2025 projection used in the last zoning ordinance was around 125,000 aircraft operations so this is actually a step back based on current results. Nationwide an increase in aviation is projected; that growth attributable more to business and corporate flying rather than an increase in personal aviation use.

The final component of the Safety Risk Study which requires updating is occupant areas, which are land uses that currently support concentrations of people or are likely to support

large concentrations of people in the future based on foreseeable development. Also included in this analysis are some currently undeveloped areas that MAC has identified as candidates for non-aeronautical development. In the 2010 study, the probability of an aircraft accident within the identified occupant area was below the targeted risk standard, and the update will confirm if that is still the case.

4. BOARD MEMBER INPUT ON ITEMS TO BE UPDATED

Chair Aho addressed the Board by asking for questions or discussion items for debate. Board Member King pointed out that forecasting operational growth is not pure science but rather a great deal of speculation, and this is a long-range forecast plan. Chair Aho concurred, citing the last plan expected operations to peak at 125,000 and the currently proposed plan is being revised to expect 101,000 operations which, from the public's perspective, is actually a decrease of what was projected in the original draft ordinance. Board Member Helkamp also noted the designation change for the north parallel runway down to the utility category so the type of aircraft using that runway along with noise levels will be changing. Mr. Ralston clarified that changing the runway to the utility designation won't in fact change the type of aircraft using the runway; there will be no new restrictions to the type of aircraft using that runway. Board Member King interjected that the discussion, however, concerned perceptions of the public. Mr. Ralston pointed out that changing to the utility designation actually reflects a more accurate picture of the types of aircraft which currently utilize that runway. Chair Aho noted the overall public perception of downgrading that runway's designation will be positive along with the fact that there is no current plan to extend the other runway's length. Board Member Beard explained that's why he asked about the 18-36 scenario discussed earlier because the additional 140 to 160 feet of asphalt being contemplated could be a source of great comfort to pilots on a takeoff roll on a hot day. Board Member Beard asked if the reason the notion of lengthening the runway was abandoned was due to economic decisions or pressure from the community.

Chair Aho recognized Bridget Rief to respond to Board Member Beard's question. Ms. Rief explained that a few years ago MAC completed a minor extension to that runway and worked with the FAA with regard to potentially extending it out to 2800 feet. There are a couple limiting obstructions which make it difficult to extend to 2800 feet, one of them is the Green Acres barn and the second is Pioneer Trail. When MAC worked with the city and county on reconstruction of Pioneer Trail years ago, we worked with them to set the elevation that worked with the existing runway length, not having projected a runway extension at that time.

The final component of the study update will be the Economic Impact Study which estimates the economic impact of implementing the State Model Airport Zoning Ordinance vs. the proposed JAZB zoning ordinance; to compare both models based on an economic development standpoint. The JAZB will rely on the expertise of Eden Prairie's planning team to identify what the dollar impact would be on lost residential and commercial property development potential along with lost property tax revenue, lost job creation opportunities and lost MAC non-aeronautical revenues.

Chair Aho affirmed that this final component of the study is especially important from the city's viewpoint and a good reason why we need this ordinance to go through, as it has

potential to greatly impact the city's development. Having this zoning ordinance in limbo makes it more difficult to have meetings with potential developers in the city when the rules and development zones are unclear. Mr. Ralston pointed out that although there is less information to present today on the Economic Impact Study portion of the ordinance, it is equally as important as the Safety Risk materials presented.

Chair Aho asked the Board if there were additional comments or concerns that needed to be addressed with regard to the presentation but no questions were raised.

5. NEXT STEPS/TIMELINE FOR PREPARING UPDATED DRAFT FLYING CLOUD AIRPORT ZONING ORDINANCE

Depending on additional input from the group, the next step is to incorporate the items to be updated into the analysis, prepare the updated Safety Risk Study and Economic Impact Analysis, and subsequently determine if any modifications to the draft 2010 zoning ordinance are warranted prior to submission. Dependent upon how all that progresses, Mr. Ralston proposed the next meeting be tentatively scheduled for mid-December, prior to the holidays, to review the results of these analyses and hopefully prepare the updated draft zoning ordinance with relatively few changes. Based on this timeline, the Board would be able to proceed with initiating the first public hearing right after the first of the year.

Chair Aho asked Board Member Klima if that timeline would allow the Eden Prairie planning team enough time to update the Economic Impact Study in preparation for that meeting. Board Member Klima replied affirmatively. Mr. Ralston stated his team would work diligently to pull together all in the information needed to update the Safety Risk Study as well, and it would be communicated to the Board if more time was needed. Chair Aho and Mr. Ralston added they are expecting minimal changes, so updating the analyses should not be a tremendous amount of work.

6. ESTABLISH NEXT MEETING DATE

Chair Aho noted Mr. Ralston's recommendation of Thursday, December 14th for the next JAZB meeting. Mr. Ralston explained the time frame for the next meeting may be longer than the first two meetings and the Board should allow 60 to 90 minutes for that meeting, depending on the level of detail staff needs to go into on the analyses. Members tentatively affirmed the recommended date. **The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, December 14th at 4:00 p.m. at Eden Prairie City Center.**

WITH NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO DISCUSS, IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KING AND SECONDED BY KLIMA TO ADJOURN. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 a.m.