



## LAKE ELMO AIRPORT FEDERAL EA / STATE EAW

# Public Event #1

## Meeting Minutes

Stillwater Area High School

May 11, 2017

6:00 – 6:30 P.M. – Open house with informational boards

6:30 – 8:10 P.M. – Presentation followed by Q&A

### MAC/Mead & Hunt Attendees

Chad Leque  
Dana Nelson  
Neil Ralston  
Joe Harris  
Melissa Scovronski  
Brad Juffer  
Amie Kolesar  
Shelly Cambridge  
Gary Schmidt  
Mitch Killian  
Michael Madigan  
Evan Barrett  
Laura Morland  
Colleen Bosold

### Representing

Metropolitan Airports Commission  
Metropolitan Airports Commission  
Metropolitan Airports Commission  
Metropolitan Airports Commission, Lake Elmo Airport Manager  
Metropolitan Airports Commission  
MAC Commissioner District F  
Mead & Hunt  
Mead & Hunt  
Mead & Hunt

Presentation slides and informational boards presented at this meeting, as well as the newsletter and frequently asked questions (FAQs) provided as handouts to the public, are available on the project website at <https://www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Lake-Elmo-Environmental-Assessment/Overview.aspx>.

### The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Provide background information on the environmental process and the stakeholder engagement plan for proposed airfield improvements at Lake Elmo Airport.
- Respond to inquiries from community members.

### Items discussed were as follows:

Chad Leque, Director of Environmental Programs for the MAC, welcomed and thanked everyone for coming and mentioned one thing he hopes people take away from tonight's discussion is the importance the project team is placing on the concept of collaboration as we go through this process. After introducing himself, Dana Nelson, the Q&A participants (Evan Barrett, Neil Ralston and Joe Harris)

## Meeting Minutes

and additional MAC staff and the MAC commissioner in attendance, Chad provided an overview of the agenda for the evening. Chad asked the audience to provide feedback (positive or negative) and ideas throughout the process, both on the project itself as well as on the format of this public event and what could make the public involvement process better.

Chad Leque began the formal presentation, which included an overview of the MAC's purpose and mission, including the legislative mandate, funding structure and system make-up; the primary role and characteristics of Lake Elmo Airport; a recap of the Lake Elmo Airport Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) recommendations; an overview of the environmental review process, including National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) processes and requirements, and the three levels of environmental review; a brief overview of the components that go into developing a project's purpose and need statement and potential constructs that may go into this project's purpose and need based on the LTCP; an introduction to the alternatives analysis part of the process – they have to be adequate to meet the components of the purpose and need statement, the project team is currently working on determining that suite of alternatives, and each alternative will be developed in sufficient enough detail to adequately assess the costs, operational safety factors and environmental impacts of each; and an overview of the 14 environmental impact categories that will be evaluated.

Dana Nelson then took over the presentation and asked for a quick poll/show of hands on who was in the room as a resident of Lake Elmo (third largest crowd); West Lakeland Township (largest crowd); Baytown Township (second largest crowd); tenants/airport users (a handful of people); Stillwater residents (1 person). She then mentioned that this is a first-of-its-kind effort for the MAC to conduct a stakeholder engagement process of this magnitude and encouraged the audience to provide feedback throughout the process, whether on the meeting format or ideas about the project. The remainder of her presentation focused on the stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) and objectives; the community engagement panel (CEP) role, objectives and composition; the outreach messaging and platforms; and the three other planned public events. She shared that the project website is <https://www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Lake-Elmo-Environmental-Assessment/Overview.aspx>.

Chad Leque came back up to discuss the project timeline for the environmental review. It is about a year-long process that is currently planned for completion in May of 2018. A printable schedule is available on the project website as well as a board out in the rotunda showing the timeline.

Chad Leque discussed next steps: the next CEP meeting will be on May 25 at 6:00 p.m. at Lake Elmo Public Library. These meetings are open to the public. At that meeting, we will review tonight's event to see what can be done better and review the comments received tonight. We'll then talk about the purpose and need for the project as well as take a deeper dive on the alternatives analysis. The consultant/technical project team will be getting to work on the alternatives analysis over the coming weeks. At that, Chad opened it up for questions. He said the team would answer questions as best they can but also encouraged people to submit written questions on the comment forms, and offered that the project team would be in the rotunda by the informational boards following the Q&A for anyone who wanted to speak one-on-one.

**The general Question & Answer session that followed is described below.** *(Responses are indicated in italics.)*

## Meeting Minutes

- Can you repeat when the CEP meeting is? *Chad Leque responded it is May 25 at 6:00 p.m. at Lake Elmo Public Library. Is it open to the public? Yes.*
- What is the acreage of the airport? *Chad Leque responded it is 640 acres. Is that just the Baytown parcel? No, that's the entire airport (MAC-owned property). I thought the RPZ extends across Manning Avenue. That is true but MAC does not own property within the RPZ west of Manning Avenue.*
- What is the dollar amount of taxes the MAC pays to Washington County or the City of Lake Elmo? *Joe Harris responded that hangars and operators at the Airport pay a personal property tax based on their lease-hold area. That exact information can be found on the county assessors' website. Approximately \$120,000 in personal property tax is collected from tenants and private businesses who have improvements at the Airport. The MAC does not pay any property taxes to the county or townships.*
- How many people from the MAC live within one mile of the Airport? *[No response/show of hands before next question was asked.]*
- How many pilots live within one mile of the Airport? *[No show of hands, and the questioner concluded no one has an answer for this, but an airport tenant reported that there are some pilots who do, but they are not here tonight. The questioner concluded it was not very many.]*
- What was the original intent of the airport? Do you recall? I remember I was out here in 1964 when Ward Holliday was the airport manager and had a flight school here. *Chad Leque responded that he thought the character of the airport has been primarily the same: a small, GA type facility, which is no different than what we anticipate to be the case as we look through the planning period of this planning process. So, educational and recreational use? Primarily.*
- Do you want to discuss the original charter of the reliever airport system and the fact that it was a specific design to separate traffic – business traffic from the large airport [MSP]? I think that drives a lot of the MAC philosophy, and people might not be familiar with that. *Chad Leque explained that there's a reason why MAC has an airport system: to promote and enhance air transportation within the metro area and regionally. MSP is a major hub airport, major transportation center. Efficient operation of that facility (both from an airside and landside perspective) is predicated on separating the different demographics of traffic the best we can. This means keeping the larger aircraft and commercial operations at MSP, and moving smaller operators to other system airports to provide the infrastructure to accommodate that demographic. In the case of Lake Elmo Airport, that is small, piston-engine, less than 10 seat-type of aircraft, which we anticipate to be the case throughout the planning period. At an airport like St. Paul Downtown Airport, that's more for larger, corporate jets – the 3Ms of the world and those types of operators. It really is a system and each airport has a role within it to make it effective and allow us to provide the services we are mandated to statutorily from an air transportation perspective. But there have been some jets that have come in on this airport? Absolutely – small jets. And you don't deny that this extension is to accommodate more small jets? Chad responded that it's not necessarily fair to say it's to accommodate them. You keep using the word piston. Chad explained the purpose of the extension is to ensure an adequate level of utility of the facility to the type of aircraft that already operate at the airport – to make sure the facility is right-sized for the demographic of operators that are already at the airport. The original intent was not for that. It was for emergency purposes for small aircraft. Chad responded, "I do not believe that is correct." Questioner said "yes it was" and invited Chad to look it up. Neil Ralston clarified that the proposed 3,500-foot runway length is designed for*

*propeller-driven aircraft. Piston and turboprop aircraft are the design aircraft for the airport and a runway of that length. A runway designed for jets would be a lot longer than 3,500 feet.*

- You talk about 26,000 operations. What does that mean? Take-offs and landings? *Chad Leque responded, yes, take-offs and landings.*
- It [the FAQ handout] says “The mix of aircraft using a runway results from the individual decisions made by the pilot, who evaluate the available runway length and the conditions with reference to the performance characteristics of their aircraft.” Why can’t we just say, and be very firm about it, no jets are allowed to land here? We’ve got New Richmond, Downtown St. Paul, Fleming Field, Crystal and a lot of other airports. I’ve been in the area since 1958, and this airport was not made for jets. In selling real estate in the area for 25 years, we were always told, this is to accommodate small aircraft for local people. We’re not looking to invite pilots from other areas; this is for the farmers and residents of Lake Elmo and Baytown Township. Now we’re doing something that’s totally different. We’re worried about the infrastructure for 200 people – which is a concern – but we’re talking now about four different communities with residents in excess of 25,000. There doesn’t seem to be a level playing field here. We’re paying an awful lot of people to study this plan for almost a two-year period. That’s a lot of salaries for two years, a lot of tax money being spent while the citizens of Washington County have gone without roads that have been improved – we’ve all got terrible roads – we’ve been forced by the Metropolitan Council to expand our population by bringing in builders, new homes, city water and sewer that I bet nobody in this room wanted; we’ve had taxes shoved down our throat to pay for improvements we didn’t want, and we’re not getting the roads we need. And I’m not even talking about airport noise. That’s going to be a much bigger complaint for most people here. We’ve had helicopters, airplanes and many other things that are upsetting us. But why are we doing all this for 200 planes that are currently at the airport? Why aren’t we looking at the needs for all these people who live around it? That’s what I don’t understand. Why aren’t we just putting these 200 planes at different airports? Do we need the airport? *Chad Leque explained, in regard to restricting jet operations at the airport, Lake Elmo Airport like every airport in the MAC system and in fact nearly all airports in Minnesota, is a public-use facility. It’s a public transportation asset just like our interstate highway system. We use federal dollars to develop and maintain these facilities as public transportation assets. There are requirements levied upon us as the airport operator if we use federal funds to maintain this public asset. One of those is to provide equal opportunity and access to law-abiding operators to this transportation asset. A lot of the federal regulation that goes to these grant assurance provisions, as well as additional analysis that needs to be done for restrictions at airports in the US, was born out of a national debate around airport noise in this country all the way from airports the size of MSP down to Lake Elmo. It centered on curtailing operations or changing aircraft operations to reduce noise impacts. U.S. Congress said these are public transportation assets and people need access to them. What that means is, our federal funding is predicated on the fact that we operate this airport in a manner that is not an undue burden on interstate commerce or is arbitrary and capriciously managed in terms of equal access to the facility. So we cannot restrict the use of the airport by a legal aircraft that can and wants to fly in and out of that airport, much the same as if somebody who has license tabs on their vehicle wants to drive on a state highway or the interstate system – that’s a public transportation asset that they have access to. Are you saying you can’t restrict a jet? Correct, we cannot. If that jet is a legal jet (which, if it’s flying, it’s legal – more or less), we can’t restrict those operators from coming in*

*and out of this airport. Then maybe we should just shut the airport down. [Several people clapped.] Chad responded, that is a perspective, and explained that the MAC runs into the same issue at MSP, but in a different context. He said, "Sometimes when an issue pops up at MSP, we'll be in a gymnasium of 150-200 people who are mad about nighttime noise around MSP. And they come up with a very reasonable idea, from their perspective, like the one you just came up with: If you're concerned about aircraft noise and the airport bothers you, shut the airport; or, in the case of MSP, close it down at night – don't allow flights into the airport at night. That is one perspective. But the reality is that the MAC has an obligation and a role that includes a lot of different stakeholders. Some of those stakeholders are just like you – a resident around the airport that has concerns with impacts from the airport. The other important stakeholder group that we have is our tenants – people who want to hangar their aircraft at a MAC airport; the family that wants to get a cheap flight to Cancun to go on a trip out of MSP but they want to fly out at 5:00 a.m. so they can get an extra day of vacation. We have a lot of different stakeholders that we, by virtue of the constitution of our organization have to be accountable to. So what we try to do in these processes – and I can't guarantee, I'll be very honest with you, that everybody is going to be 100% satisfied at the end of this process and completely happy with the outcome – but the one thing we are tirelessly dedicated to is making sure we have a process that we're implementing and supporting where we can have these dialogues and do the best we can to find middle ground with all of our varying stakeholders, while trying to meet our legislative mandate as an organization at the MAC. We are not going to solve all of these issues tonight, but this is the beginning of a process. As Dana laid out, we have a strategy and different tactics we're going to use to stay in communication, and we're going to work through this together as a group of stakeholders to get to an end state at the end of this process. The issue of noise will be a discussion point. We'll evaluate and look at the noise impacts associated with the different alternatives and what the possibilities might be. In response to the question of 'Why are we using all these tax dollars for an investment at the airport when the community isn't even keeping up roads around the airport,' the MAC is user-funded so we don't use any tax dollars. So the resources that go into planning, environmental evaluation or construction at the airport is a user-fee based funding model. These are not general funds or any type of tax dollars we're using for our operation of the airport. We can't speak to local units of government and their operations as it relates to the use of local tax dollars for infrastructure."*

- *If the people who live in and around the airport were opposed to any expansion, would you continue on with your proposal of moving forward – yes or no? Chad Leque explained, as part of this process, we have to evaluate if there are going to be significant environmental impacts with this action. If there are, we have to deal with those. We have to figure out how we're going to work through those. As an example, as part of the discussion around the noise issue, one thing we have been talking about is reviewing our noise abatement plan when we're doing the noise evaluation. This means looking at things we can do at the airport from an operational perspective in collaboration with all of our stakeholders – tenants, businesses on the airport, communities around the airport – to identify the real noise issues and determine if there are any things we can do collaboratively to reduce those impacts. We have had successes at other airports doing these things without having a heavy hand type of regulatory approach, which we don't have the authority to do by virtue of federal law. We've had successes in this area at MSP with our airline partners, the FAA, etc. So yes, it would go through, even if there was a strong opposition to it? Chad explained that the MAC has a statutory obligation to make sure it is*

*maintaining adequate infrastructure for air transportation in the metropolitan area – that is undeniably part of the MAC’s function and role from a statutory perspective. If this process moves forward and there is an alternative that is clearly needed and if the MAC is going to maintain its commitment to the purpose for which the legislature formed it, then the MAC has to move forward with those things. However, Chad reiterated that we want to do it in a way that makes sure we kick over every stone to try to reduce any impact associated with that, and we really are dedicated to that as we move through this process.*

- Are you saying, then, that the MAC’s only responsibility is to the aviation community and you have no responsibility to the residents around the airport? *Chad Leque responded, no, absolutely not and explained why he’d hope one wouldn’t make that analysis of the MAC. He pointed to what we’re doing here tonight, and said, “We’re doing this because we’re not an organization that’s like that. If you look at the MAC’s history in terms of how we operate relative to our vast array of stakeholders, if you look at the MAC objectively, when you look at our record of how we’ve dealt with things like this, when it comes to discretionary actions to try to be sensitive to and listen to the concerns of the residents around our airports, we have a pretty robust record. Not only at MSP but at our other reliever airports as well. This is your own assessment to make but I’d hope what you will take away from this meeting tonight is that we are committed to that as part of this process, because what we we’re doing here tonight, believe it or not, in terms of federal requirements, is discretionary. That doesn’t mean it’s not important and that doesn’t mean it’s not a priority for the MAC. So in answer to your question, no I don’t think that’s categorically the way the MAC operates and I don’t think our record demonstrates that.”*
- After living out here for 30 years, and this airport having comprehensive plans renewed every 10 years from 1965 plans, with all this expansion, and 200 residents on the airport and that’s been declining for the last 30 years, under the data practices act, I’d like you to release documents that show how much money you’ve already spent over the last two years for this plan, and the fact that the project is estimated around \$19M and what’s your return on your investment for the next 25 years for your 200 residents? I think it’s a lose-lose all the way around versus just resurfacing the runway that exists without moving our roads. How do you accommodate this huge expense of MSP dollars for people that don’t use that runway? And our local community sees no benefit to this. How can you justify spending that kind of money and resources that you’ve done for an airport that’s becoming obsolete? Because we’ve got residents all the way around you. You shut down a runway at Anoka already, and you’re comparing our runway airport to the 83 airports around the state that, when you look at Google maps, there’s maybe one farmer for miles around those airports. So how do you justify that? *Chad Leque responded that in addition to the 200 based tenants, there’s transient traffic that comes through these airports that use these facilities. They’re public-use facilities – not private airports just for the people based at the airport – that’s an important distinction. He noted another thing to think about when talking about the value proposition of the airport is the concept of a system. It is a system for a reason, and part of that system is MSP. The airports in the system work in conjunction with one another to ensure the MAC is meeting its statutory mandate to provide safe and convenient air transportation and promote aviation in the metro area. He also noted Lake Elmo Airport provides economic value to the community. Chad then turned it over to Neil Ralston and Joe Harris to further respond to the questions and comments. The questioner then repeated his request for the MAC to disclose and publish this information under the data practices act and speculated that the MAC has spent millions already on this project. Melissa*

*Scrovonski responded that he would need to put this request in writing and that we wouldn't have the information available tonight. Neil Ralston reported the information in question can be pulled together and provided, but that it was much less than the millions of dollars the questioner speculated. He explained that much of this work is done with in-house resources, and reminded the public that the money expended for these efforts is internally generated through the aviation system; we're not using local tax dollars. I'm asking for where is the return on investment? For the amount of money you are going to spend on Lake Elmo, how are you ever going to receive a return on your investment? If you spent \$4M upgrading a runway, how in the world is that airport even going to justify spending that amount of money? Chad Leque responded that it's important to remember it's a public asset and there is a public service component to what the MAC does. He asked, "If we operated on the basis that every single public asset had to have a return on investment, what would happen to some of the infrastructure we have in this country? It's an investment made for a public service for transportation. That's a big component in what we're talking about. It's a transportation asset that's available for public use, just like the interstate highway system."*

- *When was the last time the runway was resurfaced/repaved and what do you anticipate the life of the new runway to be? Neil Ralston responded that the existing runway has been in position since the 1950s, and it's been resurfaced several times but the base underneath the surface is past its useful life. He explained that we can't keep repaving the existing runway infrastructure; we need to rebuild it from the dirt up, so we want to make sure we get the new replacement runway in the right place. The new runway life is a 20-50 year investment. And one of the primary reasons for moving forward is we have to address failing, end-of-life infrastructure at Lake Elmo Airport.*
- *We've seen significant groundwater problems, noise pollution problems from this airport. As you plan to take action regarding the runway, are you going to do anything about the sources of pollution that come from this airport at the same time, such as the groundwater situation? As part of the engineering aspects of rebuilding the runway, will you take advantage of that opportunity when the airport is shut down to remediate some of the environmental health issues? Chad Leque responded that if we run into something during construction that is an issue or an impact, we will deal with it. Neil Ralston reported that the groundwater contamination issue that was identified in the area was not associated with the airport. Chad Leque then noted that, regarding the groundwater and the filtration systems that the MAC installed in homes, it was determined to be a source offsite that had nothing to do with the airport. Chad also said, "If, in the course of conducting the environmental evaluation, and if we do construction at the airport, we encounter situations where there are impacted soils or something of the like, of course we will deal with those in an environmentally responsible manner as part of this effort. Part of the evaluation we're going to be doing when talking about the affected environment is taking into account any preexisting conditions we should be thinking about as we embark on possibly preparing for something like this."*
- *I don't think it's any secret that 3M has looked at Lake Elmo Airport as a possible place for which to bring its corporate planes, and has considered the airport unsuitable for their needs. As I listen to the concerns of my fellow residents, it bothers me that perhaps we're going to see more of this type of corporate use and you won't be able to stop it because it's legal. And to what extent that increases the traffic, noise, and so on that we will have to endure as local residents. Chad Leque responded, if you look at the existing 3M fleet, they are big aircraft – big corporate*

*jets. They are going to need runway in excess of 3,500 feet to operate effectively, which is why they're based at St. Paul Downtown Airport, because we have that over 6,000-foot-length runway at that airport to accommodate those operations. Joe Harris then stated that a big community concern with the Lake Elmo Airport proposal is that a 3,500-foot runway could introduce more jet traffic to the airport as well as maybe an increase in overall traffic as the population of the airport continues to grow. He noted that the MAC did a runway reconstruction at St. Paul Downtown Airport last summer in which the runway was shortened to 3,800 feet. He said, "By our calculations, 3M could actually use about 4,500 feet. 3M relocated to MSP as a result of not having at least a minimum of 5,000 feet. They were going to relocate if they lost even one foot at St. Paul. The reality of these large-scale corporate operators who are flying big jet aircraft that fly across the globe relocating to Lake Elmo – it's not going to happen."*

*Regarding the jet traffic issue, Joe acknowledged that small jets can land on 3,500 feet, and do so in the middle of nowhere in communities in which they need to provide service to a client or for whatever reason they need to fly in there. He acknowledged we have great nearby facilities, like New Richmond, Osceola, St. Paul Downtown, Anoka, Flying Cloud, that have had significant investments made to attract and accommodate those types of jet aircraft because they require NAVAIDs, and more significant runway and taxiway infrastructure (all the things that won't be part of the future expansion at Lake Elmo) – is that you have a service provider at those airports that can accommodate the needs of not only the passengers but the aircraft itself. He reported that we don't even have jet fuel at Lake Elmo today, nor will we require the operator to have jet fuel for sale if or when this project goes forward. However, he noted, we could have a service provider change in which the current business owner may sell and the new service provider may elect to sell jet fuel to accommodate turboprop aircraft like King Airs, similar to what Governor Dayton flies around. Joe also mentioned that the hangar inventory at the airport wouldn't accommodate a 3M fleet. He said a lot of what's changing in the general aviation (GA) world is similar to computer technology: "If you don't have wireless in a building like this, you're not maximizing the students' learning. Teachers aren't able to use tools to advance the learning process. A lot of the GA airplanes at Lake Elmo today have been in existence for 40-50 years. Not only are some of our pilots retiring, those aircraft are soon going to be in museums as well. The new technology GA airplanes out there – the ones that are made in Duluth like the Cirruses that can be half a million dollars each, you start outfitting them and they can be upwards of three-quarters of a million or a million dollars, these are single-engine, 4-person piston aircraft that can fly ranges – single pilot – 1,000 miles. At an airport like Lake Elmo at 2,850 feet, it's not a real option for them because they can't use their aircraft to max utilization. These improvements will allow us to almost catch up to where the industry is now, with the future evolution of the aircraft as well as the pilot. It's kind of two-pronged. Certainly they can operate at 2,850, but with some of the lighting systems and instrumentation that we don't have, they're having to make a stop in between to get to their destination point. We have several people at the airport now that own these aircraft that are able to make four or five stops in communities that aren't served with commercial air service by basing out of Lake Elmo right now, so we're seeing that population slowly grow. When a hangar does come for sale at Lake Elmo, there are two or three buyers already looking to purchase it so there still is a high demand, quite frankly because we've got a great airport and this is a great community to be part of. Our pilot community that's here, they're here because they want to better understand what the community thinks of your airport because they want to walk down this road together to make it all work. We want to share with*

*you, who we are, and give you a better understanding of the activities that are at the airport and I'm hoping some of the pilots here will share a little about their story and how they use the airport, because it is turning over a leaf from recreational hobby – and we still have a lot of that out there – but a lot of the airplanes are used for a business purpose, and I believe will be going forward in the future.”*

- A number of people have had a lot of questions about the demographics and statistics used. A couple I've heard: "26,000 operations" (landings and takeoffs) and "10-seater" (*Chad Leque clarified "less than 10 seats"*). What is the breakdown of the 26,000, because when I hear a King Air, I know it's a King Air – it makes a huge difference between a recreational Cessna and a King Air. When it comes down to the usage in the area for the noise impact, that differential is night and day. It has to be a minute percentage right now, and when you say that the use is moving from recreational to business use – that's the first time I've ever heard that in these meetings – in terms of going from rec to bus use, a lot of people in this area have homes and have made investments in this area, you're making them based on what the current conditions are, and going from 1% King Air to 20% King Air makes a huge impact on our investments and quality of life from an environmental standpoint. In terms of demographics, I see that big 10-seat, I don't hear a lot of 10-seaters taking off at Lake Elmo, I'd love to know what that breakdown is. *Chad Leque responded, when we talk about those 14 categories we'll evaluate as part of this analysis, one of those is noise. Chad asked the questioner to write down some of these specific things he's interested in and concerned about on a comment card so we can bring it into the environmental analysis. He reminded people that we're at the beginning of this process and these are the kinds of things we want to hear. He acknowledged that noise is an issue people are concerned about, and that the environmental impact categories and noise will definitely be one of the topics at the third public event. Chad explained to the public that by submitting questions and concerns in writing, we can try and hit on some of those things during that meeting.*
- The \$120,000 of property taxes from Airport usage that you quoted earlier – in terms of total operating budget, does any of that comprise money that comes from pass-through [transient] traffic [those who do not lease hangars at the airport]? Do they pay any sort of compensation? What's the breakdown? Do you have an economic model of the airport that's available? *Joe Harris answered that anybody who does business at the airport pays our tenant fixed base operator, who provides the service, who then pays 1.5% of gross receipts to the MAC. This would include those who are coming in and purchasing fuel, maintenance services, and ground handling services, or paying an apron fee (i.e., paying to park their aircraft). Obviously it's complex, is there any way you can just publish the economic model? Joe answered yes, we can put together a pie chart and make that available.*
- You've used words like collaboration and communication and stakeholders. In terms of collaborating with the community, I know from speaking with a lot of people here, a lot of people are upset because it's 13 people on this commission [Community Engagement Panel] but there's really not anyone that's on the other side; well there are a couple people from the other side of the voices. Is there any way to even it out in terms of having some of these questions – there's a couple sticking points, like eliminating jets, if that's a possibility, or keeping the same length – great, we'd love you to improve the airport but can you keep it at the same length? I think there are a lot of people who would buy into that. It's increasing it which would increase new jet traffic, new King Airs, all those kinds of increases are what are really rubbing people the wrong way. You talk about collaboration, is there any way to meet in the middle in a

negotiation? Right now it feels like there's a lot of power on one side and it's "this is what we're going to do but we've got to go through this process." *Chad Leve answered, regarding the composition of the Community Engagement Panel, our intent was to make sure we had all the major stakeholder groups represented. Really, an important part of the process/intent of this group was to make sure the flow of information was getting to the right people. They are ambassadors to the process from their respective stakeholder groups. Those meetings are open to the public – they are not closed meetings. Chad continued, saying "I heard you say collaborating and then you mentioned not extending the runway. Going back to the mission the MAC has as an organization, we're looking at the existing airport infrastructure. If you go back to our statutory mandate to provide efficient, effective and safe infrastructure within the metro area for air transportation, as part of the purpose and need process we are going to vet what is really needed at the airport. What's the purpose of what we're doing? Do we need the extra runway length to be sure we're providing adequate services to ensure effective, efficient and safe operations at the airport? The LTCP evaluated that and demonstrated that, although the FAA advisory circulars say that based on the design aircraft, we could go up to 3,900 feet, in terms of providing real utility, the planning process brought it back to 3,600 feet. We went through the LTCP process and there was discussion and dialogue with the community, a lot of concern about intersecting Neal Ave. at a new location with 30<sup>th</sup> St. We cut another 100 feet off the runway extension, all while trying to stay true to what the legislature tells MAC it's supposed to be doing. I'm not suggesting that you were suggesting this, but I don't know that it's fair to say that in this case, effective collaboration somehow equates to no runway extension."* I don't mean to say that, but in terms of the legislative mandate you have, there's a difference between operating a safe environment for recreational flyers versus growing it to accommodate business travel, as your person said. *Chad responded, saying, "I think it's important to point out what is in the statement that Joe Harris made regarding business use in terms of the significance of that, and the impact of noise: A Cirrus aircraft is a 4-person airplane; a high-wing Cessna 172 is a 4-person airplane – the GA small aircraft. What Joe was saying is that with new technology in those small, composite airplanes, you can start to get speeds at altitude that make them very useful for longer-range flights. But the noise impact on the ground is really no different than the high-wing Cessna 172. It's a similar discussion we're having at MSP with advanced system airframe technology and engine technology and noise – bigger doesn't always mean noisier. In the case of Lake Elmo Airport, it's not a build-it-and-they-will-come scenario for bigger airplanes. It's a build-it-to-get-better-service-to-those-that-are-there scenario when you look at it in the long run. The design family of aircraft is not changing. It is what it is today out there. We might see some shifting – but not seismic – a shift in the demographic of aircraft. But it's really about making sure that we're being responsible as an organization in meeting that efficiency and safety component of the service we're supposed to provide to the flying public."*

- I'm a pilot from Lake Elmo Airport and I just wanted to put a face to an airport tenant. I know I may not be the most popular person here, but I'll do my best. I'm a second-generation pilot. My father was a pilot – not professionally – but for his business. I just want to throw out there the business example. He had a consulting engineering business as an environmental engineer serving small communities, working on water treatment facilities around the five-state area. He used a small jet to fly him and his engineer around to these small towns to serve them. The small aircraft was not a King Air – it was either a Cessna 172 or a Bonanza or something smaller – single-engine aircraft. It's just an example that when we talk about the business traveler –

people may not necessarily understand that the business traveler may be in a small aircraft, and that's understandable. But I'm telling you it is true in my particular case. Subsequently, we located our medical design and manufacturing company in Stillwater, specifically so we had access to a local airport to fly a small aircraft to serve local community hospitals in the five-state area. I just wanted to give a counter example – a real-world example that does exist. I do appreciate and understand your concerns of the large aircraft, and I would share that concern as well; I think it's reasonable to be concerned. I just want to say that when you're looking at commerce, it's not necessarily big aircraft. It might be the Cessna 172, the Bonanza, the Cirrus – small aircraft, 4- to 6-seat, single-engine, relatively quiet aircraft – just to put a face on that. The other thing I wanted to mention, and John Renwick is here – he's on the Community Engagement Panel – and he and I spend a lot of time figuring out and talking about how we can collaborate as stakeholders to be respectful to the community with respect to airport noise. We are very sensitive to that as well and we want to do everything within our power to positively impact operational things we can do to reduce the impact of noise. I live right by Hwy 95 and every spring the motorcycles come up and I call the sheriff pretty much every weekend because they're heading through town with vehicles that are intentionally modified to be loud. That's what really infuriates me. This is not commerce, this is somebody who intentionally modified their vehicle to be loud, which I feel is very disrespectful. As pilots, we do our best to be respectful of the community and will continue to do so regardless of this plan, to look at what we can do from an operational perspective to reduce the impacts. If you have feedback, we'd love to hear from you. If there's a particular loud aircraft you hear every Saturday morning at 6 a.m., let us know, because we can actually go talk to them and suggest they do it at 7 or 8 a.m. Even though there might not be a way of restricting that behavior from a legal perspective, normally when you talk to a pilot at Lake Elmo and tell them they're being disrespectful, they change their behavior. That's more of the character of the pilot and operator at Lake Elmo.

- I would like to say under your affected environment bullet points, one of the things you did not address are roadways. And that's what a lot of people in the room have issues with – your reconfiguration of 30<sup>th</sup> Street N. That should be addressed in that topic. And who pays for the road? *Chad Leque responded that, absolutely, roadways will be addressed as part of the alternatives analysis and will be a discussion point.*
- Will property values be addressed? *Chad Leque clarified, "in terms of noise?" In terms of decreased property values because of noise. Chad responded that those are issues we'll have to address – that's typically something that comes up through this process.*
- I think you failed to develop a purpose and a need. You're developing a plan for the future. That plan is to accommodate a different operator that can bring in jet fuel and the runways are designed so you can bring in bigger planes. Fixed-wing aircraft or high-wing aircraft doesn't take that much runway to take-off and land in. *Chad Leque responded that the purpose and need discussion will be a topic of our next public event, so we'll take up that discussion in much more detail in July, and stated that this was a good ending point for the question-and-answer session, as we've reached the end of the meeting time.*

Chad Leque reminded the audience that the project team would be available in the rotunda if anyone had further questions or wanted to speak one-on-one.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:10 p.m.