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• Environmental review process
• Stakeholder engagement process
• Draft EA/EAW document – key components
• Public comments
Environmental Review Process

• Federal and state environmental review is required before the project can be funded and implemented

• Federal environmental review
  • The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the responsible agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
  • The FAA determined that an Environmental Assessment (EA) is the appropriate federal review document for this project

• State environmental review
  • The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is the responsible government unit under the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA)
  • Minnesota Rules 4410.4300 prescribes completion of an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for this project
  • Minnesota Rules 4410.1300/4410.3900 states that a federal EA can fulfill the informational requirements of a state EAW
Stakeholder Engagement Plan

- The MAC formulated a project-specific stakeholder engagement plan to achieve the following objectives:
  - Strengthen relationships with stakeholders
  - Foster collaboration
  - Build stakeholder trust and support
  - Proactively identify areas of interest and concern
  - Support and document a thorough and effective process
  - Formalize a system for reaching a wide variety of stakeholders
  - Develop a model for future similar processes
  - Create opportunities for MAC Board members to recognize stakeholder engagement in the EA/EAW process
  - Streamline agency review
Interested Public – Outreach Platforms

• Three public events held at key milestones in the EA/EAW process
  • May 11, 2017: Introduction to the Environmental Review Process
  • August 17, 2017: Purpose & Need and Alternatives
  • November 6, 2017: Environmental Effects

• Periodic project newsletters and process updates

• Project website

• E-news subscription list

• Public notifications
Community Engagement Panel (CEP)

- Serves several important functions including:
  - Representing a broad range of stakeholder groups
  - Receiving information about the EA/EAW and sharing it with constituencies
  - Providing input to the EA/EAW as the voice of key stakeholders
  - Providing technical advice to the consultant team
- Five CEP meetings held during development of the draft EA/EAW
Original Preferred Alternative

Refined Preferred Alternative

LTCP Community Input
Stakeholder Input & Concerns
Carefully Considered During EA/EAW Development

• **Concern:** The plan is outdated.
  • Made several adjustments during the LTCP process to reflect current needs and stakeholder concerns.

• **Concern:** Estimates of existing aircraft activity levels are inaccurate.
  • Re-evaluated LTCP operations forecast for EA/EAW using latest and most comprehensive available activity data.

• **Concern:** The project is not needed.
  • Re-evaluated LTCP runway length analysis for EA/EAW.
  • Graphically depicted the runway length evaluation for easier understanding.

• **Concern:** The airport and this project do not benefit the surrounding community.
  • Airport contributes to the local and regional economy in several ways.
  • Airport tenants participate in community-focused activities.
  • More information provided in response to FAQ on project website.

• **Concern:** Realignment of 30th Street N will disrupt emergency response times and pose safety concerns to travelers.
  • Studied additional alignment alternatives and safety enhancements (paved shoulders, guardrails, snowdrift management, etc.)
  • Met with local emergency response experts to better understand effects of alternatives.

• **Concern:** The project costs too much, is fiscally irresponsible, and will increase local taxes.
  • Project will be self-funded by aviation users through state and federal programs, as well as MAC funds.
  • No local sales or property taxes will be used.
Stakeholder Input & Concerns
Carefully Considered During EA/EAW Development

**Concern:** Additional air traffic and associated noise levels will negatively affect airport neighbors.
- Re-evaluated LTCP operations forecast for EA/EAW and confirmed air traffic increase will be minimal.
- Studied a displaced threshold alternative in EA/EAW.
- Conducted new noise analysis with latest FAA software.
- Met one-on-one with several airport neighbors to discuss noise issues.
- Provided pilot briefing on noise abatement procedures.
- Installed noise abatement signs on airfield.
- MAC will establish an airport advisory committee and update the airport’s voluntary noise abatement plan in collaboration with the committee.

**Concern:** The project will negatively affect property values and quality of life.
- Aircraft flight patterns will not change significantly.
- Airport’s role will not change.
- Project will not result in significant air traffic increases.
- More information provided in response to FAQ on project website.

**Concern:** Environmental impacts to wetlands, wildlife habitats, and trees will be unacceptable.
- Analyzed impacts to these resources extensively in EA/EAW.
- MAC is considering establishment of tall-grass prairie habitat in area south of the new runway.
Stakeholder Input & Concerns
Carefully Considered During EA/EAW Development

- **Concern:** FAA could consider waiver of runway protection zone requirements.
  - Studied alternatives with roads and/or railroads in the RPZ.
  - Confirmed with FAA that they will require clear RPZ.

- **Concern:** Future airport safety zoning will negatively affect airport neighbors.
  - Studied model state safety zones in EA/EAW.
  - MAC will convene a Joint Airport Zoning Board (JAZB).
  - JAZB will consider further public input prior to adoption of an ordinance.

- **Concern:** Proposed airfield lighting will negatively affect motorists and airport neighbors.
  - Several potential mitigation measures identified in EA/EAW.

- **Concern:** Public engagement has been inadequate.
  - Established project-specific stakeholder engagement plan to ensure effective communication and information-sharing.
  - Convened community engagement panel and held several public events.
  - Met one-on-one with several airport neighbors.
  - Revised public information materials/messages based on questions/concerns.
  - Changed CEP meeting format to include public comment.
  - Hired public meeting facilitator.
  - More information available on the project website.
Draft EA/EAW – Key Components

• Purpose & Need
• Alternatives Analysis
• Environmental Effects
Purpose and Need

The **Purpose** of the project at Lake Elmo Airport is to pursue the following broader goals:

1) Address failing end-of-life infrastructure  
2) Enhance safety for airport users and the general public  
3) Improve facilities for the aircraft operating at the airport  

The **Need** for the project at Lake Elmo Airport is based on the following specific objectives:

1) Improve the runway pavement conditions  
2) Minimize incompatible land uses in the runway protection zones (RPZs)  
3) Meet runway length needs for users  
4) Upgrade the instrument approach procedures
Range of Alternatives Considered

• Five categories of alternative concepts are considered by the EA/EAW:
  • No-Action Alternative
  • Primary Runway 14/32 Alternatives
  • 30\textsuperscript{th} Street North Realignment Alternatives
  • Crosswind Runway 04/22 Alternatives
  • Instrument Approach Alternatives
Primary Runway 14/32 Alternatives Evaluation Process

A. Criteria for Identifying Range of Alternatives
   - Avoid or minimize changes to airport use and aircraft flight patterns
   - Maintain runway orientations
   - Avoid or minimize land acquisition

B. Criteria for Screening Range of Alternatives
   - Compatible with a viable 30th Street N. realignment alternative
   - Meet the Purpose and Need
   - Conform to FAA policies

C. Criteria for Identifying Preferred Alternative
   - Practicability factors
   - Environmental factors

D. Preferred Alternative
   - For Evaluation Purposes Only

No Action Alternative
Proposed Development
"Preferred Alternative"
Environmental Effects
Overview

- NEPA categories considered in detail
  - Air quality
  - Biological resources
  - Cultural resources
  - Farmlands
  - Hazardous materials & solid waste
  - Land Use
  - Noise
  - Visual effects
  - Water resources

- Other NEPA categories
  - Climate
  - Coastal resources
  - DOT Section 4(f)
  - Natural resources and energy supply
  - Socioeconomics
# Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Analysis Category</th>
<th>Effects: Baseline Alternative (No Expansion Alternative)</th>
<th>Effects: Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>Required Permitting, Mitigation, and/or Associated Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Minimal impacts during construction</td>
<td>Implement EPA-recommended best management practices (BMPs) and control strategies during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources (including fish, wildlife, and plants)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Tree removal</td>
<td>- Tree removal to occur during NLEB dormant season (October 1 – April 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Implement April 2015 USFWS/USDOT NLEB avoidance and minimization measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Implement MnDNR Blanding’s turtle avoidance measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Resources</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT Section 4(f) Lands</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmlands</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>42.28 acres directly converted</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Dispose of construction materials and other solid waste in accordance with state and local laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Analysis Category</th>
<th>Effects: Baseline Alternative (No Expansion Alternative)</th>
<th>Effects: Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>Required Permitting, Mitigation, and/or Associated Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Hand-cut trees near archeological building foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Potential Zoning Conflicts</td>
<td>Potential Zoning Conflicts</td>
<td>Convene Joint Airport Zoning Board (JAZB) to develop an Airport Zoning Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Transportation</td>
<td>RPZ Conflicts</td>
<td>Increased travel time on 30th Street</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Attractants</td>
<td>Wetlands near runway approach</td>
<td>Wetlands near runway approach</td>
<td>Use FAA-approved seed mixes in turf grass areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources and Energy Supply</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and Compatible Land Use</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Establish airport advisory commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update voluntary noise abatement plan and hold educational briefings with pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Analysis Category</th>
<th>Effects: Baseline Alternative (No Expansion Alternative)</th>
<th>Effects: Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>Required Permitting, Mitigation, and/or Associated Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Visual Effects** (including airfield lighting) | None | New airfield light system | - Install light baffles for RELs  
- Install solid fencing in runway approaches  
- Implement low, medium, and high intensity light settings to reduce frequency of light emissions |
| **Water Resources** | | | |
| **Wetlands** | None | 2.36 acres direct wetland impact | - Compensatory Mitigation Plan (assume impact will be banked)  
- USACOE 404 Army Corps Permit  
- Compliance with Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act  
- MnDNR Public Waters permit |
| **Stormwater** | None | 12.6 acres increased impervious area | - Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan  
- On-Site Best Management Practices  
- MPCA CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification and NPDES permit  
- VBWD permit |
| **Floodplains** | None | 0.06-acre wetland fill in floodplain | VBWD Permit |
| **Cumulative Impacts** | No substantial impacts | No substantial impacts | None |
Public Comments

• Spoken comments will be recorded at the public hearing tonight.
• Written comments will be accepted until April 19, 2018.
• All spoken and written comments received during the official comment period will be included in an appendix to the Final EA/EAW.
• Written responses to each comment will be provided in the Final EA/EAW.
  • Similar comments on a common theme may be grouped together and addressed with one collective response.
Public Comments

• If you wish to speak:
  • Please complete a speaker sign-up card and provide to a staff member.
  • The hearing officer will call your name when it is your turn.
  • Please limit your comments to five minutes or less.

• Written comments will be accepted until April 19, 2018, and can be submitted:
  • In-person tonight
  • Via electronic mail to: Chad.leqve@mspmac.org.
  • Via postal mail to:
    Chad Leqve, Director of Environment
    Metropolitan Airports Commission
    6040 28th Ave S
    Minneapolis, MN 55450