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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:**

- Provide background information on the proposed action and planned environmental analysis to be undertaken at Crystal Airport (MIC).
- Seek input from regulatory agencies to incorporate into the project Scope of Work.

**Items discussed were as follows:**

After introduction of participants, Evan Barrett provided an overview of Crystal Airport and the proposed actions. Lindsay Butler asked what the purpose of the proposed non-aeronautical development was. Evan Barrett explained that, as there is adequate capacity to meet the demand of aeronautical use, and the area has good potential for development, the MAC is looking to enhance revenue generation at the airport. Chad Leqve explained that the MAC is developing a master plan for non-aeronautical development across all MAC airports, so a global document addressing this question will be available in the future. Lindsay Butler noted that for the FAA to approve a land release, a
reasonably foreseeable use should be identified for FAA’s evaluation. Neil Ralston responded that to the MAC can provide more specifics for potential MIC development. Gina Mitchell explained that the FAA needs to know why the land should not be preserved long-term for aeronautical use. She said that while there is no additional hangar demand at this time there could be in the future; there is a finite amount of land at the airport and trends may change in the future. If, for example, the topography of the site makes it unsuitable for aeronautical use, this would be a relevant reason. Evan Barrett responded that one of the purposes of the EA would be to further define this use. Josh Fitzpatrick noted that this could likely be addressed with a Categorical Exclusion in the future if it cannot be covered in the EA now.

Evan Barrett then discussed the purpose and need, alternatives, and planned environmental analysis. Neil Ralston asked which forecast years would be used for the noise modeling. Chad Leqve asked the FAA representatives what their preference was. Lindsay Butler responded that they require the most recent full calendar year plus five years. Evan Barrett noted that in the recent Lake Elmo noise modeling, five years after project implementation was used. Lindsay Butler responded that this was fine, as there will be a change in the operational use of the airport.

Gina Mitchell asked if Crystal Airport already has zoning in place. Evan Barrett responded yes. Neil Ralston noted it was approved by a Joint Airport Zoning Board (JAZB) in 1983, and that the full ordinance is included in the Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) appendix.

Lindsay Butler asked if the environmental documents or request for comments would be released in languages other than English. Evan Barrett said that was yet to be determined. Gina Mitchell asked Dan Olson if the City of Crystal ever conducts outreach or publishes documents in alternate languages. Dan Olson responded that the City only uses English for public engagement. Dana Nelson explained that a community engagement panel was being formed to reach residents from different communities and the need for publishing the document or outreach materials in other languages would be a good question for this group. Gina Mitchell responded that some communities may be hard to reach with that type of engagement, and that other efforts may need to occur, such as reaching out to religious organizations or community groups in the area. Chad Leqve asked the FAA representatives if the engagement panel is well represented enough to answer the question of the need for publishing in different languages. Lindsay Butler suggested looking at the census data and said if a population likely to speak another language exceeded five percent of the population, it may be useful to publish an executive summary in that language. Chad Leqve asked the FAA representatives what the standard is. Gina Mitchell asked for the MAC to consider it, review the census data and provide a proposal for the FAA to react to. Chad Leqve suggested taking census data to the engagement panel to get their reaction, and then taking their proposal to the FAA. FAA representatives agreed.

Josh Fitzpatrick asked if the tree clearing referenced as part of the vegetation management section of the EA would use the same methodology as Lake Elmo. Neil Ralston explained that the methodology used was in the ALP that is currently with the FAA for review, and that it does include the same strategies as Lake Elmo: a combination of 2.5 feet per year plus actual survey/analysis.

Josh Fitzpatrick asked if the wetland section will consider runoff and retention, and suggested a focus on avoidance and minimization before mitigation when it comes to wetlands. Evan Barrett noted that alternatives can consider modified concepts if wetlands are an issue, except for the location of the main
runway blast pad conversion, which would be more difficult to modify even if wetlands are present. Dan Olson pointed out that Three Rivers Park District is doing improvements to MAC Park, which may include some wetland work.

Josh Fitzpatrick asked if there are new plans for runoff detention, and what the wildlife implications would be. Evan Barrett and Chad Leqve responded the team will look at that during the project and noted that the watershed district had been invited to this agency scoping meeting and, while unable to attend, provided some feedback the team will be considering.

Evan Barrett then outlined the project schedule. Josh Fitzpatrick asked if the FAA would see the Purpose and Need soon. Evan responded they would have it by the end of the week.

Evan Barrett then opened up the meeting for a general discussion and Q&A.

Lindsay Butler asked the MAC representatives if they have been contacted by the FAA Safety personnel about the Runway Safety Action Team (RSAT) and any action items for this year. Neil responded he has not been contacted but will check with other MAC staff to find out if anyone else has been contacted.

Lindsay Butler suggested that the FAA air traffic organization be informed of the Crystal proposal, as well as other FAA lines of business. Chad Leqve agreed and suggested that this should be done soon. Evan and Neil agreed. Lindsay Butler suggested sitting down with ATC personnel after FAA ADO staff have commented on the draft Airport Layout Plan. Gina Mitchell suggested this should occur prior to the ALP airspace review. Neil Ralston also explained the MAC may need assistance from the ADO staff in coordinating with FAA Flight Procedures on the procedures for Runway 32R, as it needs to be carefully designed to avoid conflicts with MSP. Neil noted they are often busy publishing new procedures and so it can be hard to get them to look at drafts of future procedures. Gina Mitchell noted the FAA is working toward an improved internal process and that more internal FAA lines of business need to get involved with this one than usual. This input should be integrated into the EA as efficiently as possible. FAA staff indicated they understand the urgency of the project and are making it a priority. Neil Ralston responded that FAA input would be welcome.

Representatives from the FAA noted they are working on reviewing the submitted ALP, and noted a desire to make sure the EA accurately reflects the near-term proposal. There is a meeting later in February to discuss any issues with the ALP.

Chad Leqve mentioned that there may be homes within the 65 DNL contour and that, if so, the MAC would conduct monitoring of internal sound levels to see if any mitigation is needed. The likelihood that levels would be high enough to trigger mitigation is low. The FAA staff concurred with this plan. Gina Mitchell further added that, in terms of additional languages possibly needed for the outreach, it may be helpful to look at the languages spoken in any homes within the 65 DNL. She suggested that the local school districts and/or the EJ Screening tool on the EPA website may be helpful in identifying this information.

Lindsay Butler asked if there is a funding plan for specific project components. Evan Barrett replied he believed it was laid out in the LTCP. Gina Mitchell said they are looking for more detailed funding splits
and said she wasn’t aware that there’s been that much definition yet. Gina noted the FAA is updating project needs for the next three years in the spring, and it would be useful to know what portion of improvements, such as the apron expansion, that the FAA, state, and other sources are expected to fund. Lindsay Butler suggested estimating a needed amount for noise mitigation for the 2021 or 2022 budget so that it is considered when formulating budgets, just to be on the safe side. Chad Leqve noted that based on years of monitoring noise at and around MIC, he felt there was a very low chance of finding homes that require mitigation. Dan Olson noted the MAC had been out to speak with the City and projected that no mitigation would be needed, and the City is on-board with this approach. The houses in the 65 DNL contour are the same age as those in Eden Prairie near Flying Cloud, who did not test above the interior threshold for mitigation. Lindsay Butler advised MAC staff to be prepared to answer why they are not going to the 60 DNL contour for purposes of noise mitigation, since that’s what the MAC uses for MSP. Chad Leqve responded that the MAC is well-prepared to answer this question.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:00 a.m.
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Crystal Airport
Federal Environmental Assessment (EA)/
State Environmental Assessment (EAW) Worksheet

February 12, 2018 – Agency Scoping Meeting
EA/EAW Scope Review
Agenda

• Introductions
• Airport Overview
• Proposed Action
• Purpose & Need
• Alternatives
• Planned environmental analysis
• Project schedule
• Discussion
Airport Overview
Primary Role of Crystal Airport

- Complimentary Reliever in the MAC system
- Accommodates Personal, Recreational, and some Business Aviation users
- Design Aircraft is and will continue to be small, propeller driven aircraft with < 10 passenger seats
- Role not expected to change in forecast period
Ultimate Airport Layout

Proposed Action

- Decommission Runway 14R/32L and convert to parallel taxiway
- Convert portions of Runway 14L/32R blast pads to usable runway
- Reduce length of turf Runway 06R/24L
- Establish non-precision LNAV instrument approach to Runway 32R
- Taxiway improvements and removals
- Expand fixed base operator (FBO) apron
- Construct segments of perimeter road around runway ends
- Develop land for non-aeronautical use along 63rd Avenue North
Purpose and Need

The **Purpose** of the project at Crystal Airport is to pursue the following goals:

1) Better align airfield infrastructure to match existing and forecasted activity levels.
2) Preserve and improve operational capabilities for the design aircraft family.
3) Enhance safety by simplifying the runway taxiway layout.

The **Need** for the project at Crystal Airport is to achieve the following objectives:

1) Simplify airfield geometry.
2) Provide the required runway length for design aircraft needs.
3) Establish non-precision GPS approaches to both ends of Runway 14L/32R.
4) Improve airport ground vehicle circulation.
5) Increase aircraft parking apron capacity.
6) Allow development of surplus Airport property for non-aeronautical use.
Alternatives

- No-Action Alternative
- Off-site Alternatives
- 2025 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) Alternatives
- Refinements to 2025 LTCP Preferred Alternative recommended by 2035 LTCP
Planned Environmental Analysis

- Air quality modeling
- Aircraft noise modeling
- DOT Section 4(f) resource review
- Hazardous materials inventory
- Historic/architectural and archeological resource assessment
- Land use compatibility and zoning assessment
- Socioeconomics and environmental justice analysis
- Vegetation management strategies
- Wetland delineation
- Other NEPA categories
Figure ES-8: 2035 Final Preferred Alternative RPZs, Safety Zones, and Noise Contours

Safety Zones are modeled consistent with the 1983 Crystal Airport Zoning Ordinance. The sizes, shapes, and/or locations of these zones may be revised by the Joint Airport Zoning Board during an update of the Zoning Ordinance.

Figure 2-10: Airport Drainage and Wetlands
Project Timeline

Project Elements

- Project Kick-Off
- Purpose & Need
- Alternatives Analysis
- Affected Environment
- Environmental Effects
- Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Plans
- Preliminary Federal EA/State EAW Review - FAA & MAC
- Draft Federal EA/State EAW Public & Agency Review
- Respond to Comments & Prepare Final Federal EA/State EAW

Meetings & Workshops

- Public Event
- Airport Community Panel (ACP) Meeting

**Notes:** Schedule updated January 8, 2018. Subject to change. Assessment of environmental effects dependant on suitable weather for field work.
Discussion/Questions

• Please send written comments to:
  • Metropolitan Airports Commission
    Attn: Chad Leqve
    6040 28th Avenue South
    Minneapolis MN, 55450

• If you have questions regarding the project, please contact Chad Leqve at 612.725.6326, or chad.leqve@mspmac.org
Sarah Emmel

From: Leqve, Chad <Chad.Leqve@mspmac.org>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2018 1:17 PM
To: 'Ed A. Matthiesen'
Cc: Judie Anderson; Mark Ray (mark.ray@crystalmn.gov); Evan Barrett; Nelson, Dana; Ralston, Neil
Subject: RE: Crystal Airport-Federal EA/State EAW Agency Scoping Meeting

Ed,

Thank you for the guidance in your email below. We will proceed accordingly and contact you with any questions.

Again, thank you.

Chad

From: Ed A. Matthiesen [mailto:ematthiesen@wenck.com]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 9:19 AM
To: Leqve, Chad <Chad.Leqve@mspmac.org>
Cc: Judie Anderson <judie@jass.biz>; Mark Ray (mark.ray@crystalmn.gov) <mark.ray@crystalmn.gov>
Subject: FW: Crystal Airport-Federal EA/State EAW Agency Scoping Meeting

I am the Engineer for the Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission. Regarding the upcoming Environmental Assessment for the proposed plan for the Crystal airport I have the following comments regarding stormwater management:

1. Any new impervious surface area should meet the Commission rules for stormwater runoff rate, volume and water quality. In working with MAC on previous projects we understand that open water that encourages bird habitat is an aviation hazard so we are willing to work with you on alternatives.
2. We would like to get all of the site up to current standards but we are willing to consider crediting removed pavement for new pavement as an option.
3. Due to the sandy soils we would allow a Best Management Practice of four times the area of turf to one unit of pavement. By observation there is a lot of open grassed space so if flow can be directed to those areas the Commission rules should be met.
4. Any piped or channeled stormwater flow must meet Commission rules prior to exiting your property.
5. If you will be preparing a grading/drainage plan or stormwater concept plan we’d be happy to meet with you to discuss our rules and possibly save you some time in your plan preparation and permitting.

Sincerely,
Ed Matthiesen, P.E.
Commission Engineer
Josh Fitzpatrick  
Federal Aviation Administration  
Dakota-Minnesota Airports District Office  
6020 28th Avenue South, Suite 102  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55450-2700

Re: Agency Scoping for the Crystal Airport Improvements Project Environmental Assessment, Crystal, Hennepin County, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Fitzpatrick:

EPA has reviewed the referenced project scoping document, dated January 23, 2018, which was prepared by the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC), in coordination with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Our comments are provided pursuant to our authorities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The proposed project involves the following improvements:

- Decommission Runway 14R/32L into a parallel taxiway;
- Convert portions of Runway 14L/32R blast pads into usable runway;
- Reduce the length of Runway 06R/24L to clear Taxiways D and F from the runway safety area (RSA);
- Establish non-precision instrument approach to Runway 32R;
- Perform various taxiway improvements;
- Expand the fixed base operator aircraft parking apron;
- Construct segments of a perimeter road around each runway end; and
- Develop airport land for non-aeronautical use along 63rd Avenue North.

We have some general recommendations that we believe will assist the development of the draft environmental assessment (EA), including comments on stormwater management and transportation resiliency, air quality strategies, recycling, energy efficiency, pollinators, native plant species, and right-of-way maintenance, and consultation records, as stated below.

Stormwater Management and Transportation Resiliency

One-hundred-year storm events are occurring with increasing frequency. The number of storm events occurring with greater intensity is also increasing. We recommend that FAA account for increased storm frequency and intensity in the design of this project in order to help ensure the health and safety of the public by using appropriate airport-specific stormwater management designs.
Air Quality Strategies
We recommend FHWA consider implementing air quality best management practices (BMPs) during the construction phase of this project. Several recommendations are included in an enclosure entitled, *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emission Reduction Checklist.*

Recycling
To the maximum extent possible, we recommend FAA consider reusing or recycling scrap material associated with the proposed taxiway removals and taxiway improvements.

Energy Efficiency
We recommend FAA consider installing energy-efficient airfield lighting.

*Pollinators, Native Plant Species, and Right-of-Way Maintenance*
We encourage FAA to implement the 2014 Presidential Memorandum (PM) entitled, "Creating a Federal Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators," which responds to evidence of steep declines in certain pollinator populations. Pollinators are critical contributors to our nation's economy, food system, and environmental health. Vegetation within the project area can provide much needed habitat for pollinators, providing food, shelter, and connections to other patches of habitat. Maintenance staff and landscape designers can all take steps to improve the quality of vegetation to benefit pollinators, steps that can also reduce costs, maintain public safety, and improve public good will. We recognize that any habitat that is created or preserved at or near the airport must conform to FAA practices to minimize the risk of wildlife hazards to aircraft.

*Consultation Records*
EPA recommends attaching consultation documents to future NEPA documents regarding wetlands and streams (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers), historic resources (Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office), and Federal and state threatened and endangered species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, respectively).

We are available to discuss these comments on the scoping document at your convenience. Please feel free to contact Mike Sedlacek of my staff at 312-886-1765, or by email at sedlacek.michael@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kenneth A. Westlake, Chief
NEPA Implementation Section
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance

Encl: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Diesel Emission Reduction Checklist

cc: Chad Leqve, Metropolitan Airports Commission

1 www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/presidential-memoranda
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency - Diesel Emission Reduction Checklist

- Use low-sulfur diesel fuel (15 ppm sulfur maximum) in construction vehicles and equipment.
- Retrofit engines with an exhaust filtration device to capture diesel particulate matter before it enters the construction site.
- Position the exhaust pipe so that diesel fumes are directed away from the operator and nearby workers, reducing the fume concentration to which personnel are exposed.
- Use catalytic converters to reduce carbon monoxide, aldehydes, and hydrocarbons in diesel fumes. These devices must be used with low sulfur fuels.
- Use enclosed, climate-controlled cabs pressurized and equipped with high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters to reduce the operators' exposure to diesel fumes. Pressurization ensures that air moves from inside to outside. HEPA filters ensure that any incoming air is filtered first.
- Regularly maintain diesel engines, which is essential to keep exhaust emissions low. Follow the manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule and procedures. Smoke color can signal the need for maintenance. For example, blue/black smoke indicates that an engine requires servicing or tuning.
- Reduce exposure through work practices and training, such as turning off engines when vehicles are stopped for more than a few minutes, training diesel-equipment operators to perform routine inspection, and maintaining filtration devices.
- Repower older vehicles and/or equipment with diesel- or alternatively-fueled engines certified to meet newer, more stringent emissions standards. Purchase new vehicles that are equipped with the most advanced emission control systems available.
- Use electric starting aids such as block heaters with older vehicles to warm the engine reduces diesel emissions.
- Use respirators, which are only an interim measure to control exposure to diesel emissions. In most cases, an N95 respirator is adequate. Workers must be trained and fit-tested before they wear respirators. Depending on work being conducted, and if oil is present, concentrations of particulates present will determine the efficiency and type of mask and respirator. Personnel familiar with the selection, care, and use of respirators must perform the fit testing. Respirators must bear a NIOSH approval number.
- Per Executive Order 13045 on Children's Health\(^2\), EPA recommends operators and workers pay particular attention to worksite proximity to places where children live, learn, and play, such as homes, schools, daycare centers, and playgrounds. Diesel emission reduction measures should be strictly implemented near these locations in order to be protective of children's health.

\(^2\) Children may be more highly exposed to contaminants because they generally eat more food, drink more water, and have higher inhalation rates relative to their size. Also, children's normal activities, such as putting their hands in their mouths or playing on the ground, can result in higher exposures to contaminants as compared with adults. Children may be more vulnerable to the toxic effects of contaminants because their bodies and systems are not fully developed and their growing organs are more easily harmed. EPA views childhood as a sequence of life stages, from conception through fetal development, infancy, and adolescence.