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Glossary of Terms

A-Weighted Decibels (dBA): A measure of noise levels adjusted relative to the frequencies most audible to the human ear.

Above Ground Level (AGL): A height above the ground as opposed to above Mean Sea Level (MSL).

Accelerate-Stop Distance: The runway length declared available and suitable for the acceleration and deceleration of an aircraft aborting a takeoff.

Advisory Circular: External publications issued by the FAA consisting of non-regulatory material providing for the recommendations relative to a policy and guidance and information relative to a specific aviation subject.

Aircraft Approach Category (AAC): An alphabetic classification of aircraft based upon 1.3 times the stall speed in a landing configuration at their maximum certified landing weight. The categories are as follows:

- Category A: Approach speed less than 91 knots
- Category B: Approach speed 91 knots or more but less than 121 knots
- Category C: Approach speed 121 knots or more but less than 141 knots
- Category D: Approach speed 141 knots or more but less than 166 knots
- Category E: Approach speed 166 knots or more

Airplane Design Group (ADG): A classification of aircraft based on wingspan and tail height. The groups are as follows:

- Group I: Wingspan up to but not including 49 feet or tail height up to but not including 20 feet
- Group II: Wingspan 49 feet up to but not including 79 feet or tail height from 20 feet up to but not including 30 feet
- Group III: Wingspan 79 feet up to but not including 118 feet or tail height from 30 feet up to but not including 45 feet
- Group IV: Wingspan 118 feet up to but not including 171 feet or tail height from 45 feet up to but not including 60 feet
- Group V: Wingspan 171 feet up to but not including 214 feet or tail height from 60 feet up to but not including 66 feet
- Group VI: Wingspan 214 feet up to but not including 262 feet or tail height from 66 feet up to but not including 80 feet

Aircraft Operation: The landing, takeoff, or touch-and-go procedure by an aircraft on a runway at an airport.
Airport Classifications: Definitions of airport classifications vary by agency. Classifications relevant to the Crystal Airport are highlighted in bold text.

- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) General Aviation Airport Classifications:
  - National: National airports support the national and state system by providing communities with access to national and international markets. They accommodate a full range of aviation activity including large corporate jet and multi-engine aircraft operations, significant charter passenger services, or all-cargo operations. They often work in conjunction with, and in support of, hub airports serving the aviation needs of larger metropolitan areas.
  - Regional: Regional airports support regional economies by connecting communities to statewide and interstate markets. These airports accommodate a full range of regional and local business activities, limited scheduled passenger service, or cargo operations. They serve corporate jet and multi-engine aircraft, as well as single-engine propeller aircraft.
  - Local: Local airports supplement communities by providing access to primarily intrastate and some interstate markets. These airports accommodate small businesses, flight training, emergency service, charter service, cargo operations, and personal flying activities. They typically accommodate smaller general aviation aircraft.
  - Basic: Basic airports support general aviation activities such as emergency service, charter or critical passenger service, cargo operations, flight training, and personal flying. These airports typically accommodate mostly single-engine propeller aircraft. They may be located in and provide service to remote areas of the United States with limited or no surface transportation options, and therefore may be critical to the transportation of goods required for local day-to-day life.

- Minnesota State Aviation System Plan (SASP) Classifications:
  - Key Airports: These airports have paved and lighted primary runways 5,000 feet or longer in length. They are capable of accommodating all single-engine aircraft along with larger multi-engine aircraft and most corporate jets.
    - Key Airports include Minneapolis-St. Paul International, St. Paul Downtown, Flying Cloud, and Anoka County – Blaine Airports.
  - Intermediate Airports: These airports have paved and lighted runways all of which are between 2,500 and 5,000 feet long. Intermediate airports can accommodate all single engine aircraft, some multi-engine aircraft, and most corporate jets.
    - Intermediate Airports include Airlake, Lake Elmo, and Crystal Airports.
  - Landing Strips: These airports have turf runways which can accommodate most single-engine aircraft and some twin engine aircraft. They may be unusable during wet weather, winter months, and during the spring melt.
• Metropolitan Council Regional Aviation System Plan (RASP) Classifications:
  o Major Airport: An airport with a primary runway length of 8,000 feet or greater with a precision approach. A Major Airport serves a primary air service access area that is international and national in scope. Its role in the airport system is to provide facilities and services primarily to scheduled air carrier and regional commuter users, but also includes air cargo and charter carriers.
    ▪ Major Airports include Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport.
  o Intermediate Airport: An airport with a primary runway length between 5,000 and 8,000 feet with a precision approach. The role of an Intermediate Airport is to provide facilities and services primarily to corporate and business general aviation aircraft. Typical users of these airports fly a variety of business jets, turboprop aircraft, and single- and twin-engine piston aircraft.
    ▪ Intermediate Airports include St. Paul Downtown Airport.
  o Minor Airport: An airport with runways all of which are 5,000 feet in length or less. Their system role is to provide general aviation facilities and services primarily to personal, business, and instructional users. The most common users of these airports fly single-engine and light twin-engine aircraft. Minnesota state statute prohibits upgrading a minor airport to intermediate airport status without legislative approval.
    ▪ Minor Airports include Flying Cloud, Anoka County – Blaine, Airlake, Lake Elmo, and Crystal Airports.
  o Special Purpose Airport: A facility open to public use, including heliports, seaplane bases, or airport landing areas whose primary geographic and service focus is normally state and metropolitan in scope. Personal, business and instruction uses are accommodated at these facilities.

• Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) Reliever Airport Classifications:
  o Primary Relievers: MAC Reliever airports that provide the infrastructure and serves that are key to corporate aviation needs.
    ▪ Primary Relievers include St. Paul Downtown, Flying Cloud, and Anoka County – Blaine Airports.
  o Complimentary Relievers: MAC Reliever airports that provide limited MSP relief and complement the three Primary Relievers by offering options for aviation activity but not to the level of infrastructure and services typically expected at a Primary Reliever.
    ▪ Complimentary Relievers include Airlake, Lake Elmo, and Crystal Airports.

Airport Elevation: The highest point of an airfield’s usable landing area measured in feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL).

Airport Layout Plan (ALP): A scaled drawing of the existing and planned land and facilities necessary for the operation and development of an airport.
Airport Reference Code (ARC): A designation that signifies the airport’s highest Runway Design Code (RDC). The ARC is used for planning and design only and does not limit the aircraft that may be able to operate safely on the airport.

Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC): A facility established to provide air traffic control service to aircraft operating on Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) flight plans within controlled airspace and principally during the en-route phase of flight.

Air Traffic Control (ATC): A service provided for the purpose of promoting the safe, orderly, and expeditious flow of air traffic, including airport, approach, and en-route air traffic control services.

Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT): A structure from which air traffic control personnel control the movement of aircraft on or around the airport.

Annual Service Volume (ASV): The number of annual operations that can be reasonably expected to occur at an airport based on a given level of delay.

Approach Surface: An imaginary obstruction-limiting surface defined in 14 CFR Part 77 which is longitudinally centered on an extended runway centerline and extends outward and upward from the primary surface at each end of a runway at a designated slope and distance based on the type of available or planned approach by aircraft to a runway. See Figure 2-6.

Approach Visibility Minimums: A set of conditions specified for operations of aircraft during Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) weather conditions.

Apron: A specified portion of an airfield used for aircraft parking and the refueling, maintenance, servicing, and loading/unloading of aircraft.

Area Navigation (RNAV): A method of navigation that permits aircraft operations on any desired course within the coverage of station-referenced navigation signals.

Automated Weather Observation System (AWOS): Equipment that takes and broadcasts automated weather readings at an airport.

Average Day Peak Month (ADPM): Defined as peak month passengers or operations divided by the number of days in the month.

Based Aircraft: The general aviation aircraft that use a specific airport as a home base.

Circling Approach: A maneuver initiated by a pilot to align the aircraft with a runway for landing when a straight-in landing from an instrument approach is not possible or is not desirable.
Clear Zone: As defined by MnDOT Aeronautics, Clear Zones off runway ends are intended to enhance operational safety of aircraft and to protect life and property in runway approach areas. The MnDOT Clear Zones have a similar function to, but are not always the same dimensions, as the FAA Runway Protection Zone (RPZ).

Common Traffic Advisory Frequency (CTAF): A radio frequency designated for the purpose of carrying out airport advisory practices while operating to or from an airport without an operating control tower.

Compass Calibration Pad: An airport facility used for calibrating an aircraft compass.

Crosswind Runway: An additional runway at an airport that compensates for primary runways that provide less wind coverage than desired.

Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL): The predicted average sound effect on an area near the airport for a typical 24-hour period. A weighting factor equivalent to a penalty of 10 decibels is applied to aircraft operations occurring between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM.

Decibel (dB): A unit used to measure the intensity of a sound or the power level of an electrical signal by comparing it with a given level on a logarithmic scale.

Declared Distances: Distances for a runway representing the maximum lengths available and suitable for meeting takeoff and landing distance requirements. They are determined in accordance with FAA design standards, with length added to or subtracted from the physical length of the runway to provide standard safety areas and protection zones. As a result, the declared distances for a runway may be more or less than the physical length of the runway depicted on aeronautical charts. There are four defined declared distances:

- Takeoff run available (TORA) – length for the ground run of a departing aircraft;
- Takeoff distance available (TODA) – length through the start of the takeoff climb;
- Accelerate stop distance available (ASDA) – length for acceleration to takeoff speed and then deceleration associated with an aborted takeoff; this is often the longest length for twins and turbines
- Landing distance available – length suitable for landing an aircraft

Design Aircraft: An aircraft with characteristics that determine the application of airport design standards for a specific runway, taxiway, apron, or other facility. This aircraft can be a specific aircraft model or a composite of several aircraft using, expected, or intended to use the airport or part of the airport (also called critical aircraft or critical design aircraft).

Dual Wheel Gear (DW): The configuration of an aircraft landing gear where two wheels are used at each wheel position to support the aircraft load.

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA): The federal agency responsible for the safety and efficiency of the national airspace and air transportation system.
Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR): The general and permanent rules established by the executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government for aviation, which are published in the Federal Register. These are the aviation subset of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Fixed Base Operator (FBO): A commercial business enterprise located on an airport that provides services to pilots including aircraft rental, training, fueling, maintenance, parking, and the sale of pilot supplies. Also known as a Full Service Commercial Operator.

Fleet Mix: A collective term generally used to describe the proportions of aircraft types operating at an airport.

Flight Service Station (FSS): Air traffic facilities which provide pilot briefings, flight plan processing, inflight radio communications, search and rescue (SAR) services, and assistance to lost aircraft and aircraft in emergency situations.

General Aviation: The segment of aviation that encompasses all aspects of civil aviation except for certified air carriers and other commercial operators such as air cargo.

Global Positioning System (GPS): A satellite based navigational system that provides signals in the cockpit of aircraft defining aircraft position in terms of latitude, longitude, and altitude.

Instrument Flight Rules (IFR): Procedures for the conduct of flight in weather conditions below Visual Flight Rule weather minimums. The term IFR is often used to define weather conditions and the type of flight plan under which an aircraft is operating.

Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC): Meteorological conditions expressed in terms of specific visibility and ceiling conditions that are less than the minimums specified for visual meteorological conditions.

Integrated Noise Model (INM): The INM is a computer model that evaluates aircraft noise impacts in the vicinity of airports. It was developed based on the algorithm and framework from the SAE AIR 1845 standard, which uses noise-power-distance (NPD) data to estimate noise accounting for specific operation mode, thrust setting, and source-receiver geometry, acoustic directivity, and other environmental factors.

Itinerant Operation: An aircraft operation where the destination point is greater than 20 miles from the aircraft’s point of origin.

Joint Airport Zoning Board (JAZB): A Joint Airport Zoning Board is comprised of the municipality that owns or controls an airport along with surrounding municipalities within which an airport hazard area may be located. Once formed, the Joint Airport Zoning Board has the power to adopt, administer, and enforce airport zoning regulations applicable to the airport hazard areas in its jurisdiction.
Knots: Nautical miles per hour, equal to 1.15 statute miles per hour.

Lateral Navigation (LNAV): Azimuth navigation without positive vertical guidance. This type of navigation is associated with non-precision approach procedures.

Local Operation: An aircraft operation that remains in the local traffic pattern, executes simulated instrument approaches or low passes at the airport, and operations to or from the airport and a designated practice area within a 20–mile radius of the tower.

Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP): The airport sponsor’s concept of the long-term development and use of an airport’s land and facilities.

MACNOMS: The MAC Noise and Operations Monitoring System collects aircraft noise levels at 39 remote noise monitoring towers located around the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP). In addition, the system collects flight track data to approximately 40 miles around MSP up to 20,000 feet.

Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC): The owner and operator of the Lake Elmo Airport. The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) was created in 1943 by the Minnesota Legislature to promote air transportation in the seven-county metropolitan area.

MIC: The FAA airport location identifier for Crystal Airport.

Microjet: A category of small jet aircraft approved for single-pilot operation, typically seating 4-8 people, with a maximum takeoff weight of under 10,000 pounds. Also referred to as very light jets or personal jets.

Medium Intensity Runway Lights (MIRL): Lights that are located along the edge of a runway to assist pilots in identifying the edge of the surface available for takeoffs and landings.

Modification to Design Standards (MOS): Any approved nonconformance to FAA standards applicable to an airport design, construction, or equipment procurement project that is necessary to accommodate an unusual local condition for a specific project on a case-by-case basis while maintaining an acceptable level of safety.

Mean Seal Level (MSL): A measure used in aviation for pilots to identify the flight or airfield elevation above sea level as opposed to above ground level (AGL).

Movement Area: The runways, taxiways, and other areas of an airport that are used for taxiing or hover taxiing, takeoff, and landing of aircraft including helicopters, exclusive of aprons and aircraft parking areas.

MSP: Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport
National Climatic Data Center (NCDC): The federal agency responsible for preserving, monitoring, assessing, and providing public access to the Nation's climate and historical weather data and information.

National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS): The national airport system plan developed by the Secretary of Transportation on a biannual basis for the development of public use airports to meet national air transportation needs.

Navigational Aid (NAVAID): A visual or electronic facility or device used as, available for use as, or designed for use as an aid to air navigation.

Non-Directional Beacon (NDB): A general purpose, low-frequency radio beacon that can be used by a pilot to determine a bearing from the transmitter.

Non-Precision Approach: A straight-in instrument approach procedure that provides course guidance, without vertical path guidance, with visibility minimums not later than ¾ mile.

Object Free Area (OFA): An area centered on the ground on a runway, taxiway, or taxilane centerline provided to enhance the safety of aircraft operations by remaining clear of objects except for objects that need to be located in the OFA for air navigation or aircraft ground maneuvering purposes.

Obstacle Free Zone (OFZ): The OFZ is the three-dimensional airspace along the runway and extended runway centerline that is required to be clear of obstacles for protection for aircraft landing or taking off from the runway and for missed approaches.

Other-Than-Utility Runway: A runway that is intended to be used by propeller driven aircraft with a maximum gross weight greater than 12,500 pounds and/or jet aircraft of any gross weight.

Part 77: Regulations for the protection of airspace around a public-use civilian or military airport are specified in 14 CFR Part 77 Safe, Efficient Use, and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace. These defined surfaces are used by the FAA to identify obstructions to airspace around an airport facility. Part 77 surfaces are comprised of primary, approach, transitional, horizontal and conical three-dimensional imaginary surfaces.

Pavement Condition Index (PCI): PCI evaluation includes a visual inspection of pavements and assignment of a numerical indicator that reflects the structural and operational condition of the pavement including the type, severity, and quantity of pavement distress.

Precision Approach: An instrument approach procedure that provides course and vertical path guidance with visibility below ¾ mile.

Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI): A navigational aid to visually identify the glideslope to the touchdown zone of the runway.
Primary Runway: A runway constructed to meet airport capacity needs. The design objective for a primary runway is to provide a runway length that will not result in operational weight restrictions.

Primary Surface: An imaginary obstruction limiting surface defined in 14 CFR Part 77 that is specified as a rectangular surface longitudinally centered about a runway. (See Figure 2-7.)

Regular Use: Regular use is considered as at least 500 or more annual itinerant operations of the runway by the critical design aircraft.

Reliever Airport: General Aviation airports in major metropolitan areas that provide pilots with attractive alternatives to using congested hub airports. To be eligible for reliever designation, an airport must be open to the public, have 100 or more based aircraft, or have 25,000 annual itinerant operations.

Remote Transmitter/Receiver (RTR): An air-to-ground communications system having transmitters and/or receivers and other ancillary equipment. These on-airport facilities allow radio communications between a pilot and ATCT and are usually located at non-towered airports.

Runway: A defined rectangular area at an airport designated for the landing and takeoff of an aircraft.

Runway Design Code (RDC): The selected AAC, ADG, and desired approach visibility minimums (in feet of runway visual range) are combined to form the Runway Design Code (RDC) for a particular runway. The RDC is used to determine the standards that apply to a specific runway and parallel taxiway to allow unrestricted operations by the design aircraft under defined meteorological conditions.

Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL): Two synchronized flashing lights, one of each side of a runway threshold, which provide positive identification of the runway approach end.

Runway Object Free Area (ROFA): An area centered on the ground on a runway centerline provided to enhance the safety of aircraft operations by remaining clear of objects, except for objects that need to be located in the ROFA for air navigation or aircraft ground maneuvering purposes.

Runway Object Free Zone (ROFZ): The ROFZ is the three-dimensional airspace along the runway and extended runway centerline that is required to be clear of obstacles for protection for aircraft landing or taking off from the runway and for missed approaches.

Runway Protection Zone (RPZ): An area at ground level prior to the threshold or beyond the runway end to enhance the safety and protection of people and property on the ground.
Runway Safety Area (RSA): A defined surface surrounding the runway prepared or suitable for reducing the risk of damage to aircraft in the event of an undershoot, overshoot, or excursion from the runway.

Runway Visual Range (RVR): An estimate of the maximum distance at which the runway, or the specified lights or markers delineating it, can be seen from a position above a specific point on the runway centerline.

Single Wheel Gear (SW): The configuration of an aircraft landing gear where a single wheel is used at each wheel position to distribute the aircraft load.

Small Aircraft: An aircraft with a maximum certificated takeoff weight of 12,500 pounds or less.

State Airport System Plan (SASP): The primary objective of the Minnesota State Aviation System Plan is to provide the state with excellent planning tools to assist in making informed decisions guiding the development of Minnesota’s system of airports and expending funds in a cost-effective manner.

State Safety Zones: Model standards promulgated by the Minnesota Department of Transportation per Minnesota Administrative Rules Chapter 8800, Section 2400 for the zoning of public airports as to airspace, land use safety, and noise sensitivity. A complete description and copy of the Minnesota Rules (Chapter 8800 Department of Transportation Aeronautics, Section 2400 Airport Zoning Standards) can be accessed via the following website link: https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/?id=8800.2400.

T-Hangar: A linear structure with interior bays that are of a “T” shape and provide shelter for aircraft.

Taxilane: A taxiway designed for low speed and precise taxiing. Taxilanes are usually, but not always, located outside the movement area, providing access from taxeways to aircraft parking positions and other terminal areas.

Taxiway: A defined path established for the taxiing of aircraft from one part of an airport to another.

Taxiway Design Group (TDG): A classification of airplanes based on outer-to-outer main landing gear width and cockpit to main gear distance.

Taxiway/Taxilane Safety Area (TSA): A defined surface alongside the taxiway prepared or suitable for reducing the risk of damage to an aircraft deviating from the taxiway.

Threshold: The beginning of that portion of the runway available for landing. In some cases, the threshold may be displaced from the physical end of the runway.
Touch and Go: A practice maneuver consisting of a landing and a takeoff performed simultaneously without coming to a complete stop. A touch and go is defined as two aircraft operations.

Traffic Pattern: Projections on the ground of the aerial path associated with an aircraft flying the crosswind, downwind, base, and final approach legs of the takeoff and landing process.

Turbine-Powered Aircraft: Aircraft powered by turbine engines including turbojets and turboprops but excluding turbo-shaft, rotary-wing aircraft. Such aircraft normally use Jet-A fuel.

Uncontrolled Airport: An airport without an airport traffic control tower at which the control of Visual Flight Rules (VFR) traffic is not exercised.

Useful Load: The aircraft maximum takeoff weight minus the aircraft empty weight. An aircraft’s useful load can be used to transport either fuel or payload (passengers, baggage, and/or cargo).

Utility Runway: A runway that is constructed for and intended to be used by propeller driven aircraft of 12,500 pounds maximum gross weight and less.

Visual Flight Rules (VFR): Procedures for the conduct of flights in weather conditions above Visual Flight Rules (VFR) weather minimums. The term VFR is often used to define weather conditions and the type of flight plan under which an aircraft is operating.

Visual Meteorological Conditions (VMC): Meteorological conditions expressed in terms of specific visibility and ceiling conditions which are equal to or greater than the threshold values for instrument meteorological conditions.

Visual Runway: A runway without an existing or planned straight-in instrument approach procedure.
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Note: The complete Minneapolis-St. Paul Reliever Airport: Activity Forecasts – Technical Report that contains full forecast development documentation can be downloaded from the MAC website at:

August 7, 2017

Mr. Neil Ralston, A.A.E., Airport Planner
Metropolitan Airports Commission
6040 28th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55450

Crystal Airport (MIC) – Crystal, MN
Approval of Master Plan Forecast & Critical Design Aircraft

Dear Mr. Ralston:

The aviation forecast has been determined to be consistent with the FAA Terminal Area Forecast and is approved. The critical design aircraft is also approved. A summary of this information is provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Case Estimate (2015)</th>
<th>Base Case 20 Year Forecast (2035)</th>
<th>Master Plan Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based Aircraft</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Table 3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Operations</td>
<td>41,838</td>
<td>39,904</td>
<td>Table 3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Design Aircraft</td>
<td>Design Group A/B-II (Small)</td>
<td>Design Group A/B-II (Small)</td>
<td>Section 4.2 &amp; 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Final Draft Master Plan prepared by MAC, draft dated June 5, 2017

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this information further, please feel welcome to contact me at (612) 253-4641 or gina.mitchell@faa.gov.

Sincerely,

Gina M. Mitchell, AICP, Community Planner
Dakota-Minnesota Airports District Office, Minneapolis Office

cc: Phil Tiedeman, Airport Manager (email)
Melissa Underwood, Bolton & Menk (email)
Nancy Nistler, FAA (email)
Robert Burrell, MnDOT Aeronautics (email)
Rylan Juran, MnDOT Aeronautics (email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Based Aircraft</th>
<th>Total Number of Operations</th>
<th>Variance from TAF (Operations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

-0.4%   0.1%   -0.8%

-0.2%   0.2%   -0.6%   -0.2%   -0.2%   0.3%

Notes:
TAF - 2015 Terminal Area Forecast published by FAA

Sources: HNTB Analysis.
1. **Introduction**

This chapter summarizes the LTCP activity forecast for Crystal Airport (MIC). The base year is represented by the twelve months ending June 2015 and forecasts were prepared for 2020, 2025, 2030, and 2035. The forecasts for the airport are unconstrained, except for runway length, and assume that the necessary facilities will be in place to accommodate demand. The chapter begins with a description of the forecast approach, followed by a discussion of the forecasts for based aircraft and aircraft operations, and then concludes with a set of alternative forecast scenarios.

The assumptions inherent in the following calculations are based on data provided by the MAC, federal and local sources, and professional experience. Forecasting, however, is not an exact science. Departures from forecast levels in the local and national economy and in the aviation industry would have a significant effect on the forecasts presented herein.

2. **Historical Trends**

**Table 1** shows historical based aircraft and aircraft operations at MIC from 1990 through 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Based Aircraft</th>
<th>Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>189,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>172,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>176,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>156,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>127,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>98,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>74,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>71,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>62,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>53,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>49,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>42,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>44,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>43,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>48,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>42,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>41,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>41,838(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Twelve months ending June 2015. Includes estimate of nighttime activity.
Source: MAC and FAA ATADS
The total number of aircraft based in Crystal airport declined from 1990 to 2015. The total counts stayed above 300 aircraft before 2000 but declined to around 185 recently. Aircraft operations fell more rapidly than based aircraft over the same period, indicating reduced utilization for those aircraft that remained based at MIC. A number of factors have contributed to the decline including the slowing economy, increased fuel prices and other operating costs, and reduced interest in recreational flying by younger people.

3. Forecast Approach

The Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area is served by a system of airports. These airports provide a variety of roles and therefore both complement and compete with each other. Since these airports operate as a system, they were forecast as a system so that the interrelationships between the airports could be properly captured. The forecast focused on five of the airports in the MAC system – Crystal, Airlake (LVN), Anoka County (ANE), Flying Cloud (FCM), and St. Paul Downtown (STP) – but also incorporated the other MAC airports – Minneapolis-St. Paul International (MSP) and Lake Elmo (21D) into the analysis. The details of the forecast approach are provided in the main forecast report, *Minneapolis-St. Paul Reliever Airport: Activity Forecasts – Technical Report*, and are summarized below:

1. Identify Catchment Areas – Crystal Airport is located in Hennepin County and most of the based aircraft owners reside in the same county as the airport they use. Nevertheless, there is some overlap between the airport catchment areas. Jet and turboprop aircraft owners that require longer runways and more extensive maintenance and fueling facilities tend to gravitate towards airports such as St. Paul Downtown (STP) and Flying Cloud Airport (FCM). Likewise, operators of small single engine piston aircraft often shy away from larger more commercial airports because of congestion and costs, even though these airports may be closer to their place of residence. Aircraft registration data from the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) was used to identify the percentage of MIC based aircraft owners that resided in each county.

2. Develop Socioeconomic Projections – Population forecasts from the Metropolitan Council (Met Council) and per capita income forecasts from Woods & Poole Economics (W&P) were used to develop hybrid income forecasts for each county in the metropolitan area. The income forecasts were used to estimate the share of based aircraft growth accounted for by each county.

3. Project the number of based aircraft registered in each county by aircraft category based on the county income forecasts and the FAA Aerospace forecast adjusted for Minneapolis-St. Paul trends.

4. Allocate the projected based aircraft to each MAC-airport according to the existing distribution pattern for each aircraft category (piston, turboprop, jet, helicopter, etc.).

5. Estimate the number of aircraft on waiting list that would be added assuming airport capacity is unconstrained. Since MIC has extra capacity, there is no waiting list and the waiting list adjustment was not applied there.

6. Redistribute aircraft from the constrained MAC airports (MSP) to the remaining unconstrained airports based on the existing distribution patterns of the airports. Although MSP has sufficient airfield capacity to accommodate growth, the facilities that can accommodate based general aviation (GA) aircraft are limited.

7. Identify base year aircraft operations. Operations counts for Crystal were initially obtained from the FAA Air Traffic Control Tower. The air traffic control tower at MIC does not operate 24 hours per day; therefore late night operations were estimated based on the MAC’s flight tracking system data. To estimate operations by aircraft type, the FAA Traffic
Flow Management System Counts (TFMSC) which provides aircraft information was used and supplemented with flight tracking system data from the MAC’s environmental office.

8. Project future year aircraft operations. In each aircraft category, operations per active aircraft were projected to increase at the same rate as the FAA forecast of hours flown per based aircraft, implicitly assuming that the number of operations per hours flown remain constant. The percentage of touch and go operations in each aircraft category was assumed to remain constant.

Forecasts include based aircraft and operations for each major category: single engine piston, multi-engine piston, turboprop, jets, helicopters, sport aircraft, experimental, and other. It was assumed that the share of each county’s registered aircraft in every aircraft category based at all of the airports under study will remain constant.

4. Forecast Results

**Table 2** shows the forecast of based aircraft for Crystal. The number of based aircraft at Crystal is projected to decline slightly, from 185 aircraft in 2015 to 171 aircraft in 2035. The dominant aircraft in the fleet, piston engine aircraft, are projected to decline, consistent with the FAA Aerospace Forecast Fiscal Years 2015-2035. Helicopters and experimental aircraft are expected to increase but not fast enough to offset the decline in the piston category.

**Table 3** shows the forecast of aircraft operations at MIC. Total aircraft operations at Crystal are forecast to decrease from 41,838 in 2015 to 39,904 in 2035, an average annual rate of -0.2 percent. Increases are projected in all categories except single-engine and multi-engine piston aircraft, for which the anticipated decrease in the based aircraft offsets slightly higher utilization forecasted by FAA. Jet and helicopter operations are expected to increase the fastest.

The percentage of operations occurring in August, the peak month at Crystal Airport, was estimated from FAA air traffic control tower records. Average Day Peak Month (ADPM) operations were estimated by dividing by 31 days. Peak hour operations were obtained from the FAA Distributed Operations Network (OPSNET). The peak hour percentage in the peak month over the past four years has averaged 18.4 percent. As shown in **Table 4**, peak hour operations are projected to fluctuate between 27 and 29 operations.
Table 2: Summary of Based Aircraft Forecast (Crystal Base Case Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Engine Piston</th>
<th>Multi-Engine Piston</th>
<th>Turboprop</th>
<th>Jets</th>
<th>Rotor</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Experimental - Excluding Ultralights</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

-0.6%  -0.8%  0.0%  0.0%  2.0%  0.0%  1.4%  0.0%  -0.4%

Table 3: Summary of Operations Forecast (Crystal Base Case Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Engine Piston</th>
<th>Multi-Engine Piston</th>
<th>Turboprop</th>
<th>Jets</th>
<th>Rotor</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Experimental - Excluding Ultralights</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35,324</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>35,039</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>32,046</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>30,993</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>30,283</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,774</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>30,633</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,454</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

-0.7%  -0.5%  1.8%  3.5%  2.8%  0.0%  2.4%  0.0%  -0.2%

Table 4: Peak Activity Forecast (Crystal Base Case Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Operations (a)</th>
<th>Peak Month Operations (b)</th>
<th>ADPM Operations (c)</th>
<th>Peak Hour Operations (d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>42,063</td>
<td>4,922</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>41,838</td>
<td>4,865</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>39,495</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>39,025</td>
<td>4,538</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>38,578</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>39,904</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Table 3.  
(b) Value for 2014 is actual. Forecast years estimated using average peak month percentage from 2011-2014.  
(c) Peak month operations divided by 31 days.  
(d) Estimated at 18.4 percent of ADPM operations based on MAC aircraft operation counts.  

Sources: As noted and HNTB analysis

5 Original Forecast Scenarios

General aviation activity has historically been difficult to forecast, since the relationships with economic growth and pricing factors are more tenuous than in other aviation sectors, such as commercial aviation. This uncertainty is likely to carry over into the near future, given the volatility of fuel prices and the continued shift in GA from personal and recreational use to business use. To address these uncertainties, and to identify the potential upper and lower bounds of future activity at the study airports, detailed high and low scenarios are presented. These scenarios use the same forecast approach that was used in the base case, but alter the assumptions to reflect either a more aggressive or more conservative outlook.

The high forecast scenario is based on the assumption that income would grow 0.5 percent per year faster than in the base case. All other assumptions are the same as in the base case. The low forecast scenario is based on the assumption that income would grow 0.5 percent more slowly each year than under the base case.

Table 5 compares the total number of based aircraft and operations under different scenarios for MIC. The MIC base case and high scenario LTCP forecasts are consistent the FAA 2015 Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) as they differ by less than 10% in the 5-year forecast period and 15% in the 10-year forecast period.

Figure 1 provides a graphic comparison of the base, high, and low, and scenario operations forecasts, along with the FAA's 2015 Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) for the airport.
Table 5: Forecast Comparison (Original Forecast Scenarios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Based Aircraft</th>
<th>Total Number of Operations</th>
<th>Variance from TAF (Operations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

-0.4%  0.1%  -0.8%  -0.2%  0.2%  -0.6%  0.3%

Notes:
TAF - 2015 Terminal Area Forecast published by FAA

Sources: HNTB analysis
Subsequent to the preparation of the high and low forecast scenarios, two additional scenarios were developed to evaluate the potential impact associated with the following alternative airfield development concepts:

1. **Stopway Scenario**: Designating the existing blast pad pavement beyond each end of Runway 14L-32R as stopway. Pavement designated as stopway can be considered as useable length for decelerating an aircraft during an aborted takeoff. Stopway pavement can be used for accelerate-stop distance calculations, but not for other takeoff or landing distance calculations. Stopways do not change the published runway length, nor are they intended to attract aircraft types different than those operating at the airport today. However, the availability of stopways may result in a small increase in aircraft operations from some users who find the existing runway length to be limiting based on accelerate-stop distance criteria. In the stopway scenario, the number of additional aircraft operations above the base case is approximately 230 annually by 2035, translating to just over four additional takeoffs and landings per week. Of the additional operations, the majority are expected to be turboprops (approximately three-quarters), with the remaining increase coming from light business jet aircraft. All other forecast assumptions are the same as in the base case. **Table 6** shows the forecast of aircraft operations at MIC under the Stopway Scenario. The number of based aircraft is not expected to change from the base case scenario.

2. **Extended Runway Scenario**: Converting portions of the existing paved blast pads on each end of Runway 14L-32R to useable runway to provide a published runway length of 3,750 feet. Due to the constrained nature of the airport, however, this will require the
implementation of declared distances, meaning that not all of the published pavement would be available for landing and takeoff movements in each direction. With the increase in published runway length (from 3,267 feet to 3,750 feet), the number of additional aircraft operations above the base case is estimated to be approximately 314 annually by 2035, translating to approximately six additional takeoffs and landings per week. As with the stopway scenario, the majority of additional operations are expected to be from turboprop aircraft. **Table 7** shows the forecast of aircraft operations at MIC under the Extended Runway Scenario. The number of based aircraft is not expected to change from the base case scenario.

**Table 8** incorporates aircraft operations under the additional forecast scenarios for MIC. The MIC stopway and extended runway LTCP forecasts remain consistent the FAA 2015 Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) as they differ by less than 10% in the 5-year forecast period and 15% in the 10-year forecast period.

**Figure 2** provides a graphic comparison of the base, high, and low, and scenario operations forecasts, along with the FAA’s 2015 Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) for the airport.

**Figure 2: MIC Forecast Comparison (Additional Scenario Operations)**
Table 6: Summary of Operations Forecast (Stopway Scenario)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Engine Piston</th>
<th>Multi-Engine Piston</th>
<th>Turboprop</th>
<th>Jets</th>
<th>Rotor</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Experimental Excluding Ultralights</th>
<th>Other (a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35,324</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>35,039</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>32,046</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>30,993</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>30,283</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,774</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>30,633</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,454</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

-0.7% -0.5% 6.2% 12.1% 2.8% 2.4% -0.2%

Source: HNTB and MAC analysis
Table 7: Summary of Operations Forecast (Extended Runway Scenario)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Engine Piston</th>
<th>Multi-Engine Piston</th>
<th>Turboprop</th>
<th>Jets</th>
<th>Rotor</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Experimental - Excluding Ultralights</th>
<th>Other (a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35,324</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>35,039</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>32,046</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>30,993</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>30,283</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,774</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>30,633</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,454</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

-0.7%  -0.5%  7.0%  14.1%  2.8%  2.4%  -0.2%

Source: HNTB and MAC analysis
Table 8: Forecast Comparison (Additional Forecast Scenarios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Based Aircraft</th>
<th>Total Number of Operations</th>
<th>Variance from TAF (Operations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

-0.4%  0.1%  -0.8%  -0.2%  0.2%  -0.6%  -0.2%  -0.2%  0.3%

Notes:
TAF - 2015 Terminal Area Forecast published by FAA

Sources: HNTB and MAC analysis
Appendix 4: Runway Length Calculation Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAA Advisory Circular 150/5325-4B Runway Length Chart</td>
<td>4-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechcraft King Air 200 Accelerate/Stop Distance Chart</td>
<td>4-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilatus PC-12 Flight Planning/Takeoff Distance Data</td>
<td>4-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 414 Accelerate/Stop Distance Chart</td>
<td>4-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper PA-31T Cheyenne Accelerate/Stop Distance Chart</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 421C Accelerate/Stop Distance Table</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper PA-31-350 Chieftain Accelerate/Stop Distance Chart</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 414A Accelerate/Stop Distance Table</td>
<td>4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 310R Accelerate/Stop Distance Table</td>
<td>4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechcraft Baron 58 Accelerate/Stop Distance Chart</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper PA-30 Twin Comanche Accelerate/Stop Distance Chart</td>
<td>4-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Assumptions used to assess runway length requirements include the following:

- Takeoff Weight: Based on 90% of Useful Load
- Temperature: 83.4°F, 28.5°C
- Pressure Altitude: 869 feet AMSL
- Wind: 5-knot headwind
- Flap Setting: Typical
Example:

Temperature (mean day max hot month): 59°F (15°C)
Airport Elevation: Mean Sea Level

Note: Dashed lines shown in the table are mid values of adjacent solid lines.

Recommended Runway Length:

For 95% = 2,700 feet (823 m)
For 100% = 3,200 feet (975 m)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>$V_1$</th>
<th>Knots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take-Off Power Set Before</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Release</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Engines Idle at $V_1$</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed and Reverse Operating Engine</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:**
- OAT: 28°C
- Pressure Altitude: 15400 FT
- Weight: 12,000 LBS
- Heading Component: 3.5 KTS
- Field Length: 4395 FT
- $V_1$: 95 KTS

**Note:** For operation with ice vanes extended, perform and if is not appropriate.

---

**Diagram:**
- Plot showing acceleration, stop, and field length vs. outside air temperature, weight, and wind component.

---
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PC-12 Digital AFM - Flight Planning

Date: 08/20/14
Registration No: 1458
PC-12 Model: PC-12/41
Interior Code: EX-6S-2

Weight & Balance

BEW (lb): 0
BEM (lb-in): 0
Useful Load (lb): 0
Takeoff Total Weight (lb): 0
Landing Total Weight (lb): 0

Fuel Use

Fuel Flow (lb/h): 0
Fuel Use (lb): 0
Remaining Fuel (lb): 0
Max Fuel Load (lb): 0

Takeoff Distance

Weight (lb): 10100
OAT (Â°C): 29
Altitude (ft): 1000
Headwind (kts): 5
Slope (%): 0
Takeoff Ground Roll (ft): 1853
Takeoff Total Distance (ft): 3124
Accelerate-Stop Distance (ft): 3677
Flaps (Â°): 15
Vr (KIAS): 79

Climb Performance

Weight (lb): 0
ISA Deviation (Â°C): 0
# ACCELERATE STOP DISTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESSURE ALTITUDE - FEET</th>
<th>WEIGHT - POUNDS</th>
<th>ENGINE FAILURE SPEED - KTAS</th>
<th>TOTAL DISTANCE - FEET</th>
<th>WEIGHT - POUNDS</th>
<th>ENGINE FAILURE SPEED - KTAS</th>
<th>TOTAL DISTANCE - FEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8650</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>8800</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>9200</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>9600</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>8500</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>8650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5-11**
SECTION 5
PERFORMANCE
PIPER AIRCRAFT CORPORATION
PA-31T, CHEYENNE

ACCELERATE/STOP DISTANCE

REPORT: 2210
5-22
### ACCELERATE STOP DISTANCE

**Conditions:**
1. 2200 RPM and 38.0 inches Hg. Manifold Pressure
3. Wing Flaps - UP.
4. Level, hard surface, Dry Runway
5. Engine failure at engine failure speed.
6. Safe Power and Maximum Effective Braking
   After Engine Failure.

**Note:**
1. If full power is applied
   without brakes set, distances apply from 200 ft.
   where full power is applied.
2. Increase distance 1% for each 1 knots headwind.
3. Increase distance 1% for each 2 knots tailwind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINE FAILURE</th>
<th>PRESSURE AT FAILURE</th>
<th>TOTAL DISTANCE - FEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7500</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7500</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>2850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4380</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINE FAILURE</th>
<th>PRESSURE AT FAILURE</th>
<th>TOTAL DISTANCE - FEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>2850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4380</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINE FAILURE</th>
<th>PRESSURE AT FAILURE</th>
<th>TOTAL DISTANCE - FEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>2850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4380</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINE FAILURE</th>
<th>PRESSURE AT FAILURE</th>
<th>TOTAL DISTANCE - FEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>2850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4380</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5-11**
NORMAL ACCELERATE - STOP DISTANCE

Figure 5-17

REPORT: LK-1208
5-19
### ACCELERATE STOP DISTANCE

**CONDITIONS:**
1. 2700 RPM and 38.0 Inches Hg. Manifold Pressure Before Brake Release.
3. Wing Flaps - UP.
4. Cowl Flaps - OPEN.
5. Level, Hard Surface, Dry Runway.

**NOTE:**
1. If full power is applied without brakes set, distances apply from point where full power is applied.
2. Decrease distance 3% for each 4 knots headwind.
3. Increase distance 5% for each 2 knots tailwind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHT - POUNDS</th>
<th>ENGINE FAILURE SPEED - KIAS</th>
<th>PRESSURE ALTITUDE - FEET</th>
<th>TOTAL DISTANCE - FEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-20°C</td>
<td>-10°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-40°F</td>
<td>+14°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6750</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
<td>3370</td>
<td>3590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3530</td>
<td>3760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>3990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3880</td>
<td>4180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4120</td>
<td>4390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>4320</td>
<td>4610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>4540</td>
<td>4840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>4770</td>
<td>5090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>5010</td>
<td>5360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>5280</td>
<td>5640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5560</td>
<td>5950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6200</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
<td>2780</td>
<td>2960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3050</td>
<td>3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>3410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>3530</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>3740</td>
<td>3990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>4130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>4130</td>
<td>4410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>4640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>4890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5700</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>2560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>2690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>2820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>2960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>2920</td>
<td>3110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>3060</td>
<td>3260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>3220</td>
<td>3450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td>3640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3590</td>
<td>3830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3780</td>
<td>4030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5200</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>2290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>2370</td>
<td>2520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>2650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>2790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>2930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>3110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>3270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5-11*
## ACCELERATE STOP DISTANCE

### CONDITIONS:
2. Mixtures - LEAN for field elevation (See Figure 5-27).
3. Wing Flaps - UP.
4. Cowl Flaps - OPEN.
5. Level, Hard Surface, Dry Runway.
7. Idle Power and Heavy Braking After Engine Failure.

### NOTE:
1. If full power is applied without brakes set, distances apply from point where full power is applied.
2. Decrease distance 2% for each 4 knots headwind.
3. Increase distance 5% for each 2 knots tailwind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHT - POUNDS</th>
<th>ENGINE FAILURE SPEED - KIAS</th>
<th>PRESSURE ALTITUDE - FEET</th>
<th>TOTAL DISTANCE - FEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-20°F</td>
<td>-10°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4°F</td>
<td>+14°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4300</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Sea Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 5-12

5-26
ACCELERATE - STOP DISTANCE
(Normally Aspirated Model Equipped With Tip Tanks -- 3725 Lbs Gross Weight)

WING FLAPS RETRACTED
FULL THROTTLE AND MAX RPM
BOTH THROTTLES CLOSED AT DECISION SPEED

RUNWAY SURFACE: PAVED, LEVEL, DRY
ACCELERATE TO 90 MPH IAS
MAXIMUM BRAKING EFFORT

FIGURE 5-08
## Appendix 5: Cost Estimates

<table>
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</tr>
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</table>
Crystal Airport (MIC)
2016 CIP Update - Runway 14R/32L & Taxiways

Engineer's Estimate
July 20, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Concept Element</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Remove Runway and Construct Parallel Taxiway (includes Taxiway lighting)</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other Taxiway Improvements</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Runway & Taxiways Total: $2,100,000*
# Engineer's Estimate

**Remove Runway & Construct Parallel Taxiway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Estimated Unit Price</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Estimated Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1012.200</td>
<td>Traffic Provisions / Airport Security &amp; Devices / Phasing</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>$ 35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2021.501</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>$ 110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2051.501</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Restoration of Haul Roads</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>$ 7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2104.513</td>
<td>Remove Bituminous Pavement (Full Depth)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$ 120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2104.513</td>
<td>Sawing Bituminous Pavement (Full Depth)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$ 2.50</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$ 6,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2105.501</td>
<td>Common Excavation (EV)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>$ 52,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2105.507</td>
<td>Subgrade Excavation (EV)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2105.526</td>
<td>Select Topsoil Borrow (CV)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$ 50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2112.501</td>
<td>Subgrade Preparation</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$ 1.50</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>$ 24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2573.503</td>
<td>Silt Fence, Type Preassembled (Incl. Mice)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2573.540</td>
<td>Aggregate Base Course (CV)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 25.00</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2573.605</td>
<td>Bituminous Surface Course PG 58-28</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$ 71.00</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$ 17,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2573.605</td>
<td>Bituminous Base Course PG 58-28</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$ 69.00</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$ 17,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2575.601</td>
<td>Bituminous Tack Coat</td>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>$ 3.50</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$ 3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2575.601</td>
<td>Bituminous Joint (Saw, Route, Seal)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>$ 16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2575.601</td>
<td>Taxiway Painting</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2575.601</td>
<td>Taxiway Lighting</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 400,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated Construction Total: $1,353,750.00

5% Contingency: $90,250.00

20% Engineering and Administration: $361,000.00

**Estimated Total Project Cost: $1,805,000.00**

---

**Remove & Construct Connector Taxiways**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Estimated Unit Price</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Estimated Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1012.200</td>
<td>Traffic Provisions / Airport Security &amp; Devices / Phasing</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2021.501</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2051.501</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Restoration of Haul Roads</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2104.505</td>
<td>Remove Bituminous Pavement (Full Depth)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2104.513</td>
<td>Sawing Bituminous Pavement (Full Depth)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$ 2.50</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$ 2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2105.501</td>
<td>Common Excavation (EV)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$ 37,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2105.507</td>
<td>Subgrade Excavation (EV)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$ 10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2105.526</td>
<td>Select Topsoil Borrow (CV)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2112.501</td>
<td>Subgrade Preparation</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$ 1.50</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2573.503</td>
<td>Silt Fence, Type Preassembled (Incl. Mice)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2573.540</td>
<td>Aggregate Base Course (CV)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 25.00</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$ 12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2573.605</td>
<td>Bituminous Surface Course PG 58-28</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$ 71.00</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$ 17,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2573.605</td>
<td>Bituminous Base Course PG 58-28</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$ 69.00</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$ 17,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2573.605</td>
<td>Bituminous Tack Coat</td>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>$ 3.50</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$ 1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2573.605</td>
<td>Bituminous Joint (Saw, Route, Seal)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$ 2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2575.601</td>
<td>Taxiway Painting</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2575.601</td>
<td>Taxiway Lighting</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated Construction Total: $222,850.00

5% Contingency: $14,856.67

20% Engineering and Administration: $59,426.67

**Estimated Total Project Cost: $297,133.33**

TOTAL Runway & Taxiways: $2,102,133.33
### Crystal Airport (MIC)
2035 Long Term Comprehensive Plan Estimates

May 15, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Concept Element</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Runway Improvements - Grading/Painting</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Runway Improvements - Electrical</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Taxiway Improvements - Grading/Paving</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Taxiway Improvements - Electrical</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $2,550,000
8.0 Crystal Airport Facility
Asset Funding Needs Report

By Number

Client: Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC)

Project Number: Crystal Airport

Asset: All

Currency: USD

Period: 20 years

Inflation: 3%

The current year is always the Period start date. If "Include past due Action Dates/Renewals" is selected, the cost of those past due Requirements is included in the current year cost.

Summary of Funding Needed by Requirement Type and Year

![Bar chart showing funding needed by year and requirement type]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Non-Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>285,303</td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>299,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,573</td>
<td>30,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>268,115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>268,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>85,301</td>
<td>14,494</td>
<td>199,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>37,341</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>21,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>294,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>294,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>294,581</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>294,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>43,851</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>194,417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>194,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>131,139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>141,470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>256,505</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>256,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,603,111</td>
<td>59,178</td>
<td>2,122,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asset Funding Needs Report

By Number

Client: Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC)
Project Number: Crystal Airport
Asset: East Maintenance Building
Asset Number: 1
Report is grouped by Year
Currency: USD

Address 1
City: Crystal
Country: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Address 2
State/Province/Region: Minnesota
ZIP: 

Current Replacement Value: 166,696
Size: 1,768 SF

Summary of Funding Needed by Requirement Type and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Non-Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>39,947</td>
<td>4,797</td>
<td>35,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>11,304</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>10,207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>8,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60,472</td>
<td>4,787</td>
<td>65,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detail of Funding Needed by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>D5021 - Branch Wiring Devices</td>
<td>Exterior Outlet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2030 - Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Overhead Sectional Doors - Electric Operation Renewal</td>
<td>17,403</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5022 - Lighting Equipment</td>
<td>Lighting Fixtures - Light Density Renewal</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5020 - Lighting and Branch Wiring</td>
<td>Lighting - Exterior - HID Wall Packs Renewal</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5012 - Low Tension Service and Dist.</td>
<td>Main Electrical Service 01 - 60A 240V/120V + Distribution Renewal</td>
<td>6,122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2010 - Exterior Walls</td>
<td>Paint Building Exterior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,531</td>
<td>4,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5021 - Branch Wiring Devices</td>
<td>Branch Wiring - Equipment &amp; Devices - Light Density Renewal</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jun 8, 2016 11:23:01 AM
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## Asset Funding Needs Report

**By Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>DS022 - Lighting Equipment</td>
<td>Lighting Features - Light Density Renewal</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS020 - Lighting and Branch Wiring</td>
<td>Lighting - Exterior - HID Wall Packs Renewal</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Paint Masonry Interior Finish - Economy Renewal</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2020</strong></td>
<td>11,304</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>DS050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Unit Heaters - Gas Fired</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2090 - Other Plumbing Systems</td>
<td>Natural Gas Supply for Bldg - 1' Feed (SF)</td>
<td>3,453</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2030 - Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Door Assembly - 3 x 7 HM</td>
<td>3,469</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2025</strong></td>
<td>10,107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>CS010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Paint Masonry Interior Finish - Economy Renewal</td>
<td>8,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2035</strong></td>
<td>8,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>58,472</td>
<td>4,797</td>
<td>63,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asset Funding Needs Report  
By Number

Client: Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC)  
Asset: East Restroom Building  
Project/Number: Crystal Airport  
Asset Number: 2

Report is grouped by Year  
Currency: USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>United States Of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Replacement Value: 79,020  
Size: 235 SF

Summary of Funding Needed by Requirement Type and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Non-Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>7,118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>63,105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detail of Funding Needed by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 – Wall Finishers</td>
<td>Painted Finish – Average (1 Coat Prime – 2 Coats Finish) Renewal</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3050 – Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Unit Heaters – Electric (Each) Renewal</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>D3040 – Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Exhaust System – Restroom w/Roof Fan Renewal</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R30 – Roofing</td>
<td>Asphalt Shingled Roofing Renewal</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 – Wall Finishers</td>
<td>Painted Finish – Average (1 Coat Prime – 2 Coats Finish) Renewal</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Asset Funding Needs Report

*By Number*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>DS020 - Lighting and Branch Wiring</td>
<td>Lighting - Exterior - HID Wall Packs Renovation</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS022 - Lighting Equipment</td>
<td>Lighting Fixtures - Average Density Renewal</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2021</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>BS030 - Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Door Assembly - 3 x 7 BM</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS030 - Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>G-90 Ceiling Taped</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2010 - Plumbing Fixtures</td>
<td>Custodial/Utility Sinks - Each</td>
<td>6,726</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS030 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Unit Heaters - Electric (Each) Renewal</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS030 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Painted Finish - Average (1 Coat Prime - 2 Coats Finish) Renewal</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS012 - Low Tension Service and Dist.</td>
<td>Main Electrical Service 02 - 100A 240V/120V - Distribution</td>
<td>19,839</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS020 - Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>Water Heater - Electric - Residential - 6 Gal Renewal</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS021 - Branch Wiring Devices</td>
<td>Branch Wiring - Equipment &amp; Devices - Average Density</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI0 - Interior Construction</td>
<td>Restroom - Complete - Single</td>
<td>10,289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D40 - Fire Protection</td>
<td>Fire Extinguishers - Dry Chem w/Cabinet (Each)</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS04 - Flashings and Trim</td>
<td>Metal Fascia and Soffit</td>
<td>8,034</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS020 - Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>Water Div Complete - Average</td>
<td>5,071</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2031</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asset Funding Needs Report
By Number

Client: Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC)
Project Number: Crystal Airport

Asset: North Maintenance Building
Asset Number: 3

Report is grouped by Year
Currency: USD

Address 1
- Crystal
City
Country
Address 2
State/Province/Region
Minneapolis
ZIP

Current Replacement Value
1,073,571
Size
5,376 SF

Summary of Funding Needed by Requirement Type and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Non-Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>102,417</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>104,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,573</td>
<td>36,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>209,316</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>8,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>23,104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>204,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>94,674</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>43,851</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>141,470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>58,781</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>967,787</td>
<td>41,780</td>
<td>1,009,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detail of Funding Needed by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>D5929 - Lighting and Branch Wiring</td>
<td>Lighting - Exterior - HID Wall Packs Renewal</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System Description</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>C1020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>VCT - Average Renewal</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3040 - Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Exhaust System - Restroom w/Roof Fan Renewal</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3020 - Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>Water Heater - Gas - Residential - 50 Gal Renewal</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3022 - Lighting Equipment</td>
<td>Lighting Fixtures - Average Density Renewal</td>
<td>40,479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B30 - Roofing</td>
<td>Roof Edge Safety Railing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3090 - Controls and Instrumentation</td>
<td>Parking Garage CO Monitor System Renewal</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>ACT System - Standard Renewal</td>
<td>7,949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3040 - Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Exhaust System - Dedicated High Velocity Renewal</td>
<td>19,708</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3092 - Emergency Light and Power Systems</td>
<td>Emergency Battery Pack Lights Renewal</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Unit Heaters - Gas Fired Renewal</td>
<td>9,295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2016</strong></td>
<td>102,417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>B2010 - Exterior Walls</td>
<td>Aged Precast Panel Joints</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,573</td>
<td>30,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2017</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,573</td>
<td>30,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>B30 - Roofing</td>
<td>Single Ply Membrane - Ballasted Renewal</td>
<td>120,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3040 - Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Exhaust System - Furnace Hood - Ductwork/Fan (Each) Renewal</td>
<td>66,205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B30 - Roofing</td>
<td>Drainspouts - Aluminum Renewal</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Furnace with AC - Gas Fired Residential Type Renewal</td>
<td>9,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3040 - Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Exhaust System - Garage Renewal</td>
<td>11,905</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2019</strong></td>
<td>209,316</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>B2030 - Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Damaged Overhead Garage Door</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>8,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2020</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>8,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>D3050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Unit Heaters - Gas Fired Renewal</td>
<td>10,776</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2030 - Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Door Assembly - 3 x 7 BM Renewal</td>
<td>12,329</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2021</strong></td>
<td>23,104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>C10 - Interior Construction</td>
<td>Restroom - Shower - Add</td>
<td>4,922</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2020 - Exterior Windows</td>
<td>Aluminum Windows</td>
<td>18,684</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D1093 - Doors and Frames</td>
<td>Door Frame</td>
<td>69,219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2010 - Plumbing Fixtures</td>
<td>Emergency Shower Units (Each)</td>
<td>4,113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2010 - Plumbing Fixtures</td>
<td>Emergency Eyewash (Each)</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3021 - Branch Wiring Devices</td>
<td>Branch Wiring - Equipment &amp; Devices - Average Density</td>
<td>22,567</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2020 - Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>Water Heater - Gas - Residential - 50 Gal Renewal</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3040 - Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Perimeter Heat - Electric Baseboard - 2500 SF</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2030 - Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Overhead Sectional Doors - Electric Operation</td>
<td>69,334</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3040 - Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Exhaust System - Dedicated High Velocity Renewal</td>
<td>24,965</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>VCT - Average Renewal</td>
<td>6,153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3060 - Controls and Instrumentation</td>
<td>Parking Garage CO Monitor System Renewal</td>
<td>5,272</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3012 - Low Tension Service and Dist.</td>
<td>Main Electrical Service 04-400A 208/120V</td>
<td>25,336</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2010 - Plumbing Fixtures</td>
<td>Control/Utility Sinks - Each</td>
<td>5,469</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3092 - Emergency Light and Power Systems</td>
<td>Emergency Battery Pack Lights Renewal</td>
<td>6,857</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2020 - Exterior Windows</td>
<td>Aluminum Windows</td>
<td>4,152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10 - Interior Construction</td>
<td>Restroom - Complete - Single</td>
<td>8,356</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2024</strong></td>
<td>294,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>294,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Paint Masonry/Enoxy Finish - Economy</td>
<td>6,164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3028 - Security and Detection Systems</td>
<td>Security System - Light Density</td>
<td>8,332</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3010 - Plumbing Fixtures</td>
<td>Kitchenette - Cabinet, Counter and Sink</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Asset Funding Needs Report

### By Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Paint Masonry/Epoxy Finish - Economy</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Paint Masonry/Epoxy Finish - Economy</td>
<td>9,319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Paint Masonry/Epoxy Finish - Economy</td>
<td>33,782</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4033 - Telephone Systems</td>
<td>Telephone System - Light Density</td>
<td>16,428</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4037 - Fire Alarm Systems</td>
<td>Fire Alarm System - Light Density</td>
<td>24,978</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2025</strong></td>
<td><strong>94,674</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>94,674</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>D40 - Fire Protection</td>
<td>Wet Sprinkler System - Ordinary Hazard w/O/Pump</td>
<td>43,851</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2029</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,851</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>43,851</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>D3040 - Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Exhaust System - Restroom w/ Roof Fan Renewal</td>
<td>4,865</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>ACT System - Standard Renewal</td>
<td>13,532</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>VCT - Average Renewal</td>
<td>8,270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3020 - Lighting and Branch Wiring</td>
<td>Lighting - Exterior - HID Wall Packs Renewal</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3092 - Emergency Light and Power Systems</td>
<td>Emergency Battery Pack Lights Renewal</td>
<td>9,216</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3022 - Roof Hatches</td>
<td>Roof Hatches</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3022 - Lighting Equipment</td>
<td>Lighting Fixtures - Average Density Renewal</td>
<td>58,914</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3060 - Controls and Instrumentation</td>
<td>Parking Garage CO Monitor System Renewal</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2090 - Other Plumbing Systems</td>
<td>Natural Gas Supply for Eldg - 1st Feed (5F)</td>
<td>13,699</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2020 - Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>Water Heater - Gas - Residential - 50 Gal Renewal</td>
<td>8,444</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2034</strong></td>
<td><strong>141,470</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>141,470</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>D3038 - Security and Detection Systems</td>
<td>Security System - Light Density</td>
<td>11,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3033 - Telephone Systems</td>
<td>Telephone System - Light Density</td>
<td>14,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3037 - Fire Alarm Systems</td>
<td>Fire Alarm System - Light Density</td>
<td>32,569</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2035</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,781</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>58,781</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>967,787</strong></td>
<td>41,780</td>
<td><strong>1,009,567</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Asset Funding Needs Report
By Number

Client: Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC)
Project Number: Crystal Airport
Asset: North Restroom Building
Asset Number: 4

Address 1
City: Crystal
Country: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Address 2
State/Province/Region: Minnesota
ZIP: 

Current Replacement Value: 80,589
Size: 235 SF

Summary of Funding Needed by Requirement Type and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Non-Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>7,118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>66,162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76,817</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detail of Funding Needed by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>D2020</td>
<td>Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Heater - Electric - Residential - 10 Gal Renewal</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3035</td>
<td>Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Heaters - Electric (Each) Renewal</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010</td>
<td>Wall Finishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Painted Finish - Average (1 Coat Prime - 2 Coats Finish) Renewal</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for 2016</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>D3022</td>
<td>Lighting Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting Fixtures - Average Density Renewal</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B30</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asphalt Shingled Roofing Renewal</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3040</td>
<td>Distribution Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exhaust System - Restroom w/ Roof Fan Renewal</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5020</td>
<td>Lighting and Branch Wiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting - Exterior - HID Wall Packs Renewal</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>C3010</td>
<td>Wall Finishes</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2020</td>
<td>Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Interior Construction</td>
<td>10,289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010</td>
<td>Wall Finishes</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H0030</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D0050</td>
<td>Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B0014</td>
<td>Flashings and Trim</td>
<td>8,034</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D0211</td>
<td>Branch Wiring Devices</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D0220</td>
<td>Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D0220</td>
<td>Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5012</td>
<td>Low Tension Service and Dist.</td>
<td>22,696</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D40</td>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2010</td>
<td>Plumbing Fixtures</td>
<td>6,726</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3030</td>
<td>Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for 2031</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,817</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Funding Needed by Requirement Type and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Non-Renewal Requirements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>144,765</td>
<td>6,765</td>
<td>151,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>58,799</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>83,987</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>89,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>21,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>189,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>194,417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>194,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>189,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>884,275</td>
<td>12,601</td>
<td>896,876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detail of Funding Needed by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>C3020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>Concrete - Painted Renewal</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3010 - Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Exhaust System - Restroom w/ Roof Can Renewal</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10 - Interior Construction</td>
<td>Restrooms - Complete - Double Renewal</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Asset Funding Needs Report

**By Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>D2050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Thru-Wall Units - Cooling w/Electric Heat Renewal</td>
<td>11,549</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R30 - Roofing</td>
<td>Modified Bitumen Renewal</td>
<td>30,023</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5022 - Lighting Equipment</td>
<td>Emergency Lights and Exit Signs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,766</td>
<td>6,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2050 - Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>Water Heaters - Elec - Residential - 52 Gal Renewal</td>
<td>3,911</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5037 - Fire Alarm Systems</td>
<td>Fire Alarm System - Light Density Renewal</td>
<td>7,616</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5022 - Lighting Equipment</td>
<td>Lighting Fixtures - Average Density Renewal</td>
<td>39,597</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>ACT Systems - Economy Renewal</td>
<td>6,995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>VCT - Average Renewal</td>
<td>3,197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2016</strong></td>
<td>144,763</td>
<td>6,766</td>
<td>151,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>R30 - Roofing</td>
<td>Single-Ply Membrane - Ballasted Renewal</td>
<td>58,799</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2019</strong></td>
<td>58,799</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>C3010 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>Concrete - Painted Renewal</td>
<td>3,576</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Thru-Wall Units - Cooling w/Electric Heat Renewal</td>
<td>12,398</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>ACT System - Economy Renewal</td>
<td>7,874</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2010 - Exterior Walls</td>
<td>Cracked Masonry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>5,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3040 - Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Exhaust System - Restrooms w/Roof Fan Renewal</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>VCT - Average Renewal</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5037 - Fire Alarm Systems</td>
<td>Fire Alarm System - Light Density Renewal</td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5022 - Lighting Equipment</td>
<td>Lighting Fixtures - Average Density Renewal</td>
<td>41,567</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2020</strong></td>
<td>83,987</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>89,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>D2050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Unit Heaters - Gas Fired</td>
<td>21,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2023</strong></td>
<td>21,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>D2090 - Other Plumbing Systems</td>
<td>Natural Gas Supply for Bldg - 2&quot; Pond (SF)</td>
<td>13,577</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2050 - Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>Water Heaters - Elec - Residential - 52 Gal Renewal</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Painted Finish - Average (1 Coat Prime - 2 Coats Finish)</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Paint Masonry/Epoxi Finish - Economy</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Paint Masonry/Epoxi Finish - Economy</td>
<td>8,834</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Painted Finish - Average (1 Coat Prime - 2 Coats Finish)</td>
<td>5,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>GSB Taped and Finished</td>
<td>8,358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Furniture with AC - Gas Fired Residential Type</td>
<td>11,323</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2030 - Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Door Assembly - 5 x 7 HM</td>
<td>13,876</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>Concrete - Painted Renewal</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Ceiling Finishes</td>
<td>Paint Masonry/Epoxi Finish - Economy</td>
<td>12,938</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3021 - Branch Wiring Devices</td>
<td>Branch Wiring - Equipment &amp; Devices - Average Density</td>
<td>18,997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3010 - Plumbing Fixtures</td>
<td>Custodial/Utility Sticks - Each</td>
<td>5,633</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3020 - Lighting and Branch Wiring</td>
<td>Lighting - Exterior - HD Wall Packs</td>
<td>3,353</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>Carpeting - Tlb</td>
<td>15,667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Thru-Wall Units - Cooling w/Electric Heat</td>
<td>15,068</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3033 - Telephone Systems</td>
<td>Telephone System - Light Density</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3017 - Low Tension Service and Dist.</td>
<td>Main Electrical Service Subpanels - 125A 208V/120V = Distribution</td>
<td>12,529</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2050 - Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>Water Dist Complete - Average</td>
<td>20,807</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2025</strong></td>
<td>189,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>D3010 - Sanitary Waste</td>
<td>Sanitary Waste - Gravity Drch - Average</td>
<td>14,847</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Interior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Doors - 5 x 7 Wld - NR</td>
<td>20,131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>VCT - Average Renewal</td>
<td>4,836</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### By Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System Description</th>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Non-Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>D0050 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Thru-Wall Units - Cooling w/Electric Heat Renewal</td>
<td>17,468</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CID09 - Interior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Doors - 3 x 7 - Half Glass</td>
<td>5,225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10 - Interior Construction</td>
<td>Restroom - Shower - Add</td>
<td>10,887</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2020 - Exterior Windows</td>
<td>Aluminum Windows</td>
<td>12,394</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2029 - Exterior Windows</td>
<td>Aluminum Windows</td>
<td>24,788</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1020 - Interior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Doors - 3 x 7 HM - NR</td>
<td>19,484</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10 - Interior Construction</td>
<td>Restroom - Complete - Single</td>
<td>12,006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>Concrete - Painted Renewal</td>
<td>4,806</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5012 - Low Tension Service and Dist.</td>
<td>Main Electrical Service 03 - 408A 208V/120V - Distribution</td>
<td>31,260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1019 - Partitions</td>
<td>CMU Block Walls - Plain</td>
<td>4,554</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3017 - Fire Alarm Systems</td>
<td>Fire Alarm System - Light Density Renewal</td>
<td>11,580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2030</strong></td>
<td><strong>194,417</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>194,417</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>D40 - Fire Protection</td>
<td>Fire Extinguishers - Dry Chem w/Cabinet (Each)</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2031</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,872</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>1,872</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>D0020 - Domestic Water Distribution</td>
<td>Water Heaters - ELC - Residential - 52 Gal Renewal</td>
<td>6,859</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D0508 - Terminal and Package Units</td>
<td>Thru-Wall Units - Cooling w/Electric Heat</td>
<td>20,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Painted Finish - Average (1 Coat Prime - 2 Coats Finish)</td>
<td>6,914</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2030 - Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Overhead Sectional Doors - Electric Operation</td>
<td>16,953</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B30 - Roofing</td>
<td>Modified Bitumen Renewal</td>
<td>52,645</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>Concrete - Painted Renewal</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3010 - Wall Finishes</td>
<td>Painted Finish - Average (1 Coat Prime - 2 Coats Finish)</td>
<td>3,409</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3020 - Floor Finishes</td>
<td>Carpetsing - Tile</td>
<td>21,655</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5033 - Telephone Systems</td>
<td>Telephone System - Light Density</td>
<td>8,038</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2030 - Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Overhead Sectional Doors - Electric Operation</td>
<td>47,887</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for 2035</strong></td>
<td><strong>189,710</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>189,710</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>884,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,601</strong></td>
<td><strong>896,876</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table A6-1
Baseline Condition Average Daily Flight Operations

Aircraft Type

Aircraft ID

Helicopter

Arrivals
Day

Departures

Night

Total

0.85

0.19

1.04

-

0.03

Day

Touch and Gos

Night

Total

0.82

0.22

1.04

0.03

-

0.03

Day

Total Operations

Night

Total

Day

0.10

-

0.10

1.76

Night
0.41

Total
2.17

-

-

-

0.06

-

0.06

Robinson R22

R22

0.03

Agusta 109

A109

0.82

0.19

1.01

0.79

0.22

1.01

0.10

-

0.10

1.70

0.41

2.11

2.35

0.04

2.39

2.26

0.12

2.39

0.98

-

0.98

5.59

0.16

5.76

Multi-Engine Piston
Beechcraft Baron BE-55

BEC55

0.12

-

0.12

0.12

-

0.12

-

-

-

0.24

-

0.24

Beechcraft Baron BE-58

BEC58

0.08

-

0.08

0.08

-

0.08

-

-

-

0.16

-

0.16

Cessna 310 Twin

CNA310

0.22

-

0.22

0.20

0.02

0.22

0.16

-

0.16

0.59

0.02

0.61

Cessna Super Skymaster 337

CNA337

0.08

-

0.08

0.08

-

0.08

-

-

-

0.16

-

0.16

Cessna 340 Twin

CNA340

0.27

-

0.27

0.27

-

0.27

0.16

-

0.16

0.69

-

0.69

Cessna 414 Twin

CNA414

0.06

-

0.06

0.06

-

0.06

-

-

-

0.12

-

0.12

Cessna Golden Eagle 421

CNA421

0.18

-

0.18

0.18

-

0.18

-

-

-

0.37

-

0.37

Piper Aztec Twin

PA23AZ

0.12

-

0.12

0.12

-

0.12

-

-

-

0.24

-

0.24

Piper Twin Comanche

PA30

0.08

-

0.08

0.08

-

0.08

-

-

-

0.16

-

0.16

Piper Navajo Twin

PA31

0.49

0.04

0.53

0.45

0.08

0.53

0.33

-

0.33

1.27

0.12

1.39
0.78

Piper Seneca Twin

PA34

0.31

-

0.31

0.29

0.02

0.31

0.16

-

0.16

0.76

0.02

Piper Seminole Twin

PA44

0.33

-

0.33

0.33

-

0.33

0.16

-

0.16

0.82

-

0.82

25.03

1.21

26.24

25.63

0.61

26.24

20.92

0.84

21.76

71.58

2.66

74.24

Single-Engine Piston
Grumman American Cheetah

AA5A

0.23

-

0.23

0.23

-

0.23

0.42

-

0.42

0.88

-

0.88

Beechcraft Debonair/Bonanza

BEC33

0.43

0.03

0.46

0.44

0.02

0.46

0.42

-

0.42

1.29

0.05

1.34

Beechcraft Bonanza 35

BECM35

0.31

0.03

0.34

0.34

-

0.34

0.42

-

0.42

1.07

0.03

1.11

Beechcraft Bonanza 36

BECM35

1.39

0.03

1.43

1.38

0.05

1.43

1.26

-

1.26

4.03

0.08

4.11

Cessna 152

CNA152

0.02

0.02

0.03

0.03

-

0.03

-

-

-

0.05

0.02

0.07

Cessna 195

CNA170

0.41

-

0.41

0.39

0.02

0.41

0.42

-

0.42

1.22

0.02

1.24

Cessna Skyhawk 172

CNA172

5.47

0.20

5.67

5.55

0.11

5.66

2.09

0.42

2.51

13.11

0.73

13.84

Cessna Cardinal 177

CNA177

0.15

-

0.15

0.15

-

0.15

0.42

-

0.42

0.71

-

0.71

Cessna Skywagon 180

CNA180

0.25

-

0.25

0.25

-

0.25

0.42

-

0.42

0.91

-

0.91

Cessna Skylane 182

CNA182

1.10

0.03

1.13

1.12

0.02

1.13

1.67

-

1.67

3.89

0.05

3.94

Cessna 185

CNA185

0.08

-

0.08

0.08

-

0.08

1.26

-

1.26

1.42

-

1.42

Cessna 206

CNA206

0.15

0.02

0.16

0.16

-

0.16

0.42

-

0.42

0.73

0.02

0.75

Cessna Centurion 210

CNA210

0.15

-

0.15

0.15

-

0.15

0.42

-

0.42

0.71

-

0.71

Aviat Husky A-1

GASEPF

0.03

-

0.03

0.03

-

0.03

-

-

-

0.07

-

0.07

Lancair Columbia 300

GASEPV

0.07

-

0.07

0.07

-

0.07

-

-

-

0.13

-

0.13

Lancair Columbia 400

GASEPV

0.20

-

0.20

0.20

-

0.20

0.42

-

0.42

0.81

-

0.81

Cirrus SR-20

GASEPV

0.45

0.02

0.47

0.44

0.03

0.48

0.42

-

0.42

1.32

0.05

1.37

Mooney M-20P

M20J

2.18

0.08

2.26

2.25

0.02

2.26

0.84

-

0.84

5.27

0.10

5.37

Mooney M-20T

M20J

0.61

0.03

0.64

0.59

0.05

0.64

0.42

-

0.42

1.62

0.08

1.70

Mooney M-20

M20J

1.35

0.07

1.41

1.39

0.02

1.41

0.84

-

0.84

3.58

0.08

3.66

Piper Comanche

PA24

0.38

-

0.38

0.34

0.03

0.38

0.84

-

0.84

1.56

0.03

1.59

Piper Cherokee

PA28

0.10

0.02

0.11

0.10

0.02

0.11

1.67

-

1.67

1.87

0.03

1.90

Piper Arrow

PA28CA

0.20

-

0.20

0.20

-

0.20

0.42

-

0.42

0.81

-

0.81

Piper Warrior

PA28CH

5.33

0.46

5.79

5.73

0.07

5.79

2.51

0.42

2.93

13.57

0.94

14.51

Piper Cherokee Dakota

PA28DK

0.03

-

0.03

0.03

-

0.03

-

-

-

0.07

-

0.07

Piper Lance/Saratoga

PA32SG

0.02

-

0.02

0.02

-

0.02

-

-

-

0.03

-

0.03

Piper Cherokee Six

PA32SG

1.58

0.07

1.64

1.56

0.08

1.64

1.26

-

1.26

4.39

0.15

4.54
1.01

Piper Malibu

PA46

0.28

0.02

0.30

0.30

-

0.30

0.42

-

0.42

0.99

0.02

Rockwell Aero Commander 112

RWCM12

0.03

-

0.03

0.03

-

0.03

-

-

-

0.07

-

0.07

Cirrus SR-22

SR22

2.07

0.10

2.17

2.08

0.08

2.17

1.26

-

1.26

5.41

0.18

5.59

2.30

0.26

2.56

2.17

0.38

2.56

2.12

2.12

6.59

0.64

7.23

Experimental

GASEPV

1.28

0.13

1.41

1.02

0.38

1.41

1.06

-

1.06

3.36

0.51

3.87

Vans RV-7

GASEPV

0.51

-

0.51

0.51

-

0.51

0.53

-

0.53

1.55

-

1.55

Vans RV-8

GASEPV

0.51

0.13

0.64

0.64

-

0.64

0.53

-

0.53

1.68

0.13

1.81

0.11

0.01

0.12

0.12

0.00

0.12

-

-

-

0.23

0.01

0.24

Experimental

Turboprop

0.00

Beechcraft King Air 300

BEC30B

0.01

-

0.01

0.01

-

0.01

-

-

-

0.01

-

0.01

Beechcraft King Air 200

BEC200

0.02

0.00

0.02

0.02

0.00

0.02

-

-

-

0.04

0.00

0.04

Beechcraft King Air 90

BEC90

0.02

-

0.02

0.02

-

0.02

-

-

-

0.03

-

0.03

Cessna 208

CNA208

0.00

-

0.00

0.00

-

0.00

-

-

-

0.01

-

0.01

Cessna Conquest 441

CNA441

0.01

0.00

0.01

0.01

-

0.01

-

-

-

0.02

0.00

0.02

Piper Malibu Meridian

CNA208

0.00

-

0.00

0.00

-

0.00

-

-

-

0.01

-

0.01

Pilatus PC-12

PC12

0.04

0.00

0.04

0.04

-

0.04

-

-

-

0.08

0.00

0.08

Socata TBM 700

STBM7

0.01

-

0.01

0.01

-

0.01

-

-

-

0.02

-

0.02

Socata TBM-850

CNA208

0.01

-

0.01

0.01

-

0.01

-

-

-

0.01

-

0.01

0.01

-

0.01

0.01

-

0.01

-

-

-

0.02

-

0.02

Cessna Citation Jet 525

CNA525C

0.01

-

0.01

0.01

-

0.01

-

-

-

0.02

-

0.02

30.65

1.71

32.35

31.02

1.34

32.35

24.12

0.84

24.96

85.79

3.88

89.67

Jets
Total
Note: Total may not add due to rounding.

Source: MACNOMS Data Analysis, HNTB Activity Forecasts
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
<th>Aircraft ID</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Touch and Gos</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Operations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson R22</td>
<td>R22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agusta 109</td>
<td>A109</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell 4290 GlobalRanger</td>
<td>B429</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson R44</td>
<td>R44</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MACNOMS Data Analysis, HNTB Activity Forecasts
Table A6-3
Baseline Condition Average Annual Runway Use

| Aircraft Group | Runway | Arrivals | | | Departures | | | Touch and Gos | | |
|---------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|               |        | Day      | Night    | Total    | Day      | Night    | Total    | Day      | Night    | Total    |
| Helicopters   | 6L     | 10%      | 21%      | 12%      | 10%      | 14%      | 11%      | 11%      | 0%       | 11%      |
|               | 6R     | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 14L    | 23%      | 0%       | 19%      | 26%      | 0%       | 21%      | 20%      | 0%       | 20%      |
|               | 14R    | 17%      | 0%       | 14%      | 17%      | 0%       | 14%      | 14%      | 0%       | 14%      |
|               | 24L    | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 24R    | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 32L    | 11%      | 35%      | 16%      | 15%      | 0%       | 12%      | 14%      | 0%       | 14%      |
|               | 32R    | 39%      | 44%      | 40%      | 32%      | 86%      | 43%      | 42%      | 0%       | 42%      |
| Piston        | 6L     | 3%       | 1%       | 3%       | 3%       | 0%       | 3%       | 5%       | 0%       | 5%       |
|               | 6R     | 1%       | 0%       | 0%       | 1%       | 0%       | 1%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 14L    | 37%      | 47%      | 38%      | 27%      | 34%      | 27%      | 24%      | 50%      | 25%      |
|               | 14R    | 6%       | 0%       | 5%       | 9%       | 8%       | 9%       | 15%      | 0%       | 14%      |
|               | 24L    | 1%       | 0%       | 0%       | 1%       | 0%       | 1%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 24R    | 12%      | 4%       | 12%      | 10%      | 4%       | 10%      | 14%      | 0%       | 13%      |
|               | 32L    | 10%      | 13%      | 10%      | 17%      | 7%       | 16%      | 17%      | 0%       | 16%      |
|               | 32R    | 31%      | 35%      | 31%      | 33%      | 47%      | 33%      | 26%      | 50%      | 27%      |
| Turboprop     | 6L     | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 6R     | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 14L    | 57%      | 33%      | 56%      | 48%      | 100%     | 49%      | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 14R    | 4%       | 0%       | 4%       | 4%       | 0%       | 4%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 24L    | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 24R    | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 4%       | 0%       | 4%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 32L    | 10%      | 67%      | 13%      | 20%      | 0%       | 19%      | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 32R    | 29%      | 0%       | 27%      | 24%      | 0%       | 24%      | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
| Jets          | 6L     | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 6R     | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 14L    | 50%      | 0%       | 50%      | 50%      | 0%       | 50%      | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 14R    | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 24L    | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 24R    | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 32L    | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
|               | 32R    | 50%      | 0%       | 50%      | 50%      | 0%       | 50%      | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |

Note: Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: MAC Analysis
### Table A6-4

#### 2035 Final Preferred Alternative Condition Average Annual Runway Use

| Aircraft Group | Runway | Arrivals | | | | | | Departures | | | | | | Touch and Gos | | |
|----------------|--------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                |        | Day      | Night  | Total  | Day    | Night  | Total  | Day      | Night  | Total  | Day    | Night  | Total  |
|                |        | 10%      | 21%    | 10%    | 10%    | 14%    | 10%    | 11%      | 11%    | 11%    | 11%    | 11%    | 11%    |
| Helicopters    | 6L      | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 6R      | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 14L     | 40%      | 0%     | 39%    | 43%    | 0%     | 42%    | 33%      | 33%    | 33%    | 33%    | 33%    | 33%    |
|                | 24L     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 24R     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 32R     | 50%      | 79%    | 51%    | 47%    | 86%    | 48%    | 55%      | 55%    | 55%    | 55%    | 55%    | 55%    |
| Pistons        | 6L      | 2%       | 1%     | 2%     | 3%     | 0%     | 3%     | 9%       | 0%     | 8%     | 9%     | 0%     | 8%     |
|                | 6R      | 1%       | 0%     | 1%     | 2%     | 0%     | 2%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 14L     | 42%      | 43%    | 42%    | 37%    | 55%    | 37%    | 38%      | 44%    | 39%    | 38%    | 44%    | 39%    |
|                | 24L     | 1%       | 0%     | 1%     | 2%     | 0%     | 2%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 24R     | 10%      | 1%     | 9%     | 8%     | 6%     | 8%     | 12%      | 16%    | 12%    | 12%    | 16%    | 12%    |
|                | 32R     | 44%      | 55%    | 44%    | 49%    | 39%    | 49%    | 41%      | 40%    | 41%    | 41%    | 40%    | 41%    |
| Turboprops     | 6L      | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 6R      | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 14L     | 59%      | 33%    | 57%    | 51%    | 100%   | 51%    | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 24L     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 24R     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 1%     | 0%     | 1%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 32R     | 41%      | 67%    | 43%    | 48%    | 47%    | 48%    | 41%      | 40%    | 41%    | 41%    | 40%    | 41%    |
| Jets           | 6L      | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 6R      | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 14L     | 50%      | 0%     | 50%    | 50%    | 0%     | 50%    | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 24L     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 24R     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |
|                | 32R     | 50%      | 0%     | 50%    | 50%    | 0%     | 50%    | 0%       | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     | 0%     |

**Note:** Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

**Source:** MAC Analysis
### Table A6-5
Baseline Condition Departure Flight Track Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runway</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Jets</th>
<th>Helicopters</th>
<th>Piston</th>
<th>Turboprop</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Each departure track was dispersed to either side of the backbone tracks. Default INM Version 7.0d subtrack use percentages were used to assign aircraft to the subtracks created during dispersa. Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Source: MAC Analysis, 2015
### Table A6-6
#### 2035 Final Preferred Alternative Condition Departure Flight Track Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runway</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Jets Day</th>
<th>Jets Night</th>
<th>Helicopters Day</th>
<th>Helicopters Night</th>
<th>Piston Day</th>
<th>Piston Night</th>
<th>Turboprop Day</th>
<th>Turboprop Night</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Each departure track was dispersed to either side of the backbone tracks. Default INM Version 7.0d subtrack use percentages were used to assign aircraft to the subtracks created during dispersal. Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**Source:** MAC Analysis, 2015
Figure A6-1: Baseline Condition INM Flight Tracks
Figure A6-2: 2035 Final Preferred Alternative Condition INM Flight Tracks
Appendix 7: Existing Zoning Ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952 MAC Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td>7-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 Crystal Airport Joint Airport Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORDINANCE NO. 6

An Ordinance regulating the height of structures and trees and the use of the property in the vicinity of Crystal Airport.

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission considers it necessary for the purpose of promoting public health, safety, order, convenience and general welfare by protecting the lives and property of users of the Crystal Airport and of owners and occupants of land in its vicinity to adopt the following airport zoning ordinance applicable to Crystal Airport as authorized by Minnesota Laws 1945, Chapter 303 as amended, M.S.A. 360.061-360.074.

The Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission does ordain:

Section 1. Definitions. As used in this ordinance, unless the context otherwise requires:

(1) "Airport" means the Crystal Airport, a public airport owned and being operated, maintained and developed by the Commission.

(2) "Airport hazard" means any structure of tree or use of land, which obstructs the air space required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking off at the airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or taking off of aircraft.

(3) "Airport hazard area" means the area of land or water or both upon which an airport hazard might exist if not prevented as provided in this ordinance.

(4) "Person" means any individual, firm, partnership, corporation, company, association, joint stock association or body politic, and includes any trustee, receiver, assignee or other similar representative thereof.

(5) "Nonconforming use" means any structure, tree or use of land, which does not conform to a regulation prescribed in this ordinance or any amendment thereto as of the effective date of such regulation or amendment.

(6) "Structure" means any object constructed or installed by man including but without limitation buildings, towers, smoke stacks and overhead transmission lines.

(7) "Tree" means and includes any object of natural growth.

(8) Zoning "map" means the Crystal Airport Zoning Map hereto attached and made a part of this ordinance.

(9) "Master Plan" means the established airport layout as shown by Commission's Plan #2745B, Drawing 2 hereto attached and made a part of this ordinance.

(10) "Airport reference point" means the center point of the airport hazard area, as designated on the zoning map.

(11) "Commission" means Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, herein referred to as MAC.
(12) "Committee" means the MAC Airport Zoning Committee.

(13) "Board" means the MAC Airport Zoning Appeal Board.

(14) "Public notice" shall mean notice published at least twice with an interval of at least seven days between publication dates in the official newspaper of the cities of Minneapolis and Saint Paul, and of the county in which the airport is located.

Section 2. Airport Hazard Area, Airport Reference Point And Zones. The airport hazard area is the area surrounding the airport reference point as designated on the zoning map and is divided into zones, as shown on the zoning map, in respect to which zones height limits as hereinafter set forth will apply:

(1) The landing zones are strips within the confines of the airport boundaries, designated in black on the map, and along which landings and take-offs are made and taxiing is done.

(2) The approach zones are trapezoidal areas which extend beyond the ends of all landing zones as indicated on the zoning map.

(3) The horizontal surface zones are areas having radii of 5,000 feet from the airport reference point and are shown on the zoning map.

(4) The conical surface zones are areas lying immediately beyond the horizontal surface zones having to their outer-limits a radius of 8,000 feet from the airport reference point as shown on the zoning map.

(5) The transition zones are irregular areas lying just outside of approach zones as shown on the zoning map.

Section 3. Height Limits. Except as otherwise provided in this ordinance, no structure shall be located, constructed, altered or maintained, and no tree shall be allowed to grow above height limits hereinafter established within any landing zone, approach zones, horizontal surface zones, conical surface zone or transition zones, said heights being measured in feet above established elevations as follows:

(1) Within landing zones - the elevation of the surface of the landing strips except as required and as necessary and incidental to airport operations or as may be recommended by or is in accordance with rules of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

(2) Within approach zones - the established elevation for the beginning of each approach zone as shown on the Master Plan, plus one foot of height for every 30 feet of horizontal distance measured along the centerline of the approach zone from the end nearest the landing zone to a point on said centerline at right angles to the structure or tree in question.

(3) Within horizontal surface zones - 150 feet above the established elevation of the airport, said established airport elevation being mean sea level elevation 869 feet.
(4) Within conical surface zones - The elevation of the horizontal surface zone at 5,000 feet from the airport reference point plus one foot of height for every 20 feet of horizontal distance to 8,000 feet from the airport reference point.

(5) Within transition zones - The height limit permitted at a point on the centerline of the nearest approach zone at right angles to the structure or tree in question plus one foot in height for every seven feet of horizontal distance from the nearest side boundary of said landing or approach zone to such structure or tree measured along a line at right angles to the centerline of such landing or approach zone.

(6) Where zones overlap, the height limit shall be that of the zone imposing the more stringent height limit.

Section 4. Use Restrictions. Except as provided in Section 8 hereof, from and after the taking effect of this ordinance it shall be unlawful to put any land located within the airport hazard area to any of the following uses:

(1) Any use which would create unreasonable interference with radio communication between aircraft and the airport or communication facilities in the vicinity thereof, or which would unreasonably interfere with other navigational aid or devices used by the airport or by aircraft using said airport, or with electronic navigational aids that may at the time of such interference be established for the vicinity thereof.

(2) Any use which would materially reduce the visibility within the aforementioned airport hazard area or which would make it difficult for flyers in the vicinity of or on the airport to distinguish between airport lights or markers or other navigational lights or markers in the vicinity of the airport or which would result in glare in the eyes of flyers using the airport.

(3) The conduct of any business or occupation, or any use, which business, occupation or use, by its very nature, is inherently dangerous or hazardous as respects likelihood of causing or resulting in injury or damage to aircraft or the occupants thereof flying to and from or in the vicinity of said airport, or persons present at or in the vicinity of said airport or lawfully in the vicinity thereof.

(4) Any other use or uses which would be dangerous or hazardous to the safety of aircraft using the airport or maneuvering in the vicinity thereof or to the health, safety or general welfare of airport personnel and other persons using said airport.

Section 5. Existing Nonconforming Uses. The height limits and use restrictions as provided herein or as may hereafter be provided in any amendment hereto, except as hereinafter provided in Section 6, subdivision 2 and Section 9, subdivision 2, shall in no event be construed to interfere with the continuance of any nonconforming use or to require the removal, lowering or other change or alteration of any existing nonconforming tree, or of any nonconforming structure the construction or alteration of which was begun through the letting of contracts therefor prior to the effective date of this ordinance or amendment thereto and where such construction or alteration is prosecuted with reasonable diligence; provided that the provisions hereof shall not be construed as a limitation upon the rights conferred upon MAC by M.S.A. 360.074.
Section 6. Permits. Application shall be made and permit procured from the MAC Zoning Committee created hereunder in each of the following instances and subject to the following conditions:

(1) Where it is desired to erect or locate structures, to increase the height of existing structures or to plant or transplant trees within the airport hazard area to a height in excess of ten feet below the height limit herein provided with respect thereto.

(2) Where it is desired to replace, substantially alter or repair, rebuild, or relocate any nonconforming structure or tree within the airport hazard area, provided, however, that whenever the Committee determines that a nonconforming structure or tree within the airport hazard area has been abandoned or more than 80% torn down, destroyed, deteriorated or decayed no permit shall be granted.

(3) No permit shall be granted that would allow the establishment or creation of an airport hazard or that would permit a nonconforming structure or tree or nonconforming use to be made or to become higher or to become a greater airport hazard than was the case under the applicable zoning regulations at the time when the application for permit was made.

(4) In granting any permit, the Committee may, if it deems such action advisable to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance and reasonable in the circumstances, so condition such permit as to require the owner of a structure or tree in question to permit the MAC at its own expense to install, operate and maintain thereon such markers and lights as may be necessary to indicate to flyers the presence of an airport hazard.

(5) Whenever any person prior to erection, alteration or relocation of structures or planting or transplanting of trees within the airport hazard area makes a report of the contemplated erection, alteration or relocation of structures or the contemplated planting or transplanting of trees within said airport hazard area, to the committee, the committee shall promptly investigate and determine whether or not there would be a violation of the ordinance; and if a violation be found the committee shall so advise such person, who shall thereupon alter his plans so as to meet the requirements of the ordinance.

Section 7. Variances. Any person desiring to erect or to locate any structure or to increase the height thereof or to permit the growth of any tree or otherwise to use property within the airport hazard area contrary to the provisions of this ordinance may apply to the MAC Airport Zoning Appeal Board created hereunder for variance from the provisions of this ordinance. Such variance shall be allowed where literal application or enforcement of the provisions of this ordinance would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship to the applicant, and where the relief granted would not be contrary to the public interest but would do substantial justice and would be in accordance with the spirit of these provisions. Any variance may be granted, however, subject to such reasonable conditions as the Board may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this ordinance, and the granting of such variance may be conditioned upon the owner of a structure or tree granting to the MAC the right at its expense to install, operate and maintain thereon such markers and lights as may be necessary to indicate to flyers the presence of an airport hazard.
(1) Two copies of an application for variance, indicating the facts surrounding such application in sufficient detail to permit a determination of the application on its merits, shall be filed with the MAC Airport Zoning Committee which shall forthwith transmit one copy to the MAC Airport Zoning Appeal Board, the second copy being retained by the Committee for its files.

Section 8. Administration. For the administration and enforcement of the provisions of this ordinance there is hereby created an administrative agency to be known as the MAC Airport Zoning Committee, the same to consist of three members. The said Committee shall include one member of the Commission appointed by the said Commission to represent the City of Minneapolis, a second member of the Commission appointed by the said Commission to represent the City of Saint Paul and a third member who shall be the Executive Director of the said Commission serving ex officio. The members of the Committee, except the ex officio member, shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission. No compensation shall be paid members of the MAC Zoning Committee except reimbursement of actual expense.

(1) The powers and duties of said administrative agency shall be as provided by Laws 1945, c. 303, as amended, M.S.A., sections 360.061-.074.

(2) Where a nonconforming structure or tree within the airport hazard area has been abandoned or more than 80% torn down, destroyed, deteriorated or decayed, although no application for permit has been made, the Committee may order the owner of such nonconforming structure or tree at the owner's expense to lower, remove, reconstruct or equip the same as may be necessary to conform to this ordinance, in which case the Committee shall give notice thereof to the owner, and if the owner shall neglect or refuse to comply with such order for ten days after notice is given, then the Committee may proceed to have such nonconforming structure or tree lowered, removed reconstructed or equipped and assess the cost and expense thereof against such structure or against the land whereon such structure or tree is or was located. Unless such an assessment is paid within ninety days from the date of service of notice thereof on the owner or upon the person in possession of such structure or tree or of the land upon which the same is or was located, the sum due shall bear interest at the rate of 8% per annum until paid and may be collected either by suit in a court of competent jurisdiction or in the same manner as are general taxes. Notice aforesaid shall be in writing and served in the same manner as a summons in a civil action.

(3) Applications for permits shall be made to the Committee on forms prepared and furnished by it. The forms shall provide for a statement by applicant of the purpose for which the permit is applied, and for statement of applicant of all facts pertinent to the question whether or not the application should be granted. Such applications shall be promptly considered and the permit granted or denied by the Committee, notice in writing of the Committee's decision to be promptly delivered or mailed to the applicant.

(4) All reports made pursuant to Section 6 hereof shall be received by the Committee and shall be reviewed by it promptly to determine whether there is an airport hazard, and if found that there is one, notice in writing of such finding setting forth the reasons therefor shall be promptly delivered or mailed to the person making such report.
(5) All applications for variance shall be received by the Committee, which shall forthwith transmit the copy of such application to the MAC Airport Zoning Appeal Board, retaining a second copy of such application for the Committee’s files. The Committee shall be represented at all hearings on applications for variance before the Board unless it shall attach its written approval to the application for variance on transmitting it to the Board.

(6) The Committee shall have its office at the office of the MAC. It shall keep and file in its said office records of all its proceedings, all applications for permits and reports and of action thereon. The Committee shall also keep on file a record of all variances granted by the MAC Airport Zoning Appeal Board. The files of the Committee shall be open to the public.

(7) The majority vote of the members shall control on all matters coming before it.

Section 9. Board of Adjustment. There is hereby created a MAC Airport Zoning Appeal Board consisting of five members. Two members shall be appointed by the Commission from the City of Minneapolis, two members shall be appointed by the Commission from the City of Saint Paul, and the fifth member shall be appointed by a majority vote of the other four members. No member of the MAC Airport Zoning Appeal Board may be a member of the MAC Airport Zoning Committee. Each member shall serve for a term of three years and until his successor is appointed and all members shall be removable by the Commission for cause upon written charges and after notice and opportunity for public hearing before the Commission. The powers and duties of said Board shall be as provided by Laws 1945, c. 303 as amended, M.S.A. Sections 360.061-.074.

Section 10. Appeals.

(1) Any person aggrieved or taxpayer affected by any decision of the MAC Airport Zoning Committee made in its administration of this ordinance, or the Commission or any governing body or administrative agency of a political subdivision, if of the opinion that a decision of said Committee is an improper application of airport zoning regulations of concern of such Commission, governing body or administrative agency, may appeal to the MAC Airport Zoning Appeal Board from the decision of the Committee.

(2) All appeals must be taken within a reasonable time, as provided by the rules of the Board, by filing with the Committee and with the Board a notice of appeal specifying the grounds thereof. The Committee shall forthwith transmit to the Board all papers constituting the record upon which the action appealed from was taken.

(3) An appeal shall stay all proceedings in furtherance of the action appealed from unless the Committee certifies to the Board after notice of appeal has been filed with it that by reason of the facts set forth in the certificate a stay would in its opinion cause imminent peril to life or property. In such case, proceedings shall not be stayed otherwise than by order of the Board on due notice to the Committee and on due cause shown.
(4) The Board shall fix a reasonable time for the hearing of appeals, give public notice and due notice to the parties in interest and decide the same within a reasonable time. Upon the hearing any party may appear in person or by agent or by attorney.

(5) The Board may in conformity with the provisions of this ordinance reverse or affirm wholly or partly or modify the order, requirement, decision or determination appealed from and may make such order, requirement, decision or determination as ought to be made, and to that end the Board shall have all the powers of the MAC Airport Zoning Committee from which the appeal is taken.

Section 11. Judicial Review. Any person aggrieved or taxpayer affected by any decision of the MAC Airport Zoning Appeal Board, or any governing body or administrative agency of a political subdivision which is of the opinion that a decision of the Committee is illegal will have such right of judicial review as is provided in Minnesota Laws 1945, Chapter 303 as amended upon exhausting the administrative remedies herein provided.

(1) In any case in which provision or provisions of this Ordinance are held by a court to interfere with the use or enjoyment of a particular structure or parcel of land to such an extent or to be so onerous in their application to such a structure or parcel of land as to constitute a taking or deprivation of that property in violation of the constitution of this state or of the United States, such holding shall not affect the application of such provisions as to other structures and parcels of land.

Section 12. Violation and Penalty. Every person who within the airport hazard area shall construct, locate or maintain, substantially change or substantially alter or repair any existing structure or plant, transplant or permit the growth of any tree or make use of property contrary to the terms of this ordinance, or who having been granted a permit or variance as herein provided, shall construct, locate, substantially change or substantially alter or repair any existing growth or structure or permit the growth of any tree except as permitted by such permit or variance, or who otherwise shall violate the terms hereof or regulations, orders or rules promulgated hereunder, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days or by both such fine and imprisonment. Each day a violation continues to exist shall constitute a separate offense, provided however, that where a report has been made and filed with the MAC Airport Zoning Committee as herein provided, for the purposes of this section there shall be no violation within the meaning of this section until the Committee has given notice that the alteration, erection or location of structures or planing or transplanting of trees, in respect to which such report is made and filed, constitutes an airport hazard in violation of this ordinance, and reasonable opportunity has been given to remove the hazard. (As amended by MAC Ordinance 39 adopted and in effect January 10, 1972)

(1) In addition, the MAC may institute in any court of competent jurisdiction an action to prevent, restrain, correct or abate any violation of this ordinance or of regulations, orders or rulings promulgated hereunder, and the court shall adjudge to the Commission such relief by way of injunction (which may be mandatory) or otherwise as may be proper under all the facts and circumstances of the case in order to fully effectuate the purposes of this ordinance and of regulations, orders and rulings promulgated pursuant thereto.
Section 13. Severability. If any of the provisions of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are declared to be severable.

Section 14. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption.

Passed by the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission on the 25th day of August, 1952.

Filed in the office of the Secretary of State on the 2nd day of September, 1952.

Map filed on the 10th day of September, 1952.
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CRYSTAL AIRPORT
ZONING ORDINANCE
CREATED BY THE
CRYSTAL AIRPORT JOINT ZONING BOARD

AN ORDINANCE REGULATING AND RESTRICTING THE HEIGHT OF STRUCTURES AND OBJECTS OF NATURAL GROWTH, AND OTHERWISE REGULATING THE USE OF PROPERTY, IN THE VICINITY OF THE CRYSTAL AIRPORT BY CREATING THE APPROPRIATE ZONES AND ESTABLISHING THE BOUNDARIES THEREOF; PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN THE RESTRICTIONS AND BOUNDARIES OF SUCH ZONES; DEFINING CERTAIN TERMS USED HEREIN; REFERRING TO THE CRYSTAL AIRPORT ZONING MAP WHICH IS INCORPORATED IN AND MADE A PART OF THIS ORDINANCE; PROVIDING FOR ENFORCEMENT; ESTABLISHING A BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT; AND IMPOSING PENALTIES.

IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED BY THE CRYSTAL AIRPORT JOINT ZONING BOARD PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY CONFERRED BY MINNESOTA STATUTES 360.061 - 360.074, AS FOLLOWS:
SECTION I: PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY

The Crystal Airport Joint Zoning Board, created and established by joint action of the Common Council of the Cities of Brooklyn Center, Brooklyn Park, Crystal, New Hope, Minneapolis, and Robbinsdale and the Metropolitan Airports Commission pursuant to the provisions and authority of Minnesota Statutes 360.063, hereby finds and declares that:

A. An airport hazard endangers the lives and property of users of the Crystal Airport, and property or occupants of land in its vicinity, and also if of the obstructive type, in effect reduces the size of the area available for the landing, takeoff, and maneuvering of aircraft, thus tending to destroy or impair the utility of the Crystal Airport and the public investment therein.

B. The creation or establishment of an airport hazard is a public nuisance and an injury to the region served by the Crystal Airport.

C. For the protection of the public health, safety, order, convenience, prosperity and general welfare, and for the promotion of the most appropriate use of land, it is necessary to prevent the creation or establishment of airport hazards.

D. The prevention of these airport hazards should be accomplished, to the extent legally possible, by the exercise of the police power without compensation.

E. The prevention of the creation or establishment of airport hazards and the elimination, removal, alteration, mitigation, or marking and lighting of existing airport hazards are public purposes for which political
subdivisions may raise and expend public funds.

SECTION II: SHORT TITLE

This ordinance shall be known as "Crystal Airport Joint Zoning Ordinance."
Those sections of land affected by this Ordinance are indicated in "Exhibit A"
which is attached to this Ordinance.

SECTION III: DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Ordinance, unless the context otherwise requires:

"AIRPORT" means the Crystal Airport located in Hennepin County, Minnesota.

"AIRPORT ELEVATION" means the established elevation of the highest point on the
usable landing area which elevation is established to be 869 feet above mean sea
level.

"AIRPORT HAZARD" means any structure or tree or use of land which obstructs the
airspace required for, or is otherwise hazardous to, the flight of aircraft in
landing or taking off at the airport; and any use of land which is hazardous to
persons or property because of its proximity to the airport.

"DWELLING" means any building or portion thereof designed or used as a residence
or sleeping place of one or more persons.

"ESTABLISHED RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD IN A BUILT-UP URBAN AREA" (ERN-BUUA) means
an area, which, if it existed on or before January 1, 1978 (for low density
structures and lots) and an area which, if it existed on or before July 2, 1979
(all other land uses), shall be considered a conforming use that shall not be
prohibited except as provided below in V B 5 EXEMPTIONS-ESTABLISHED RESIDENTIAL
NEIGHBORHOODS. The following criteria shall be applied and considered in
determining what constitutes an ERN-BUUA:

(1) Location of the airport;
(2) Nature of the terrain within Safety Zones A and B;
(3) Existing land uses and character of the neighborhood around the airport;
(4) Population of the community;
(5) That the average population density in all areas within one mile of any
point on a runway be equal to or greater than one dwelling unit per acre;
(6) Population density near the airport compared with population density in
other areas of the community;
(7) The age and the economic, political and social stability of the neighborhood.
and the community as a whole;
(8) The proximity of supporting school, commercial, religious, transportation
and other facilities and their degree of integration with residential land
uses;
(9) Presence or absence of public utilities including, but not limited to,
public sanitary sewer system, electric service and gas mains;
(10) Whether or not the factors listed in subparagraphs (8) and (9) above tend to
make the community surrounding the airport a self-sufficient unit;
(11) Whether the areas within one mile of the perimeter of the airport property
would be considered primarily residential in character; and
(12) Other material factors deemed relevant by the governmental unit in
distinguishing the area in question as established, residential, urban and
built-up.

"HEIGHT" for the purpose of determining the height limits in all zones set forth
in this Ordinance and shown on the zoning map, the datum shall be mean sea level
elevation unless otherwise specified.

"LANDING AREA" means the area of the airport used for the landing, taking off or
taxiing of aircraft.

"LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURE" means a single-family or two-family home.

"LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL LOT" means a single lot located in an area which is
zoned for single-family or two-family residences and in which the predominant
land use is such type of residences.

"NONCONFORMING USE" means any pre-existing structure, tree, natural growth, or
use of land which is inconsistent with the provisions of this Ordinance or an
amendment hereto.

"NON-PRECISION INSTRUMENT RUNWAY" means a runway having an existing or planned
straight-in instrument approach procedure utilizing air navigation facilities
with only horizontal guidance, and for which no precision approach facilities
are planned or indicated on an approved planning document.

"PERSON" means an individual, firm, partnership, corporation, company,
association, joint stock association, or body politic, and includes a trustee,
receiver, assignee, administrator, executor, guardian, or other representative.

"PLANNED" as used in this Ordinance refers only to those proposed future airport
developments that are so indicated on a planning document having the approval of
the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Transportation, Division
of Aeronautics and the Metropolitan Airports Commission.

"PRECISION INSTRUMENT RUNWAY" means a runway having an existing instrument
approach procedure utilizing an Instrument Landing System (ILS), or a precision
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Approach Radar (PAR). Also, a runway for which a precision instrument approach system is planned and is so indicated on an approved planning document.

"RUNWAY" means any existing or planned paved surface or turf-covered area of the airport which is specifically designated and used or planned to be used for the landing and/or taking off of aircraft.

"SLOPE" means an incline from the horizontal expressed in an arithmetic ratio of horizontal magnitude to vertical magnitude.

\[
\text{Slope} = \frac{3}{1} = 3 \text{ ft. horizontal to 1 ft. vertical}
\]

"STRUCTURE" means an object constructed or installed by man, including, but without limitations, buildings, towers, smokestacks, and overhead transmission lines.

"TRAVERSE WAYS" for the purpose of determining height limits as set forth in this Ordinance shall be increased in height by 17 feet for interstate highways; 15 feet for all other public roadways; 10 feet or the height of the highest mobile object that would normally traverse the road, whichever is greater, for private roads; 23 feet for railroads; and for waterways and all other traverse ways not previously mentioned, an amount equal to the height of the highest mobile object that would normally traverse it.

"TREE" means any object of natural growth.

"UTILITY RUNWAY" means a runway that is constructed for and intended to be used by propeller-driven aircraft of 12,500 pounds maximum gross weight and less.

"VISUAL RUNWAY" means a runway intended solely for the operation of aircraft using visual approach procedures, with no straight-in instrument approach procedure and no instrument designation indicated on an approved planning document.

"WATER SURFACES" for the purpose of this Ordinance shall have the same meaning as land for the establishment of protected zones.

"ZONING ADMINISTRATOR" for the purpose of this ordinance is the person in each affected municipality (Brooklyn Park, Brooklyn Center, Crystal, New Hope, Minneapolis, Robbinsdale) whose responsibility it is to issue building permits. (See Section XI B)
SECTION IV: AIRSPACE OBSTRUCTION ZONING

A. AIRSPACE ZONES: In order to carry out the purpose of this Ordinance, as set forth above, the following airspace zones are hereby established: Primary Zone, Horizontal Zone, Conical Zone, Approach Zone, and Transitional Zone and whose locations and dimensions are as follows:

1. PRIMARY ZONE: All that land which lies directly under an imaginary primary surface longitudinally centered on a runway and:
   a. extending 200 feet beyond each end of 13L-31R, 13R-31L, and 200 feet beyond the displaced threshold of 5L-23R and 5R-23L; The elevation of any point on the primary surface is the same as the elevation of the nearest point on the runway centerline. The width of the primary surface is:
   b. 250 feet for Runways 13L-31R, 13R-31L, 5L-23R, 5R-23L.

2. HORIZONTAL ZONE: All that land which lies directly under an imaginary horizontal surface 150 feet above the established airport elevation, or a height of 1019 feet above mean sea level or 40 feet above existing ground level where such ground is above 979 feet above mean sea level, the perimeter of which is constructed by swinging arcs of specified radii from the center of each end of the primary surface of each runway and connecting the adjacent arcs by lines tangent to those arcs. The radius of each arc is:
   a. 6,000 feet for Runways 13L-31R, 13R-31L, 5L-23R, 5R-23L.

3. CONICAL ZONE: All that land which lies directly under an imaginary
conical surface extending upward and outward from the periphery of the
horizontal surface at a slope of 20 to 1 for a horizontal distance of
4,000 feet as measured radially outward from the periphery of the
horizontal surface.

4. APPROACH ZONE: All that land which lies directly under an imaginary
approach surface longitudinally centered on the extended centerline at
each end of a runway. The inner edge of the approach surface for
Runways 13L-31R and 13R-31L is at the same width and elevation as, and
coincides with, the end of the primary surface. The inner edge of the
approach surface for Runways 5L-23R and 5R-23L is the same width as the
primary surface and is at the same elevation as, and coincides with a
point 200 feet from the end of each runway. The approach surface
inclines upward and outward at a slope of:
a. 40:1 for Runways 13L-31R, 13R-31L, 5L-23R, 5R-23L.

The approach surface expands uniformly to a width of:
b. 2,250 feet for Runways 13L-31R, 13R-31L, 5L-23R, 5R-23L at a
distance of 10,000 feet to the periphery of the conical surface.

5. TRANSITIONAL ZONE: All that land which lies directly under an imaginary
surface extending upward and outward at right angles to the runway
centerline and centerline extended at a slope of 7 to 1 from the sides
of the primary surfaces and from the sides of the approach surfaces
until they intersect the horizontal surface or the conical surface.

B. HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS: Except as otherwise provided in this Ordinance, and
except as necessary and incidental to airport operations, no structure or
tree shall be constructed, altered, maintained, or allowed to grow in any
airspace zone created in Subsection IV A so as to project above any of the
imaginary airspace surfaces described in said Subsection IV A hereof. Where an area is covered by more than one height limitation, the more restrictive limitations shall prevail.

C. BOUNDARY LIMITATIONS: The airspace obstruction zoning restrictions set forth in this section shall apply for a distance not to exceed one and one-half miles beyond the perimeter of the airport boundary and in that portion of an airport hazard area under the approach zone for a distance not exceeding two miles from the airport boundary.

SECTION V: LAND USE SAFETY ZONING:

A. SAFETY ZONE BOUNDARIES: In order to carry out the purpose of this Ordinance, as set forth above and also, in order to restrict those uses which may be hazardous to the operational safety of aircraft operating to and from the Crystal Airport, and furthermore to limit population and building density in the runway approach areas, thereby creating sufficient open space so as to protect life and property in case of an accident, there are hereby created and established the following land use safety zones:

1. SAFETY ZONE A: All land in that portion of the approach zones of a runway, as defined in Subsection IV A hereof, which extends outward from a point 200 feet from the displaced threshold for Runways 5L-23R and 5R-23L and from the end of the primary surface for a Runways 13L-31R and 13R-31L a distance equal to:
   a. 2,167 feet for runways 13L-31R, 13R-31L.
   b. 1,400 feet for runways 5L-23R, 5R-23L.

2. SAFETY ZONE B: All land in that portion of the approach zones of a runway, as defined in Subsection IV A hereof, which extends outward from
Safety Zone A a distance equal to:

a. 1,083 feet for runways 13L-31R, 13R-31L.
b. 700 feet for runways 5L-23R, 5R-23L.

3. SAFETY ZONE C: All that land which is enclosed within the perimeter of the horizontal zone, as defined in Subsection IV A hereof, and which is not included in Zone A or Zone B.

4. EXCEPTIONS - ESTABLISHED RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS: The following described lands are designated as Established Residential Neighborhoods in Built-Up Urban Areas, based upon the state of development of the areas on July 2, 1979. Land uses which were in existence in these areas on July 2, 1979 are exempt from the USE RESTRICTIONS of Sections V B 2 and 3 below, and are subject to the provisions of V B 5 below.

a. Runway 31:

Auditor's Subdivision Number 328, lots 15, 17, 22 - 25, 29
R.L.S. 893
Charles R. Knable Post #494 Addition
Twin Lake Addition, block 11, lots 3 and 4
Bodem's Addition, block 1, lots 1 - 7
Lois First Addition, lot 1
Lois Second Addition, lot 1
Lois Third Addition, lots 1, 2, 3
Erma M. Gallagher Addition, block 2, lot 5
Hillcrest Addition, lots 1, 3
Klink Addition, block 1, lots 1 - 4
Sowers Addition, lot 1
Tred Company Second Addition
Twin Oak Terrace Second Addition, block 1, lots 1 - 4
Twin Oak Terrace, block 1, lots 1 - 8;
    block 2, lots 1 - 7
Hoffinger Addition, block 1, lots 1 - 7
Twin Lake Manor, block 1, lots 2 - 10
    block 2, lots 1 - 12
Twin Lake Terrace, block 1, lots 1 - 4
    block 2, lots 1 - 5
Twin Lake Orchard Addition, lots 1, 2
Cragg and Ziebarth's, block 1, lots 1, 2, 3
Cragg Terrace, block 1, lots 1, 2, 3
Murray Lane Eighth Addition, block 2, lots 13, 14
  block 3, lots 1 - 9 and 12 - 17
Hiawatha Manor Second Addition, block 1, lots 1 - 11
  block 4, lots 1 - 4 and 5 - 10
Hiawatha Manor First Addition, block 2, lots 1 - 4
Hiawatha Manor, block 3, lots 1 - 3

b. Runway 13
Auditor's Subdivision 328, lots 1 - 8, 11, 13, 15, 16
Larburn Second Addition, block 1, lots 6 - 10
Larburn Addition, block 1, lots 1 - 12
  block 2, lots 1 - 12
  block 3, lots 1 - 6
  block 4, lot 1
Larburn Third Addition, block 1, lot 2 and outlot 2
  block 2, lots 1, 2, 3
A. M. Carlson's Addition, block 1, lots 1 - 12
  block 2, lots 1 - 11
  block 3, lots 1 - 9
  block 4, lots 1 - 10
Helmer Sorenson Addition, block 1, lots 1 - 7, outlot 1
Acme Investment First Addition, block 1, lot 1
  block 2, lots 1, 2, 3
A. M. Carlson's Second Addition, block 3, lot 7
A. M. Carlson's Third Addition, block 3, lots 9, 10, 11
Edgewood Estates Subdivision, block 1, lots 1, 2, 3
  block 2, lot 1
Metes and Bounds Legal Descriptions: parcels 3020, 6679, 1706, 1704,
  1708, Section 32, T-119, R-21

c. Runway 23
Auditor's Subdivision 328, lot 1
Bergstrom's Lynside Manor Second Addition, block 1, lots 1 - 22,
  block 2, lots 1 - 12
Bergstrom's Lynside Manor Third Addition, block 1, lots 13, 14, 15
  block 2, lots 1 - 4, 9 - 15
Waite's Addition, block 2, lots 7 - 10
Waite's Second Addition, block 2, lots 7-11

d. Runway 5
Kensey Manor Second Addition, block 1, lots 11 - 18, 1, 2
  block 2, lots 1 - 9, 12 - 19
  block 3, lots 11 - 13
  block 4, lots 1 - 15
Mork Campion Addition, block 1, lots 16, 17
Kensey Manor, block 3, lots 3 - 7, 17, 18
B. USE RESTRICTIONS:

1. GENERAL: Subject at all times to the height restrictions set forth in Subsection IV B, no use shall be made of any land in any of the safety zones defined in Subsection V A which creates or causes interference with the operations of radio or electronic facilities on the airport or with radio or electronic communications between airport and aircraft, makes it difficult for pilots to distinguish between airport lights and other lights, results in glare in the eyes of pilots using the airport, impairs visibility in the vicinity of the airport, or otherwise endangers the landing, taking off, or maneuvering of aircraft.

2. ZONE A: Subject at all times to the height restrictions set forth in Subsection IV B and to the general restrictions contained in Subsection V B 1 areas designated as Zone A shall contain no buildings, temporary structures, exposed transmission lines, or other similar above-ground land use structural hazards, and shall be restricted to those uses which will not create, attract, or bring together an assembly of persons thereon. Permitted uses may include, but are not limited to, such uses as agriculture (seasonal crops), horticulture, animal husbandry, raising of livestock, wildlife habitat, light outdoor recreation (nonspectator), cemeteries, and auto parking.

3. ZONE B: Subject at all times to the height restrictions set forth in Subsection IV B, and to the general restrictions contained in Subsection V B 1, areas designated as Zone B shall be restricted in use as follows: a. Each use shall be on a site whose area shall not be less than three acres.
b. Each use shall not create, attract, or bring together a site population that would exceed 15 times that of the site acreage.

c. Each site shall have no more than one building plot upon which any number of structures may be erected.

d. A building plot shall be a single, uniform and non-contrived area, whose shape is uncomplicated and whose area shall not exceed the following minimum ratios with respect to the total site area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area at least (Acres)</th>
<th>But Less Than (Acres)</th>
<th>Ratio of Site Area to Bldg. Plot Area</th>
<th>Building Plot Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Max. Site Population (15 persons/A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8:1</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6:1</td>
<td>72,600</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>and up</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. The following uses are specifically prohibited in Zone B: Churches, hospitals, schools, theaters, stadiums, hotels and motels, trailer courts, camp grounds, and other places of frequent public or semi-public assembly.

4. ZONE C: Zone C is subject only to height restrictions set forth in Subsection IV B, and to the general restrictions contained in Subsection V B 1.

5. EXEMPTIONS - ESTABLISHED RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS:

a. Land uses which existed as of July 2, 1979 in the Established Residential Neighborhoods set forth in Section V A 4 above, and as
shown on the zoning map are subject to the height restrictions of Section IV B and the general restrictions of Section V B 1. Land uses which came into existence after July 2, 1979 are treated as though they were not in a designated Established Residential Neighborhood and are subject to the Zone A or Zone B restrictions as the case may be.

b. Land uses in Established Residential Neighborhoods which violate any of the following restrictions are prohibited as safety hazards and must be acquired, altered or removed at public expense. Those conditions are as follows:

(1) The following land uses if they exist in Safety Zone A or B and in an "Established Residential Neighborhood In a Built-Up Urban Area" are considered by the Commissioner to constitute airport safety hazards so severe, either to persons on the ground or to the air-traveling public, or both, that they must be prohibited under local airport zoning ordinances:

(a) any structure which a person or persons customarily use as a principal residence and which is located entirely inside Safety Zone A within 1000 feet of the end of the primary zone;

(b) any structure which a person or persons customarily use as a principal residence and which is located entirely within Safety Zones A or B and which penetrates an imaginary approach surface as defined by Section IV A;
(c) any land use in Safety Zone A or B which violates any of the following standards:

(i) the land use must not create or cause interference with the operation of radio or electronic facilities on the airport or with radio or electronic communications between the airport and aircraft;

(ii) the land use must not make it difficult for pilots to distinguish between airport lights and other lights;

(iii) the land use must not result in glare in the eyes of pilots using the airport or impair visibility in the vicinity of the airport.

(d) any isolated residential building lot zoned for single-family or two-family residences on which any structure, if built, would be prohibited by subparagraphs b.(1)(a), (b) or (c) above. An "isolated" residential building lot is one located in an area in which the predominant land use is single-family or two-family residential structures; and

(e) any other land use which presents, in the opinion of the Commissioner, a material danger to the landing, taking off or maneuvering of aircraft or to the safety of persons on the ground. In making such a determination, the Commissioner shall consider the following factors:

(i) possibility that the land use may contribute to or cause a collision of two or more aircraft or an aircraft and some other object;
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(ii) possibility that the land use may, in case of an aircraft accident, cause an explosion, fire or the release of harmful or noxious fumes, gases or substances;

(iii) tendency of the land use to increase the number of persons that could be injured in case of an aircraft accident;

(iv) effect of the land use on availability of clear areas for emergency landings; and

(v) flight patterns around the airport, the extent of use of the runway in question, the type of aircraft using the airport, whether the runways are lighted, whether the airport is controlled, and other similar factors.

C. BOUNDARY LIMITATIONS: The land use safety zoning restrictions set forth in this section shall apply for a distance not to exceed one mile beyond the perimeter of the airport boundary and in that portion of an airport hazard area under the approach zone for a distance not exceeding two miles from the airport boundary.

SECTION VI: AIRPORT ZONING MAP:
The several zones herein established are shown on the Crystal Airport Zoning Map consisting of 2 sheets, prepared by Toltz, King, Duvall, Anderson and dated May 1980, attached hereto and made a part hereof, which map, together with such amendments thereto as may from time to time be made, and all notations, references, elevations, data, zone boundaries, and other information thereon, shall be and the same is hereby adopted as part of this Ordinance.
SECTION VII: NONCONFORMING USES:

Regulations not retroactive. The regulations prescribed by this Ordinance shall not be construed to require the removal, lowering, or other changes or alteration of any structure or tree not conforming to the regulations as of the effective date of this Ordinance, or otherwise interfere with the continuance of any nonconforming use. Nothing herein contained shall require any change in the construction, alteration, or intended use of any structure, the construction or alteration of which was begun prior to the effective date of this Ordinance, and is diligently prosecuted and completed within two years thereof.

SECTION VIII: PERMITS:

A. FUTURE USES: Except as specifically provided in Paragraph 1 and 2 hereunder, no material change shall be made in the use of land and no structure shall be erected, altered, or otherwise established in any zone hereby created unless a permit therefor shall have been applied for and granted by the zoning administrator, hereinafter provided for. Each application for a permit shall indicate the purpose for which the permit is desired, with sufficient particularity to permit it to conform to the regulations herein prescribed. If such determination is in the affirmative, the permit shall be granted.

1. However, a permit for a tree or structure of less than 75 feet of vertical height above the ground shall not be required in the horizontal and conical zones or in any approach and transitional zones beyond a horizontal distance of 4,200 feet from each end of the runway except when such tree or structure, because of terrain, land contour, or topographic features, would extend the height or land use limit
prescribed for the respective zone.

2. Nothing contained in this foregoing exception shall be construed as permitting or intending to permit any construction, alteration, or growth of any structure or tree in excess of any of the height limitations established by this Ordinance as set forth in Section IV and the land use limitations set forth in Section V.

B. EXISTING USES: Before any existing use or structure may be replaced, substantially altered or repaired, or rebuilt within any zone established herein, a permit must be secured authorizing such replacement, change, or repair. No permit shall be granted that would allow the establishment or creation of an airport hazard or permit a nonconforming use, structure, or tree to become a greater hazard to air navigation than it was on the effective date of this Ordinance or any amendments thereto, or than it is when the application for a permit is made. Except as indicated, all applications for such a permit shall be granted.

C. NONCONFORMING USES ABANDONED OR DETERIORATED: Whenever the zoning administrator determines that a nonconforming structure or tree has been abandoned or more than 80% torn down, deteriorated, or decayed, no permit shall be granted that would allow such structure or tree to exceed the applicable height limit or otherwise deviate from the zoning regulations. Whether application is made for a permit under this paragraph or not, the zoning administrator may order the owner of the nonconforming structure, at his own expense, to lower, remove, reconstruct, or equip the same in the manner necessary to conform to the provisions of this Ordinance. In the event the owner of the nonconforming structure shall neglect or refuse to
comply with such order for ten days after receipt of written notice of such order, the zoning administrator may, by appropriate legal action, proceed to have the nonconforming structure lowered, removed, reconstructed, or equipped and assess the cost and expense thereof against the land on which the structure is or was located. Unless such an assessment is paid within ninety days from the service of notice thereof on the owner of the land, the sum shall bear interest at the rate of eight per cent per annum from the date the cost and expense is incurred until paid, and shall be collected in the same manner as are general taxes.

SECTION IX: VARIANCES:

Any person desiring to erect or increase the height of any structure, or permit the growth of any tree, or use his property not in accordance with the regulations prescribed in this Ordinance may apply to the Board of Adjustment, hereinafter provided for, for a variance from such regulations. If a person submits an application for a variance by certified mail to the zoning administrator who shall forward it to the members of the Board and the Board fails to grant or deny the variance within four months, the variance shall be deemed to be granted by the Board. When the variance is granted by reason of the failure of the Board to act on the variance, the person receiving the variance shall notify the Board and Commissioner of Transportation by certified mail that the variance has been granted. The applicant shall include a copy of the original application for the variance with this notice to the Commissioner. The variance shall be effective 60 days after this notice is received by the Commissioner subject to any action taken by the Commissioner pursuant to Section 360.063, Subdivision 6. Such variances shall be allowed where it is duly found that a literal application or enforcement of the regulations would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship and relief granted would not be
contrary to the public interest but do substantial justice and be in accordance with the spirit of this Ordinance provided any variance so allowed may be subject to any reasonable conditions that the Board of Adjustment or Commissioner may deem necessary to effectuate the purpose of this Ordinance.

SECTION X: HAZARD MARKING AND LIGHTING:

A. NONCONFORMING USES: The owner of any nonconforming structure or tree is hereby required to permit the installation, operation, and maintenance thereon of such markers and lights as shall be deemed necessary by the zoning administrator to indicate to the operators of aircraft in the vicinity of the airport the presence of such airport hazards. Such markers and lights shall be installed, operated, and maintained at the expense of the Metropolitan Airports Commission.

B. PERMITS AND VARIANCES: Any permit or variance granted by the zoning administrator or Board of Adjustment as the case may be, may, if such action is deemed advisable to effectuate the purpose of this Ordinance and be reasonable in the circumstances, so condition such permit or variance as to require the owner of the structure or tree in question at his own expense, to install, operate, and maintain thereon such markers and lights as may be necessary to indicate to pilots the presence of an airport hazard.

SECTION XI: AIRPORT ZONING ADMINISTRATOR:

A. DUTIES: It shall be the duty of the zoning administrator to administer and enforce the regulations prescribed herein. Applications for permits and variances shall be made to the zoning administrator upon a form furnished by him. Permit applications shall be promptly considered and granted or denied
by him in accordance with the regulations prescribed herein. Variance applications shall be forthwith transmitted by the zoning administrator for action by the Board of Adjustment hereinafter provided for.

B. MUNICIPAL IDENTIFICATION: For the purpose of this Ordinance the Zoning Administrator shall be the following municipal officials: the Brooklyn Center Director of Planning and Inspection for lands located in Brooklyn Center; the Brooklyn Park Zoning Administrator for lands located in Brooklyn Park; the Crystal Building Inspector for lands located in Crystal; the Minneapolis Director of Inspection for lands located in Minneapolis; the New Hope Building Official for lands located in New Hope; and the Robbinsdale Director of Community Development for lands located in Robbinsdale. In the event that one or more of the above-described zoning administrators does not administer this ordinance, and if the municipality does not appoint a successor zoning administrator, the Crystal Airport Joint Zoning Board shall appoint an individual or a permit-issuing agency to administer the ordinance in the municipality or municipalities.

C. LIMITATION OF SCOPE: In the event that a permit application is denied by the zoning administrator because it violates the terms of this airport zoning ordinance and the terms of the municipal zoning ordinance, the applicant must receive variances from both the Board of Adjustment, as provided for in Minnesota Statutes 360.067 Subdivision 2, and the municipality before a permit may be issued.

SECTION XII: BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

A. ESTABLISHMENT: The Board of Adjustment shall consist of five members appointed by the Metropolitan Airports Commission and each shall serve for a
term of three years and until his successor is duly appointed and qualified. Of the members first appointed, one shall be appointed for a term of one year, two for a term of two years, and two for a term of three years. Upon their appointment the members shall select a chairman to act at the pleasure of the board. Members shall be removable by the Metropolitan Airports Commission for cause, upon written charges, after a public hearing.

B. POWERS: The Board of Adjustment shall have and exercise the following powers:

1. To hear and decide appeals from any order, requirement, decision, or determination made by the Zoning Administrator in the enforcement of the zoning regulations contained in this ordinance, as provided in Minnesota Statutes 360.068.

2. To hear and decide special exceptions to the terms of zoning regulations contained in this Ordinance upon which such Board of Adjustment under such regulations may be required to pass.

3. To hear and decide specific variances under Minnesota Statutes 360.067.

C. PROCEDURES:

1. The Board of Adjustment shall adopt rules for its governance and procedure in harmony with the provisions of this Ordinance. Meetings of the Board of Adjustment shall be held at the call of the Chairman and at such other times as the Board of Adjustment may determine. The Chairman, or in his absence the acting chairman, may administer oaths and compel the attendance of witnesses. All hearings of the Board of Adjustment shall be public. The Board of Adjustment shall keep minutes.
of its proceedings showing the vote of each member upon each question
or, if absent or failing to vote, indicating such fact, and shall keep
records of its examinations and other official actions, all of which
shall immediately be filed in the office of the Zoning Administrator and
shall be a public record.

2. The Board of Adjustment shall make written findings of fact and
conclusions of law giving the facts upon which it acted and its legal
conclusions from such facts in reversing, affirming, or modifying any
order, requirement, decision or determination which comes before it
under the provisions of this Ordinance.

3. The concurring vote of a majority of the members of the Board of
Adjustment shall be sufficient to reverse any order, requirement,
decision or determination of the Zoning Administrator or to decide in
favor of the applicant on any matter upon which it is required to pass
under this Ordinance or to effect any variation in this Ordinance.

SECTION XIII: APPEALS:

A. Any person aggrieved, or any taxpayer affected by any decision of the Zoning
Administrator made in his administration of airport zoning regulations
contained in this Ordinance, may appeal to the Board of Adjustment. Such
appeals may also be made by any governing body of a municipality, county, or
airport zoning board, which is of the opinion that a decision of the zoning
administrator is an improper application of this ordinance as it concerns
such governing body or board.

B. All appeals hereunder must be commenced within 30 days of the Zoning
Administrator's decision by filing with the Zoning Administrator a notice of
appeal specifying the grounds thereof. The Zoning Administrator shall forthwith transmit to the Board of Adjustment all papers constituting the record upon which the action appealed from was taken. In addition, any person aggrieved, or any taxpayer affected by any decisions of the Zoning Administrator made in his administration of airport zoning regulations contained in this ordinance who desires to appeal such decision, shall submit an application for a variance by certified mail to the members of the Board of Adjustment in the manner set forth in Minnesota Statutes 360.068, Subdivision 2.

C. An appeal shall stay all proceedings in furtherance of the action appealed from, unless the Zoning Administrator certifies to the Board of Adjustment, after the notice of appeal has been filed with it, that by reason of the facts stated in the certificate a stay would in his opinion, cause imminent peril to life or property. In such case, proceedings shall not be stayed except by order of the Board of Adjustment on notice to the Zoning Administrator and on due cause shown.

D. The Board of Adjustment shall fix a reasonable time for hearing appeals, give public notice, notice to the municipalities of Brooklyn Center, Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Minneapolis, New Hope, Robbinsdale and the Metropolitan Airports Commission, and due notice to the parties in interest, and decide the same within a reasonable time. Upon the hearing any party may appear in person or by agent or by attorney.

E. The Board of Adjustment may, in conformity with the provisions of this ordinance, reverse or affirm, in whole or in part, or modify the order, requirement, decision or determination appealed from and may make such
order, requirement, decision or determination, as may be appropriate under the circumstances, and to that end shall have all the powers of the Zoning Administrator for the purpose of enforcing this airport zoning Ordinance.

SECTION XIV: JUDICIAL REVIEW:
Any person aggrieved, or any taxpayer affected by any decision of the Board of Adjustment, or any governing body of a municipality, county, or airport zoning board, which is of the opinion that a decision of the Board of Adjustment is illegal may present to the District Court of Hennepin County a verified petition setting forth that the decision or action is illegal, in whole or in part, and specifying the grounds of the illegality. Such petition shall be presented to the court within 30 days after the decision is filed in the office of the Board of Adjustment. The petitioner must exhaust the remedies provided in this Ordinance before availing himself of the right to petition a court as provided by this section.

SECTION XV: PENALTIES:
Every person who shall construct, establish, substantially change, alter or repair any existing structure or use, or permit the growth of any tree without having complied with the provision of this Ordinance or who, having been granted a permit or variance under the provisions of this Ordinance, shall construct, establish, substantially change or substantially alter or repair any existing growth or structure or permit the growth of any tree, except as permitted by such permit or variance, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days or by both. Each day a violation continues to exist shall constitute a separate offense. The Airport Zoning Administrator may enforce all provisions of this ordinance through such proceedings for injunctive relief and other relief as may be proper under the laws of Minnesota Statutes 360.073 and other applicable law.
SECTION XVI: CONFLICTS:
Where there exists a conflict between any of the regulations or limitations prescribed in this Ordinance and any other regulations applicable to the same area, whether the conflict be with respect to the height of structures or trees, the use of land, or any other matter, the more stringent limitation or regulation shall govern and prevail.

SECTION XVII: SEVERABILITY:
A. In any case in which the provisions of this Ordinance, although generally reasonable, are held by a court to interfere with the use or enjoyment of a particular structure or parcel of land to such an extent, or to be so onerous in their application to such a structure or parcel of land as to constitute a taking or deprivation of that property in violation of the constitution of this state or the constitution of the United States, such holding shall not affect the application of this Ordinance as to other structures and parcels of land, and to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are declared to be severable.

B. Should any section or provision of this Ordinance be declared by the courts to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the Ordinance as a whole or any part thereof other than the parts so declared to be unconstitutional or invalid.

SECTION XVIII: EFFECTIVE DATE:
This Ordinance shall take effect on the 9th day of December, 1987. Copies thereof shall be filed with the Commissioner of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, State of Minnesota, and the Register of Deeds, Hennepin County, Minnesota.
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## Appendix 8: Stakeholder Engagement Program Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials from June 8, 2016 Tenant Briefing</td>
<td>8-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from July 15, 2016 Municipal Planners Briefing</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from September 6, 2016 Tenant Briefing</td>
<td>8-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from September 8, 2016 Crystal City Council Working Group Briefing</td>
<td>8-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from September 12, 2016 Brooklyn Park City Council Briefing</td>
<td>8-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from September 26, 2016 Brooklyn Center City Council Briefing</td>
<td>8-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from September 27 and September 29, 2016 Public Information Meeting</td>
<td>8-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from January 26, 2017 Tenant Briefing</td>
<td>8-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from January 27, 2017 Municipal Planners Briefing</td>
<td>8-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from March 30, 2017 Supplemental Public Information Meeting</td>
<td>8-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavits of Publication for Public Notices</td>
<td>8-135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crystal Airport
2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

Briefing Agenda

• Guiding Principles
• Aviation Activity Forecasts
• Development Concepts
• Stakeholder Engagement
• Next Steps
LTCP Guiding Principles

- States high-level purpose and objectives for planning
- Provides focus and direction to evaluate planning decisions
  - Airport Role
  - Airport Infrastructure
  - Stakeholder and Community Engagement
  - Land Use Compatibility & Environmental Considerations
  - Financial Viability

Activity Forecast Summary

- Based Aircraft
  - 296 in 2000
  - 185 in 2015
  - 171 estimated in 2035
- Aircraft Operations
  - ~177,000 in 2000
  - ~41,000 in 2015
  - ~40,000 estimated in 2035
- Trend towards stabilizing activity levels
Runway Incursion Mitigation (RIM)

- Airfield geometry identified as a primary contributing factor for Runway Incursions (RIs) at MIC
  - 37 documented RIs since 2007
- MIC is now on FAA's RIM “Hit List”
  - Hot Spot #6 has 13 RIs by itself
  - 9 aircraft, 4 vehicle incursions
- Improving airfield safety by reducing the rate of runway incursions is a high priority in the LTCP

Runway Length Requirements

- Design Aircraft Family
  - Small Propeller-Driven Airplanes
  - Fewer Than 10 Passenger Seats
- Primary Runway Length
  - FAA Guidance: Range of 3,300 – 3,900 feet
  - Aircraft-specific analysis: ~3,600 feet appropriate length for long-term future planning
    - Based on Accelerate-Stop Distance (ASDA)
    - Enhances safety and operational capability for the design aircraft family of propeller airplanes
    - Does NOT consider length requirements for jets
  - Existing RWY 14L-32R length is at the bottom end of this range
  - Consider “activating” paved overruns as stopways
Previous LTCP Concept

Maintain One Primary and One Crosswind Runway

- Previous LTCP adopted in December 2008
- Recommendation to “right size” the airfield to better align infrastructure with demand
  - Decommission turf (6R-24L) and south parallel (14R-32L) runways
  - Leaves a two-runway system in place
  - Opportunity to eliminate most or all Hot Spots
  - Open up Aeronautical & Non-Aeronautical development opportunities
- Turf Runway Operations

LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Activate RWY 14-32 Stopways

- No change to runway ends or thresholds
- Requires Stopway lighting
- Requires additional safety area grading off ends
- Provides for ~3,767 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
- Safety benefits for all; operational benefits for some
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

- Utility Runway Designation
  - Improves RPZ Compliance
- Convert existing RWY 14R-32L to Full Parallel Taxiway
- Remove section of TWY E that crosses RWY 6-24
- Remove direct Apron-to-Runway access
- Additional apron/hangar development areas
- Obstacle (tree) clearing
- Additional LNAV instrument approaches

Stakeholder & Public Engagement

- Pre-Publication Stakeholder Engagement
  - Agencies
  - Tenants
  - Municipal Representatives
- MAC Board Approval to Publish Draft LTCP
- Formal Public Review Period
  - 45-day review period (targeting Fall 2016)
  - Public Information Meeting(s)
  - Additional briefings as necessary
- MAC Board Approval to Submit to Met C
- Metropolitan Council Review
- Final MAC Board Adoption
- Tenant/User Engagement During the Public Process is Crucial!
Questions, Input & Open Dialogue
On July 15, 2016, MAC staff met with representatives from several municipalities in the vicinity of the Crystal Airport to update them about the status of the draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP). Represented municipalities included:

- City of Crystal (Dan Olson, City Planner and John Sutter, Community Development Director)
- Hennepin County (Jason Gottfried, Senior Planning Analyst)
- City of Brooklyn Center (Tim Benetti, City Planner)
- City of Brooklyn Park (Cindy Sherman, Planning Director)

MAC staff in attendance were Dana Nelson, Mike Wilson, Melissa Scovronski, Kelly Gerads, Gary Schmidt, Robert Dockry, and Neil Ralston.

A copy of the briefing agenda, presentation slides, and supplemental handouts are attached.

The briefing started with a review of the Airport’s role, current activity trends compared to other airports in the state, and the updated LTCP activity forecasts. Questions that arose from this portion of the briefing included:

- What are some examples of peer “Intermediate” airports in the state? For context, which airports have higher activity levels?
- What is MAC doing to market flight training activities at Crystal Airport?

The next item was a recap of the airfield changes recommended in the previous LTCP, and a description of the refinements to the base concept that we are considering in this planning cycle. The refinements under consideration include:

- Utility runway designations and use of smaller-dimension Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)
- Converting existing RWY 14L-32R paved overruns to stopways
- Converting existing RWY 14L-32R paved overruns to runway (discarded from further consideration)
- Ultimate taxiway configuration to simplify airfield layout

Dialogue from this portion of the briefing included the following items:
• Overall, the municipal representatives seemed supportive of the preliminary plan recommendation to convert the existing RWY 14L-32R paved overruns to stopways, likening them to paved shoulders on freeways. However, the Crystal representatives emphasized that we will have to carefully consider how we explain the rationale for the stopway conversion to the public to avoid the perception that this is a “back door” way to expand the airport.
• Concern was expressed about the stopway edge lighting moving closer to residential neighborhoods. MAC will confirm that the stopway lights use unidirectional lenses that are only visible in the direction of the takeoff roll.
• City of Crystal staff questioned the need for the crosswind runway, noting that if it was decommissioned it would open up a lot of valuable real estate along CR 81/Bottineau Boulevard for non-aeronautical development (like the recent medical device facility being constructed in Brooklyn Park). MAC staff explained that the rationale for preserving the crosswind runway are for wind coverage (primary 14-32 alignment does not provide 95% wind coverage in all conditions), and that use of the crosswind disperses noise impacts around the airport.

The final portion of the briefing focused on stakeholder engagement, public input, and the timeline for moving the LTCP forward. In particular, MAC staff solicited input from the group about methods to notify the public about upcoming informational meetings.

• The cities are increasing their use of social media to notify citizens of upcoming meetings. They will assist us through these channels.
• To maximize notification efforts, the cities recommended that we direct mail a postcard to residents in the vicinity of the airport. Crystal staff will put together a suggested list of residents to include in the direct mail.
• They also have had success in using temporary digital signage to announce meeting times and locations. They suggested that we could consider setting up temporary message boards next to the VFW on Bass Lake Road, and perhaps next to the former HFI hangar site.

Our next step is to coordinate further with the municipalities regarding the logistics of the public outreach program after we have MAC Board approval to proceed.

Attachments:
• Meeting agenda
• Briefing slides
• Draft LTCP Guiding Principles
• Crystal Airport LTCP Forecast Summary
----- Agenda Topics -----

- Introductions
- Crystal Airport LTCP Guiding Principles (draft)
- Aviation Activity Forecast (2015 – 2035)
  - Baseline activity levels
  - Base Case forecast
    - Based Aircraft
    - Aircraft Operations
    - Aircraft Fleet Mix
- Recap of Alternatives Considered in Previous LTCP
  - Eight (8) concepts evaluated
  - Preferred Alternative = Right-Size Airfield
    - Decommission two runways/retain two runways
  - Preferred Alternative Retained for 2035 LTCP
- Preferred Alternative Refinements Being Evaluated
  - Runway Designation
    - “Utility” Runway designation
  - Convert Runway 14L-32R Paved Overruns to Stopways
    - No new pavement; requires edge lights and additional safety area grading
    - Does not change published runway length
    - Safety enhancement
    - Improved but limited operational capabilities for some users
  - Taxiway Configuration Changes
- Stakeholder Engagement
  - User Group Outreach
  - First MAC Committee presentation – August 2016
  - Public/Stakeholder Comment Period (45 Days) – Fall 2016
- Open Discussion/Next Steps
Crystal Airport
2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

Briefing Agenda

• Introductions
• Airport Role
• Guiding Principles
• Aviation Activity Forecasts
• Development Concepts
• Stakeholder Engagement & Next Steps

Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP Purpose:
• Update view of future facility needs
• Serve as the “road map” to guide our development strategy for Crystal Airport
• Shape the 7-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Crystal Airport Role

• Primary Role of Crystal Airport
  – Integral part of the regional Reliever Airport 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

• Crystal Airport Context
  – Of Peer “Intermediate” Airports (83)
    – 2nd busiest for aircraft operations
    – 3rd highest number of based aircraft
  – Of All Minnesota Airports (135)
    – Top 10 busiest for aircraft operations & top 5 for based aircraft

LTCP Guiding Principles

• States high-level purpose and objectives for planning
• Provides focus and direction to evaluate planning decisions
  – Airport Role
  – Airport Infrastructure
  – Stakeholder and Community Engagement
  – Land Use Compatibility & Environmental Considerations
  – Financial Viability
Activity Forecast Summary

- Based Aircraft (MnDOT)
  - 296 in 2000
  - 185 in 2015
  - 171 estimated in 2035

- Aircraft Operations
  - ~177,000 in 2000
  - ~41,000 in 2015
  - ~40,000 estimated in 2035

- Trend towards stabilizing activity levels

- Aircraft Fleet Mix

Previous LTCP Alternatives Considered
Previous LTCP Preferred Alternative

Maintain One Primary and One Crosswind Runway

- Previous LTCP adopted in December 2008
- Recommendation to “right size” the airfield to better align infrastructure with demand
  - Decommission turf (6R-24L) and south parallel (14R-32L) runways
  - Leaves a two-runway system in place
  - Opportunity to eliminate most or all “Hot Spots”
  - Open up Aeronautical & Non-Aeronautical development opportunities
- Turf Runway Operations

LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

“Utility” runway designation
- Allows use of smaller Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)
- Reduces number of homes in the RPZ
- Published runway strength = 12,500 pounds
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Stopways
- No change to runway ends or thresholds
- Requires Stopway lighting
- Requires additional safety area grading off ends
- Provides for ~3,767 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
- Safety benefits for all; operational benefits for some

LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Runway
- Changes runway ends
- Requires taxiway extensions
- Provides for ~4,267 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
- Increases complexity through declared distances
- Increases community noise exposure by moving takeoffs closer to homes

Dismissed from further consideration
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

- Convert existing RWY 14R-32L to Full Parallel Taxiway
- Remove section of TWY E that crosses RWY 6-24
- Remove direct Apron-to-Runway access
- Additional apron/hangar development areas
- Obstacle (tree) clearing
- Additional LNAV instrument approaches

Stakeholder & Public Engagement

- Pre-Publication Stakeholder Engagement
  - Agencies
  - Tenants
  - Municipal Representatives
- MAC Board Approval to Publish Draft LTCP
- Formal Public Review Period
  - 45-day review period (targeting Fall 2016)
  - Public Information Meeting(s)
  - Additional briefings as necessary
- MAC Board Approval to Submit to Met Council
- Metropolitan Council Review
- Final MAC Board Adoption
Questions, Input & Open Dialogue
Crystal Airport
2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

Guiding Principles

Guiding principles establish a foundation for and parameters against which planning-related decisions are evaluated. These principles provide focus and direction in formulating a recommended development plan – in this case for Crystal Airport (MIC). The principles also act as a high-level explanation of the purpose and objectives of the planning process.

By nature, these guiding principles are dynamic and may be adjusted over time.

Airport Role

Operating within a diverse system of metropolitan area airports, Crystal Airport’s primary role is to serve personal, recreational, and some business aviation users in the northwest metropolitan area, including the cities of Crystal, Brooklyn Park, and Brooklyn Center. Example business services include flight training, aircraft rentals, charter flights, aircraft and propeller maintenance, sale of aircraft avionics and parts, and medical flight transportation.

The primary role of Crystal Airport is not expected to change during the planning period. The Airport’s classification will continue to be that of:

- A Complimentary Reliever in the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) system
- An Intermediate Airport per Minnesota Department of Transportation/Office of Aeronautics (MnDOT)
- A Minor Airport per the Metropolitan Council Regional Aviation System Plan

The aircraft mainly anticipated to use Crystal Airport – and that which it is designed for – will continue to be a family of small, propeller-driven airplanes with fewer than 10 passenger seats.

The proposed plan does not contemplate upgrading the role of Crystal Airport to accommodate a larger aircraft family or scheduled passenger or cargo flights. Nor does the plan contemplate downgrading the role of Crystal Airport.

Airport Infrastructure

Key airfield improvement objectives for Crystal Airport are to:

1. Right size the airfield to match existing and forecasted activity levels
2. Preserve and, if possible, improve operational capabilities for the current family of aircraft using the facility
3. Enhance safety by simplifying the runway and taxiway layout
The planning process will ensure proposed airfield development conforms to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and MnDOT regulations, design standards, and system plans to the extent practical and feasible.

Wherever prudent, development plans will make use of existing facilities through renewal, modernization and/or infill development.

**Stakeholder and Community Engagement**

The planning process will seek to foster consensus among stakeholders, including tenants and users, the FAA, MnDOT, the Metropolitan Council, the Metropolitan Airports Commission, and local governmental bodies.

Airport development and maintenance plans should consider the objectives of local governmental bodies, including partnering with these bodies to promote regional economic development and local land use compatibility.

The planning process will include a public involvement program to inform and educate interested parties of possible plans for Crystal Airport’s future and any associated community impacts, and to consider community feedback received.

**Land Use Compatibility & Environmental Considerations**

A significant investment has been made in Crystal Airport, warranting the need to protect the facility from new non-compatible off-airport development that could compromise its role. Existing zoning and land use controls should be maintained, unless otherwise modified, to facilitate long-term plan implementation in a manner that acknowledges the urban nature of the neighborhoods surrounding Crystal Airport and encourages compatible development.

In service to all parties, operation and development of Crystal Airport will promote initiatives to incorporate environmental stewardship and infuse sustainable thinking.

**Financial Viability**

Development at Crystal Airport will continue to be self-funded by users of the airport and aviation system; no local sales or property taxes will be used to fund Airport improvements.

- All facility improvements will be funded through pursuing FAA and MnDOT grants first, with MAC funding as a secondary source.
- Future development at Crystal Airport should promote financial self-sufficiency to the maximum extent practical, including strategies to encourage tenant investments in facility improvements and/or new facilities, and other non-aeronautical revenue generation.
1. Introduction

This chapter summarizes the LTCP activity forecast for Crystal Airport (MIC). The base year is represented by the twelve months ending June 2015 and forecasts were prepared for 2020, 2025, 2030, and 2035. The forecasts for the airport are unconstrained, except for runway length, and assume that the necessary facilities will be in place to accommodate demand. The chapter begins with a description of the forecast approach, followed by a discussion of the forecasts for based aircraft and aircraft operations, and then concludes with a set of alternative forecast scenarios.

The assumptions inherent in the following calculations are based on data provided by the MAC, federal and local sources, and professional experience. Forecasting, however, is not an exact science. Departures from forecast levels in the local and national economy and in the aviation industry would have a significant effect on the forecasts presented herein.

2. Historical Trends

Table 1 shows historical based aircraft and aircraft operations at MIC from 1990 through 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Based Aircraft</th>
<th>Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>189,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>172,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>176,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>156,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>127,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>98,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>74,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>71,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>62,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>53,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>49,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>42,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>44,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>43,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>48,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>42,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>41,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>41,838(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Twelve months ending June 2015. Includes estimate of nighttime activity.
Source: MAC and FAA ATADS.
The total number of aircraft based in Crystal airport declined from 1990 to 2015. The total counts stayed above 300 aircraft before 2000 but declined to around 185 recently. Aircraft operations fell more rapidly than based aircraft over the same period, indicating reduced utilization for those aircraft that remained based at MIC. A number of factors have contributed to the decline including the slowing economy, increased fuel prices and other operating costs, and reduced interest in recreational flying by younger people.

3. Forecast Approach

The Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area is served by a system of airports. These airports provide a variety of roles and therefore both complement and compete with each other. Since these airports operate as a system, they were forecast as a system so that the interrelationships between the airports could be properly captured. The forecast focused on five of the airports in the MAC system – Crystal, Airlake (LVN), Anoka County (ANE), Flying Cloud (FCM), and St. Paul Downtown (STP) – but also incorporated the other MAC airports – Minneapolis-St. Paul International (MSP) and Lake Elmo (21D) into the analysis. The details of the forecast approach are provided in the main forecast report, *Minneapolis-St. Paul Reliever Airport: Activity Forecasts – Technical Report*, and are summarized below:

1. Identify Catchment Areas – Crystal Airport is located in Hennepin County and most of the based aircraft owners reside in the same county as the airport they use. Nevertheless, there is some overlap between the airport catchment areas. Jet and turboprop aircraft owners that require longer runways and more extensive maintenance and fueling facilities tend to gravitate towards airports such as St. Paul Downtown (STP) and Flying Cloud Airport (FCM). Likewise, operators of small single engine piston aircraft often shy away from larger more commercial airports because of congestion and costs, even though these airports may be closer to their place of residence. Aircraft registration data from the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) was used to identify the percentage of MIC based aircraft owners that resided in each county.

2. Develop Socioeconomic Projections – Population forecasts from the Metropolitan Council (Met Council) and per capita income forecasts from Woods & Poole Economics (W&P) were used to develop hybrid income forecasts for each county in the metropolitan area. The income forecasts were used to estimate the share of based aircraft growth accounted for by each county.

3. Project the number of based aircraft registered in each county by aircraft category based on the county income forecasts and the FAA Aerospace forecast adjusted for Minneapolis-St. Paul trends.

4. Allocate the projected based aircraft to each MAC-airport according to the existing distribution pattern for each aircraft category (piston, turboprop, jet, helicopter, etc.).

5. Estimate the number of aircraft on waiting list that would be added assuming airport capacity is unconstrained. Since MIC has extra capacity, there is no waiting list and the waiting list adjustment was not applied there.

6. Redistribute aircraft from the constrained MAC airports (MSP) to the remaining unconstrained airports based on the existing distribution patterns of the airports. Although MSP has sufficient airfield capacity to accommodate growth, the facilities that can accommodate based general aviation (GA) aircraft are limited.

7. Identify base year aircraft operations. Operations counts for Crystal were initially obtained from the FAA Air Traffic Control Tower. The air traffic control tower at MIC does not operate 24 hours per day; therefore late night operations were estimated based on the MAC’s flight tracking system data. To estimate operations by aircraft type, the FAA Traffic
Flow Management System Counts (TFMSC) which provides aircraft information was used and supplemented with flight tracking system data from the MAC’s environmental office.

8. Project future year aircraft operations. In each aircraft category, operations per active aircraft were projected to increase at the same rate as the FAA forecast of hours flown per based aircraft, implicitly assuming that the number of operations per hours flown remain constant. The percentage of touch and go operations in each aircraft category was assumed to remain constant.

Forecasts include based aircraft and operations for each major category: single engine piston, multi-engine piston, turboprop, jets, helicopters, sport aircraft, experimental, and other. It was assumed that the share of each county’s registered aircraft in every aircraft category based at all of the airports under study will remain constant.

4. Forecast Results

Table 2 shows the forecast of based aircraft for Crystal. The number of based aircraft at Crystal is projected to decline slightly, from 185 aircraft in 2015 to 171 aircraft in 2035. The dominant aircraft in the fleet, piston engine aircraft, are projected to decline, consistent with the FAA Aerospace Forecast Fiscal Years 2015-2035. Helicopters and experimental aircraft are expected to increase but not fast enough to offset the decline in the piston category.

Table 3 shows the forecast of aircraft operations at MIC. Total aircraft operations at Crystal are forecast to decrease from 41,838 in 2015 to 39,904 in 2035, an average annual rate of -0.2 percent. Increases are projected in all categories except single-engine and multi-engine piston aircraft, for which the anticipated decrease in the based aircraft offsets slightly higher utilization forecasted by FAA. Jet and helicopter operations are expected to increase the fastest.

The percentage of operations occurring in August, the peak month at Crystal Airport, was estimated from FAA air traffic control tower records. Average Day Peak Month (ADPM) operations were estimated by dividing by 31 days. Peak hour operations were obtained from the FAA Distributed Operations Network (OPSNET). The peak hour percentage in the peak month over the past four years has averaged 11.6 percent. As shown in Table 4, peak hour operations are projected to fluctuate between 27 and 29 operations.
Table 2: Summary of Based Aircraft Forecast (Crystal Base Case Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Engine Piston</th>
<th>Multi-Engine Piston</th>
<th>Turboprop</th>
<th>Jets</th>
<th>Rotor</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Experimental - Excluding Ultralights</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Annual Growth Rate**

-0.6%  -0.8%  0.0%  0.0%  2.0%  0.0%  1.4%  0.0%  -0.4%

### Table 3: Summary of Operations Forecast (Crystal Base Case Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Engine Piston</th>
<th>Multi-Engine Piston</th>
<th>Turboprop</th>
<th>Jets</th>
<th>Rotor</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Experimental - Excluding Ultralights</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35,324</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>35,039</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>32,046</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>30,993</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>30,283</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,774</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>30,633</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,454</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Annual Growth Rate**

-0.7%  -0.5%  1.8%  3.5%  2.8%  0.0%  2.4%  0.0%  -0.2%

Table 4: Peak Activity Forecast (Crystal Base Case Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Operations (a)</th>
<th>Peak Month Operations (b)</th>
<th>ADPM Operations (c)</th>
<th>Peak Hour Operations (d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>42,063</td>
<td>4,922</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>41,838</td>
<td>4,865</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>39,495</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>39,025</td>
<td>4,538</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>38,578</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>39,904</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Table 3.
(b) Value for 2014 is actual. Forecast years estimated using average peak month percentage from 2011-2014.
(c) Peak month operations divided by 31 days.
(d) Estimated at 18.4 percent of ADPM operations based on MAC aircraft operation counts.

Sources: As noted and HNTB analysis.

5 Scenarios

General aviation activity has historically been difficult to forecast, since the relationships with economic growth and pricing factors are more tenuous than in other aviation sectors, such as commercial aviation. This uncertainty is likely to carry over into the near future, given the volatility of fuel prices and the continued shift in GA from personal and recreational use to business use. To address these uncertainties, and to identify the potential upper and lower bounds of future activity at the study airports, detailed high and low scenarios are presented. These scenarios use the same forecast approach that was used in the base case, but alter the assumptions to reflect either a more aggressive or more conservative outlook.

The high forecast scenario is based on the assumption that income would grow 0.5 percent per year faster than in the base case. All other assumptions are the same as in the base case. The low forecast scenario is based on the assumption that income would grow 0.5 percent more slowly each year than under the base case.

Subsequent to the preparation of the high and low forecast scenarios, an additional scenario was developed to evaluate the potential impact associated with designating the existing overrun pavement beyond each end of Runway 14L-32R as stopway. Pavement designated as stopway can be used for decelerating an aircraft during an aborted takeoff and can be considered for accelerate-stop distance calculations, but cannot be considered for takeoff or landing distance calculations. Designating stopways will allow aircraft to depart at a higher takeoff weight when accelerate-stop distance is a limiting factor, and will promote safety by formally making this pavement available for use in the event of an aborted takeoff attempt. Stopways do not change
the published runway length, nor are they intended to attract aircraft types different than those operating at the airport today. However, the availability of stopways may result in a small increase in aircraft operations from some users who find the existing runway length to be limiting based on accelerate-stop distance criteria. In the stopway scenario, the number of additional aircraft operations above the base case is approximately 230 annually, translating to just over four additional takeoffs and landings per week. Of the additional operations, the majority are expected to be turboprops (approximately three-quarters), with the remaining increase coming from small jets. All other forecast assumptions are the same as in the base case.

Table 5 compares the total number of based aircraft and operations under different scenarios for MIC. The MIC base case, high and stopway scenario LTCP forecasts are consistent the FAA 2015 Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) as they differ by less than 10% in the 5-year forecast period and 15% in the 10-year forecast period.

Figure 1 provides a graphic comparison of the base, high and low, and stopway scenario operations forecasts, along with the FAA's 2015 Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) for the airport.
Table 5: Forecast Comparison By Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Based Aircraft</th>
<th>Total Number of Operations</th>
<th>Variance from TAF (Operations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Growth Rate

-0.4%  0.1%  -0.8%
-0.2%  0.2%  -0.6%  -0.2%  0.3%

Sources: HNTB Analysis.
Figure 1: MIC Forecast Comparison (Operations)
Crystal Airport
2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

06 September 2016 – Tenant Briefing
Draft LTCP Overview

Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP
Purpose:
• Update view of future facility needs
• Serve as the “road map” to guide our development strategy for Crystal Airport
• Shape the 7-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

Briefing Agenda
• Airport Role & Context
• Aviation Activity Forecasts
• Development Concepts
• Stakeholder Engagement & Next Steps
Crystal Airport Role

• Primary Role of Crystal Airport
  – Integral part of the regional Reliever Airport 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

• Crystal Airport Context
  – Of Peer “Intermediate” Airports (83)
    – 2nd busiest for aircraft operations
  – 3rd highest number of based aircraft
  – Of All Minnesota Airports (135)
    – Top 10 busiest for aircraft operations & top 5 for based aircraft

Activity Forecast Summary

• Based Aircraft (MnDOT)
  – 296 in 2000
  – 185 in 2015
  – 171 estimated in 2035

• Aircraft Operations
  – ~177,000 in 2000
  – ~41,000 in 2015
  – ~40,000 estimated in 2035

• Trend towards stabilizing activity levels
• Aircraft Fleet Mix
Previous LTCP Alternatives Considered

Previous LTCP Preferred Alternative

Maintain One Primary and One Crosswind Runway

- Previous LTCP adopted in December 2008
- Recommendation to “right size” the airfield to better align infrastructure with demand
  - Decommission turf (6R-24L) and south parallel (14R-32L) runways
  - Leaves a two-runway system in place
  - Open up Aeronautical & Non-Aeronautical development opportunities
Crystal Airport “Hot Spots”

- “Hot Spots” = Designated airport area where heightened attention by pilots and drivers is necessary due to complex or confusing layouts
- Reducing runways to one primary and one crosswind simplifies the airfield configuration for pilots
- Crystal’s 8 existing Hot Spots can be reduced with the proposed plan

Runway Length Requirements

- Design Aircraft Family
  - Small Propeller-Driven Airplanes
  - Fewer Than 10 Passenger Seats
- Primary Runway Length
  - FAA Guidance: Range of 3,300 – 3,900 feet
  - Aircraft-specific analysis: ~3,600 feet appropriate length for long-term future planning
    - Based on Accelerate-Stop Distance (ASDA)
    - Enhances safety and operational capability for the design aircraft family of propeller airplanes
    - Does NOT consider length requirements for jets
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

**Utility runway designation**
- Allows use of smaller Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)
- Reduces number of homes in the RPZs
- Published runway strength = 12,500 pounds

**Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Stopways**
- No change to runway ends or thresholds
- Requires Stopway lighting
- Requires additional safety area grading off ends
- Provides for ~3,800 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Runway

- Changes runway ends
- Requires taxiway extensions
- Provides for ~4,300 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
- Potential to attract larger aircraft
- Increases community noise exposure by moving takeoffs closer to homes

Taxiway Configuration Changes

- Convert existing RWY 14R-32L to Full Parallel Taxiway with lighting
- Remove section of TWY E that crosses RWY 6-24
- Extend TWY B to new parallel
- Remove direct Apron-to-Runway access @ TWY E2 & E3
- Convert portion of TWY E to Taxilane
Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative

- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP
- Utility Runway designations
- Convert RWY 14-32 paved overruns to stopways
- Taxiway configuration changes
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach

Stakeholder & Public Engagement

- Pre-Publication Stakeholder Engagement
  - Agencies
  - Tenants
  - Municipal Representatives
- MAC Board Approval to prepare & publish Draft LTCP
- Formal Public Review Period
  - 45-day review period (September 12 – October 26, 2016)
  - Public Information Meetings
    - Tuesday, September 27 @ Crystal Community Center (5-7pm)
    - Thursday, September 29 @ Brooklyn Park City Hall (5-7pm)
- MAC Board Approval to Submit to Met Council
- Metropolitan Council Review
- Final MAC Board Adoption
- Environmental, ALP, Zoning Update
MEMO

DATE: September 22, 2016

TO: Crystal Airport LTCP Working Group Members

FROM: Neil Ralston, Airport Planner

SUBJECT: Summary of 09/06/16 Crystal Airport Draft 2035 LTCP Tenant Briefing

On September 6, 2016, MAC staff hosted a tenant briefing to present information about, and solicit feedback on, the draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport. Approximately 20 tenants attended the briefing.

The following topics were covered during the briefing:

- Airport role and activity context
- LTCP aviation forecast summary
- Review of the previous (2025) LTCP Preferred Alternative
- Concept revisions being considered for the 2035 LTCP
- Overview of upcoming stakeholder engagement activities

The draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative presented to the tenants included the following project elements:

- Implement the two-runway system from the previous LTCP (close turf Runway 6R-24L and south parallel Runway 14R-32L)
- Change to Utility Runway designations, resulting in use of smaller-dimension Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)
- Convert the existing Runway 14L-32R paved overruns into stopways so that the additional length could be used for accelerate-stop distance calculations
- Taxiway configuration changes to simplify the airfield and reduce the likelihood of incursion errors
- FBO apron expansion
- Assess the feasibility of requesting an additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach (Runway 32 end)

The tenant group offered the following feedback:

- The turf runway is an asset and it should be retained in the future plan.

MAC staff pointed out several issues associated with retaining the turf runway, including declining operations (about 60 per month based on Tower counts), its aging condition that will
require rehabilitation in the near future, its contribution to airfield complexity, the need to remove obstructions (trees) in its approach, and the constraint that it has on expanding the FBO apron.

- Closing Runway 14R/32L may be short-sighted if aviation demand grows faster than MAC projects in its latest forecasts.

MAC staff provided examples of several high-volume general aviation airports that operate with a two-intersecting runway configuration similar to the proposed layout for Crystal. Examples include Republic Airport (FRG) in Farmingdale, NY (~198,000 operations); Fort Lauderdale Executive (FXE) in FL (~160,000 operations), and Teterboro (TEB) in NJ (~172,000 operations). According to FAA guidelines, the annual service volume (estimate of annual airfield capacity) for a two-intersecting runway configuration is approximately 230,000 operations. With annual operations levels expected to remain in the 40,000-range at Crystal for the foreseeable future, a two-runway system appears to be very appropriate.

- The stopway scenario identified as the preferred alternative will not have a noticeable benefit for the majority of operators at Crystal. Converting the existing overruns to runway extensions would provide benefit by allowing all aircraft to use the extra length for takeoff.

MAC staff talked about the advantages and disadvantages of the full-blown runway extension option evaluated in the draft LTCP. With a length of nearly 4,300 feet, this caliber of runway would likely attract aircraft that are larger than the target design family of propeller-driven airplanes with fewer than 10 passenger seats and a maximum gross takeoff weight of less than 12,500 pounds. Also, the additional cost to extend taxiways to the new runway ends would be about $2,000,000. Finally, pushing the start of takeoff roll closer to neighborhoods is likely to increase noise levels. However, MAC staff encouraged tenants to provide data and information to make a better case for providing additional runway length beyond that proposed in the stopway scenario.

- MAC should at least consider extending the runway on the north end to provide additional takeoff length to the south during the hotter summer months. MAC could also consider a noise wall or berm off the runway ends to help deflect takeoff roll noise.

- A vibrant, healthy FBO and competitive fuel prices are essential components to the future viability of Crystal Airport. The ability to expand the FBO apron to more efficiently accommodate aircraft is also important.

- MAC should have provided information about the Draft 2035 LTCP to the tenants sooner to allow for review and feedback before the plan was presented to the public at large. Tenant input wasn’t solicited before the plan was locked in and finalized.

Other questions from the tenants included:
- Why do you call Crystal Airport a Reliever?
- If Crystal is still one of the busiest airports in the state, why are you going to close two runways?
- Will the decommissioning of the two runways impact the viability of retaining the Control Tower?

A copy of the briefing attendance list is attached, along with a copy of the presentation handout materials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Contact Info</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Hahn</td>
<td>Self GYC East 910</td>
<td>612-288-9601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dhahn@dsight.com">dhahn@dsight.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Lott</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>612-288-9601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dlottsc@email.com">dlottsc@email.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Jansen</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>952-935-4386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Murchato</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>763-587-9054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Meier</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>763-512-3886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP Karper</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>612-905-6832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter WaferSmith</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>763-786-5876</td>
<td><a href="mailto:avatars@gmail.com">avatars@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kack</td>
<td>RAAC</td>
<td>612-980-7056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Wiley</td>
<td>RAAC-Wiley Fdy</td>
<td>612-325-6786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Vistad</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>612-710-2055</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kvt.vistad@upmc.edu">kvt.vistad@upmc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Fox</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>612-710-2055</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pfvillk@nordhi.com">pfvillk@nordhi.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Mazer</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>763-464-2605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Berger</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td><a href="mailto:winterhill.stan@gmail.com">winterhill.stan@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Shalbey</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>218-832-5215</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jshaly@state.wi.gov">jshaly@state.wi.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Teske</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>218-832-5215</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jteske@hindu.davis.his.com">jteske@hindu.davis.his.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARK Rivard</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>218-832-5215</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ARK.RIVARD@STATE.WI.EDU">ARK.RIVARD@STATE.WI.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Tenant Briefing Sign-in Sheet

**Crystal Airport – MAC Office/Maintenance Building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Contact Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Paul C. Jr.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>763-755-1784 / no computer available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Andersen</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>612-875-3717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

Briefing Agenda

• Airport Role & Context
• Aviation Activity Forecasts
• Development Concepts
• Stakeholder Engagement & Next Steps

Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP Purpose:
• Update view of future facility needs
• Serve as the “road map” to guide our development strategy for Crystal Airport
• Shape the 7-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Crystal Airport Role

• Primary Role of Crystal Airport
  – Integral part of the regional Reliever Airport 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

• Crystal Airport Context
  – Of Peer “Intermediate” Airports (83)
    – 2nd busiest for aircraft operations
    – 3rd highest number of based aircraft
  – Of All Minnesota Airports (135)
    – Top 10 busiest for aircraft operations & top 5 for based aircraft

Activity Forecast Summary

• Based Aircraft (MnDOT)
  – 296 in 2000
  – 185 in 2015
  – 171 estimated in 2035

• Aircraft Operations
  – ~177,000 in 2000
  – ~41,000 in 2015
  – ~40,000 estimated in 2035

• Trend towards stabilizing activity levels
• Aircraft Fleet Mix
Previous LTCP Alternatives Considered

Previous LTCP Preferred Alternative

Maintain One Primary and One Crosswind Runway

- Previous LTCP adopted in December 2008
- Recommendation to “right size” the airfield to better align infrastructure with demand
  - Decommission turf (6R-24L) and south parallel (14R-32L) runways
  - Leaves a two-runway system in place
  - Opportunity to eliminate most or all airfield “Hot Spots”
  - Open up Aeronautical & Non-Aeronautical development opportunities
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Utility runway designation
- Allows use of smaller Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)
- Reduces number of homes in the RPZs
- Published runway strength = 12,500 pounds

LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Stopways
- No change to runway ends or thresholds
- Requires Stopway lighting
- Requires additional safety area grading off ends
- Provides for ~3,800 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Runway
- Changes runway ends
- Requires taxiway extensions
- Provides for ~4,300 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
- Potential to attract larger aircraft
- Increases community noise exposure by moving takeoffs closer to homes

Not carried forward as the Preferred Alternative

Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative
- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP
- Utility Runway designations
- Convert RWY 14-32 paved overruns to stopways
- Taxiway configuration changes
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible
Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP Noise Analysis

Stakeholder & Public Engagement

- Formal Public Review Period
  - 45-day review period (September 12 – October 26, 2016)
    - Public notice in Sun Post
    - Information posted on MAC website [Crystal Airport page]
      https://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
  - Public Information Meetings
    - Tuesday, September 27 @ Crystal Community Center (5-7pm)
    - Thursday, September 29 @ Brooklyn Park City Hall (5-7pm)
    - Postcard invitation to airport neighbors
  - Opportunity to submit written comments
    - At public information meetings, via email, or traditional mail
      Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org

- MAC Board Approval to Submit to Metropolitan Council
- Metropolitan Council Review
- Final MAC Board Adoption
- Environmental & Airport Layout Plan (ALP)
Thank you!
Crystal Airport
2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

12 September 2016 – Brooklyn Park City Council
Draft LTCP Overview

Briefing Agenda

• Airport Role & Context
• Aviation Activity Forecasts
• Development Concepts
• Stakeholder Engagement & Next Steps

Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP Purpose:
• Update view of future facility needs
• Serve as the “road map” to guide our development strategy for Crystal Airport
• Shape the 7-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Crystal Airport Role

• Primary Role of Crystal Airport
  – Integral part of the regional Reliever Airport 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

• Crystal Airport Context
  – Of Peer “Intermediate” Airports (83)
    – 2nd busiest for aircraft operations
    – 3rd highest number of based aircraft
  – Of All Minnesota Airports (135)
    – Top 10 busiest for aircraft operations & top 5 for based aircraft

Activity Forecast Summary

• Based Aircraft (MnDOT)
  – 296 in 2000
  – 185 in 2015
  – 171 estimated in 2035

• Aircraft Operations
  – ~177,000 in 2000
  – ~41,000 in 2015
  – ~40,000 estimated in 2035

• Trend towards stabilizing activity levels
• Aircraft Fleet Mix
Previous LTCP Alternatives Considered

Previous LTCP Preferred Alternative

Maintain One Primary and One Crosswind Runway

- Previous LTCP adopted in December 2008
- Recommendation to “right size” the airfield to better align infrastructure with demand
  - Decommission turf (6R-24L) and south parallel (14R-32L) runways
  - Leaves a two-runway system in place
  - Opportunity to eliminate most or all airfield “Hot Spots”
  - Open up Aeronautical & Non-Aeronautical development opportunities
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Utility runway designation
- Allows use of smaller Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)
- Reduces number of homes in the RPZs
- Published runway strength = 12,500 pounds

LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Convert RWY 14-32
Overruns to Stopways
- No change to runway ends or thresholds
- Requires Stopway lighting
- Requires additional safety area grading off ends
- Provides for ~3,800 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Runway
- Changes runway ends
- Requires taxiway extensions
- Provides for ~4,300 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
- Potential to attract larger aircraft
- Increases community noise exposure by moving takeoffs closer to homes

Not carried forward as the Preferred Alternative

Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative
- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP
- Utility Runway designations
- Convert RWY 14-32 paved overruns to stopways
- Taxiway configuration changes
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible
Stakeholder & Public Engagement

- Formal Public Review Period
  - 45-day review period (September 12 – October 26, 2016)
    - Public notice in Sun Post
    - Information posted on MAC website (Crystal Airport page)
      [http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx](http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx)
  - Public Information Meetings
    - Tuesday, September 27 @ Crystal Community Center (5-7pm)
    - Thursday, September 29 @ Brooklyn Park City Hall (5-7pm)
    - Postcard invitation to airport neighbors
  - Opportunity to submit written comments
    - At public information meetings, via email, or traditional mail
      [Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org](mailto:Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org)

- MAC Board Approval to Submit to Metropolitan Council
- Metropolitan Council Review
- Final MAC Board Adoption
- Environmental & Airport Layout Plan (ALP)

Thank you!
Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

26 September 2016 – Brooklyn Center City Council
LTCP Overview

Briefing Agenda

- Airport Role & Context
- Aviation Activity Forecasts
- Development Concepts
- Stakeholder Engagement & Next Steps

Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP Purpose:
- Update view of future facility needs
- Serve as the “road map” to guide our development strategy for Crystal Airport
- Shape the 7-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Crystal Airport Role

- **Primary Role of Crystal Airport**
  - Integral part of the regional Reliever Airport 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

- **Crystal Airport Context**
  - Of Peer “Intermediate” Airports (83)
    - 2nd busiest for aircraft operations
    - 3rd highest number of based aircraft
  - Of All Minnesota Airports (135)
    - Top 10 busiest for aircraft operations & top 5 for based aircraft

Activity Forecast Summary

- **Based Aircraft (MnDOT)**
  - 296 in 2000
  - 185 in 2015
  - 171 estimated in 2035

- **Aircraft Operations**
  - ~177,000 in 2000
  - ~41,000 in 2015
  - ~40,000 estimated in 2035

- Trend towards stabilizing activity levels
- Aircraft Fleet Mix
Previous LTCP Alternatives Considered

Previous LTCP Preferred Alternative

Maintain One Primary and One Crosswind Runway

- Previous LTCP adopted in December 2008
- Recommendation to “right size” the airfield to better align infrastructure with demand
  - Decommission turf (6R-24L) and south parallel (14R-32L) runways
  - Leaves a two-runway system in place
  - Opportunity to eliminate most or all airfield “Hot Spots”
  - Open up Aeronautical & Non-Aeronautical development opportunities
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Utility runway designation
- Allows use of smaller Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)
- Reduces number of homes in the RPZs
- Published runway strength = 12,500 pounds

Convert RWY 14-32
Overruns to Stopways
- No change to runway ends or thresholds
- Requires Stopway lighting
- Requires additional safety area grading off ends
- Provides for ~3,800 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

**Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Runway**
- Changes runway ends
- Requires taxiway extensions
- Provides for ~4,300 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
- Potential to attract larger aircraft
- Increases community noise exposure by moving takeoffs closer to homes

*Not carried forward as the Preferred Alternative*

Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative

- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP
- Utility Runway designations
- Convert RWY 14-32 paved overruns to stopways
- Taxiway configuration changes
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible
Stakeholder & Public Engagement

- **Formal Public Review Period**
  - 45-day review period (September 12 – October 26, 2016)
    - Public notice in Sun Post
    - Information posted on MAC website (Crystal Airport page)
      - [https://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx](https://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx)
  - Public Information Meetings
    - Tuesday, September 27 @ Crystal Community Center (5-7pm)
    - Thursday, September 29 @ Brooklyn Park City Hall (5-7pm)
    - Postcard invitation to airport neighbors
  - Opportunity to submit written comments
    - At public information meetings, via email, or traditional mail
      - Crystal Airport LTCP Comments@mspmac.org

- **MAC Board Approval to Submit to Metropolitan Council**
- **Metropolitan Council Review**
- **Final MAC Board Adoption**
- **Environmental & Airport Layout Plan (ALP)**

---

**Thank you!**
PUBLIC NOTICE
DRAFT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
CRYSTAL AIRPORT
Public Comment Period Open

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) has prepared a draft version of the 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport. The purpose of the LTCP is to identify facility needs at Crystal Airport through 2035. The public is invited to review this document and provide written comments to the MAC.

Crystal Airport is located in Hennepin County, approximately seven miles northwest of downtown Minneapolis. It lies within the City of Crystal, with small portions of airport property overlapping into the City of Brooklyn Park and the City of Brooklyn Center. The Draft 2035 LTCP includes a recommendation from the previous plan (completed in 2008) to close existing Runways 14R-32L (parallel to Runway 14L-32R) and 06R-24L (a grass runway), leaving a two-runway airfield in place. Refinements to the previous plan included in this update are: 1] re-designating the remaining runways as “Utility” to better reflect today’s and the airport’s expected future aircraft activity levels, as well as to permit the use of smaller Runway Protection Zones; 2] converting existing Runway 14L-32R overrun pavement into stopways to improve safety and offer some operational improvements for the types of aircraft already operating at the airport; and 3] modifying the taxiway layouts to reduce the possibility of runway crossings on the airfield.

Copies of the draft LTCP document will be available for distribution, and for viewing on the MAC’s website, beginning Monday, September 12, 2016. Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 26, 2016 at 5:00pm CDT.

http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx

A printed copy of the document will be available for review at the following locations: MAC General Office building, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis; Crystal City Hall, 4141 Douglas Drive North, Crystal; Rockford Road Library, 6401 42nd Avenue North, Crystal; and at Crystal Airport, 5800 Crystal Airport Road, Crystal. Requests for a paper copy can be sent to the email address below.

The public is also invited to attend informational meetings to learn more about the proposed improvements included in the draft LTCP. See below for the times and locations:

Tuesday, September 27, 2016
5:00 to 7:00 pm
Crystal Community Center
4800 Douglas Drive North
Crystal, MN 55428

Thursday, September 29, 2016
5:00 to 7:00 pm
Brooklyn Park City Hall, Council Chambers
5200 85th Avenue North
Brooklyn Park, MN 55443

The meetings will include a 6 p.m. presentation by MAC staff, as well as opportunities to ask questions and talk directly with staff.

Written comments can be submitted via email by sending them to Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or by physically mailing them to Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) will hold two OPEN HOUSES FOR THE PUBLIC to learn more about its proposed long term plans for Crystal Airport.

Please join us! MAC staff will provide a presentation at 6 p.m.

**Tues., Sept 27 • 5 to 7pm**
**Crystal Community Center**  
4800 Douglas Drive North  
Crystal, MN 55428

**Thurs., Sept 29 • 5 to 7pm**
**Brooklyn Park City Hall**  
Council Chambers  
5200 85th Avenue North  
Brooklyn Park, MN 55443

Questions about the open houses? Please contact Shelly Cambridge at shelly.cambridge@mspmac.org or at 612-726-8144.

The draft 2035 Long Term Comprehensive Plan and a summary of the changes included in the plan can be found on the MAC’s website at metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
Thank you for attending this Crystal 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) public informational meeting.

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) owns and operates Crystal Airport. It is one of six general aviation airports within the MAC’s system of airports. The Airport plays an important role in this system by attracting general aviation aircraft away from Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP) thereby relieving congestion at MSP. Crystal is the closest MAC airport to downtown Minneapolis.
ABOUT CRYSTAL AIRPORT

Crystal Airport has operated continuously since it opened in September 1950. In 2015, Crystal Airport was home to 185 aircraft and accommodated approximately 40,000 landings and takeoffs – an average of 110 aircraft operations per day. The airport sits on 436 acres of land and has four runways – three paved and one turf. The primary runways, 14L-32R and 14R-32L, are 3,267 feet and 3,266 feet long, respectively, and are 75 feet wide. The paved crosswind runway, 06L-24R, is 2,499 feet long and 75 feet wide. The turf runway, 06R-24L, is 2,123 feet long and 137 feet wide.

Crystal Airport serves personal, recreational, and some business aviation users in the northwest metropolitan area, including the cities of Crystal, Brooklyn Park, Brooklyn Center, and Minneapolis. Examples of business services provided at the Airport include flight training, aircraft rentals, charter flights, aircraft and propeller maintenance, sale of aircraft avionics and parts, and medical flight transportation.

ABOUT THE DRAFT 2035 LTCP

An LTCP is a tool used by airport planners to predict an airport’s infrastructure needs into the future. This update to Crystal Airport’s LTCP explores the facility’s needs out to the year 2035 and includes recommendations for its development over the next 5-10 years. It does not, however, authorize actual construction.

For this LTCP, the overarching objective is to “right-size” the airport to match how it is used today and how it is expected to be used in the future, as well as to improve safety and operational parameters. The role of the Airport is expected to stay the same through 2035. The aircraft anticipated to use the airport – and that which it is designed for – will continue to be a family of small, propeller-driven airplanes with fewer than 10 passenger seats.

The 2035 LTCP is an update to the 2025 LTCP, which was published in 2008. Most of the proposed improvements in the 2025 plan are also part of the 2035 draft document.

The 2025 LTCP recommended the airfield be right sized to better align with the infrastructure needs of aircraft operators today and into the future. To do this, the preferred alternative was to close both the turf runway (06R-24L) and the south parallel runway (14R-32L), leaving a two-runway airfield in place. This plan not only simplifies the airfield, but may also provide additional on-airport property for aeronautical and non-aeronautical development.

The Draft 2035 LTCP proposes to carry the recommendations from the 2025 plan forward, along with a few refinements. Refinements to the 2025 plan included in this draft update are:

- Re-designating the two remaining runways as “Utility” to better reflect today’s and the airport’s expected future aircraft activity levels, as well as to permit the use of smaller Runway Protection Zones (RPZs) beyond the runway ends.
- Converting the existing Runway 14L-32R overrun pavement on both ends of the runway into stopways to improve safety and offer some operational improvements for aircraft already operating at the airport. Pilots can consider stopways in calculating the length of pavement needed to decelerate and stop an aircraft during an aborted takeoff.
- Modifying the taxiway layouts to reduce opportunities for unintended runway crossings.

The draft LTCP report is available for public review and comment on the MAC website at www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The MAC is accepting written comments about the plan through October 26, 2016. To provide comments, you can fill out a comment form tonight, mail your form at a later date, or submit your comments via email to Crystal-Airport-Ltcp-comments@mspmac.org. All comments submitted will be included in the project record and published in the final report. We thank you for taking the time to learn more about this draft plan and for submitting comments.

WHAT’S NEXT?

The 2035 LTCP is in draft form. Following the public comment period, the plan will be completed and presented to the MAC board for its final adoption. It will also be presented to the Metropolitan Council for additional review.
WHAT AIRPORT IMPROVEMENTS ARE PROPOSED IN THE PLAN?

The following improvements are recommended and are shown on the map:

A. Close existing Runways 14R-32L and 06R-24L (turf)
B. Convert existing Runway 14L-32R into a full-length parallel taxiway and add taxiway lights
C. Change the runway designation to Utility and use small aircraft design standards to reduce Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) dimensions
D. Convert existing paved overruns on Runway 14L-32R to stopways. Includes adding edge lighting and additional Runway Safety Area (RSA) grading
E. Expand the FBO apron (improvement to be paid for by the tenant)
F. Taxiway configuration changes to reduce airfield complexity
G. Pursue the establishment of a new non-precision instrument approach to the Runway 32 end, if feasible (not shown)
1. Research & study refinements to previous plan recommendations
2. Engage MAC board, municipal staff & other key stakeholders
3. Draft report with alternatives including a proposed alternative
4. Request formal MAC board approval to publish draft report for public comment
5. Prepare draft environmental review documents per state & FAA requirements
6. Establish Joint Airport Zoning Board with local governments to update existing airport zoning
7. Prepare & submit Airport Layout Plan to the FAA for review & approval
8. Begin engineering & architectural designs
9. Request approval from MAC board to proceed with bidding projects
10. Finalize environmental review documents & submit to State & FAA for approvals
11. Comment on draft environmental & zoning documents
12. Incorporate public comments & present final LTCP to MAC board for approval
13. Develop final funding plan & request federal/state grant funds for project(s)
14. Local governments and adjacent communities review & comment on MAC annual Capital Improvement Program
15. Project funding programmed by FAA/MnDOT
16. Comment on draft report & proposed preferred alternative
17. Finalize environmental review documents & submit to State & FAA for approvals
18. MAC BOARD For final adoption
19. MAC STAFF & AGENCIES For approval of bid award
20. METROPOLITAN COUNCIL For reviews
21. MAC BOARD For approval
General aviation airports, like Crystal, contribute to the local economy in a number of ways. They provide:

- Employment for airport workers;
- Facilities for personal and business aircraft;
- Charter transportation services for local businesses; and
- Space for general aviation service companies to do business.

As a result, businesses and workers are able to purchase goods and services from other companies in the community, helping to ensure a thriving local economy.

Specific benefits of the Crystal Airport include:

- Direct employment created by the airport’s businesses, which include Thunderbird Aviation, North of Sixty Aviation, Maxwell Aircraft Services, and Wentworth Aircraft. Additional employers include the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the MAC. Altogether, these entities provide about 60 full-time and 20 part-time jobs at Crystal Airport.

- MAC operates, maintains, and improves the airport at no cost to local taxpayers. Development at Crystal Airport will continue to be funded by users of the aviation system via FAA and/or MnDOT grant programs, and MAC funds. No local sales or property taxes will be used to fund improvements.

- Airport tenants contribute to the local tax base by paying personal property taxes on hangar facilities and making purchases at local establishments.

- Crystal Airport is home to several tenant groups who emphasize aviation education and awareness, including the North Hennepin Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol.

For more information about Crystal Airport, including efforts to update the airport’s Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP), go to www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx.
Crystal Airport
2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

Public Informational Meetings: September 27 & 29, 2016
LTCP Overview Briefing

Briefing Agenda

• Airport Role & Context
• Aviation Activity Forecasts
• Development Concepts
• Stakeholder Engagement & Next Steps

Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP Purpose:
• Update view of future facility needs
• Serve as the “road map” to guide our development strategy for Crystal Airport
• Shape the 7-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Crystal Airport Role

- **Primary Role of Crystal Airport**
  - Integral part of the regional Reliever Airport 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

- **Crystal Airport Context**
  - Of Peer “Intermediate” Airports (83)
    - 2nd busiest for aircraft operations
    - 3rd highest number of based aircraft
  - Of All Minnesota Airports (135)
    - Top 10 busiest for aircraft operations & top 5 for based aircraft

Activity Forecast Summary

- **Based Aircraft (MnDOT)**
  - 296 in 2000
  - 185 in 2015
  - 171 estimated in 2035

- **Aircraft Operations**
  - ~177,000 in 2000
  - ~41,000 in 2015
  - ~40,000 estimated in 2035

- Trend towards stabilizing activity levels
- Aircraft Fleet Mix
Previous LTCP Alternatives Considered

Previous LTCP Preferred Alternative

Maintain One Primary and One Crosswind Runway

- Previous LTCP adopted in December 2008
- Recommendation to “right size” the airfield to better align infrastructure with demand
  - Decommission turf (6R-24L) and south parallel (14R-32L) runways
  - Leaves a two-runway system in place
  - Opportunity to eliminate most or all airfield “Hot Spots”
  - Open up Aeronautical & Non-Aeronautical development opportunities
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Utility runway designation
- Allows use of smaller Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)
- Reduces number of homes in the RPZs
- Published runway strength = 12,500 pounds

LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Stopways
- No change to runway ends or thresholds
- Requires Stopway lighting
- Requires additional safety area grading off ends
- Provides for ~3,800 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
LTCP Concept Refinements Being Considered

Convert RWY 14-32 Overruns to Runway
- Changes runway ends
- Requires taxiway extensions
- Provides for ~4,300 feet Accelerate-Stop Distance
- Potential to attract larger aircraft
- Increases community noise exposure by moving takeoffs closer to homes

Not carried forward as the Preferred Alternative

Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative
- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP
- Utility Runway designations
- Convert RWY 14-32 paved overruns to stopways
- Taxiway configuration changes
- FBO Apron Expansion
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible
Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative

- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP
- Utility Runway designations
- Convert RWY 14-32 paved overruns to stopways
- Taxiway configuration changes
- FBO Apron Expansion
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible

Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative

- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP
- Utility Runway designations
- Convert RWY 14-32 paved overruns to stopways
- Taxiway configuration changes
- FBO Apron Expansion
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible
Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative

- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP
- Utility Runway designations
  - Convert RWY 14-32 paved overruns to stopways
- Taxiway configuration changes
- FBO Apron Expansion
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible
Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative

- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP
- Utility Runway designations
- Convert RWY 14-32 paved overruns to stopways
- Taxiway configuration changes
  - FBO Apron Expansion
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible
Stakeholder & Public Engagement

- **Formal Public Review Period**
  - 45-day review period (September 12 – October 26, 2016)
    - Public notice in Sun Post
    - Information posted on MAC website (Crystal Airport page)
      [http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx](http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx)
  - Public Information Meetings
    - Tuesday, September 27 @ Crystal Community Center (5-7pm)
    - Thursday, September 29 @ Brooklyn Park City Hall (5-7pm)
    - Postcard invitation to airport neighbors
  - Opportunity to submit written comments
    - At public information meetings, via email, or traditional mail
      [CrystalAirport_LTCP_Comments@mspmac.org](mailto:CrystalAirport_LTCP_Comments@mspmac.org)

- **MAC Board Approval to Submit to Metropolitan Council**
- **Metropolitan Council Review**
- **Final MAC Board Adoption**
- **Environmental & Airport Layout Plan (ALP)**

---

Thank you!
Crystal Airport
Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

Public Informational Meetings – September 27 & 29, 2016
Airport Vicinity
CRYSTAL AIRPORT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Existing Airport Layout
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Based Aircraft</th>
<th>Total Number of Operations</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Annual Growth Rate**

-0.4% 0.1% -0.8% -0.2% 0.2% -0.6% -0.2% 0.3%

**Notes:**

TAF - 2015 Terminal Area Forecast published by FAA

**Sources:** HNTB Analysis.
Design Aircraft Family
- Small Propeller-Driven Airplanes
- Fewer than 10 Passenger Seats

Primary Runway Length
- FAA Guidance: Range 3,300 to 3,900 feet
  - Existing primary runway length is 3,267 feet
  - Aircraft-Specific Analysis: ~3,600 feet would be appropriate for the design aircraft family
    - Based on Accelerate-Stop Distance (ASD)
    - ASD is the length needed to accelerate an aircraft to takeoff speed, make a decision to abort the takeoff, and then stop the aircraft on available pavement

**Typical Aircraft Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft</th>
<th>MTOW (lbs)</th>
<th>Approach Speed (knots)</th>
<th>Wingspan</th>
<th>Tail Height</th>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 172</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36' - 1&quot;</td>
<td>8' - 11&quot;</td>
<td>Single-Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirrus SR22</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38' - 4&quot;</td>
<td>8' - 11&quot;</td>
<td>Single-Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBM 850</td>
<td>7,954</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41' - 7&quot;</td>
<td>14' - 4&quot;</td>
<td>Single-Engine Turboprop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond DA42</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>44' - 4&quot;</td>
<td>8' - 2&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclipse 550</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37' - 11&quot;</td>
<td>11' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>Very Light Jet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilatus PC-12</td>
<td>10,450</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>53' - 4&quot;</td>
<td>14' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>Single-Engine Turboprop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna Caravan 208</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52' - 3&quot;</td>
<td>14' - 11&quot;</td>
<td>Single-Engine Turboprop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper PA-30 Twin Comanche</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>36' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>8' - 2&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper PA-31T Cheyenne</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>42' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>12' - 9&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Engine Turboprop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper PA-31-350 Cheyenne</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>13' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 414A</td>
<td>6,785</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>48' - 7&quot;</td>
<td>11' - 6&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 412C</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41' - 1&quot;</td>
<td>11' - 5&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna Citation Mustang</td>
<td>8,645</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43' - 2&quot;</td>
<td>13' - 5&quot;</td>
<td>Very Light Jet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raytheon Beechcraft King Air 200</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>57' - 11&quot;</td>
<td>14' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Engine Turboprop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 441</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>49' - 4&quot;</td>
<td>13' - 2&quot;</td>
<td>Multi-Engine Turboprop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative Refinement Concepts – Stopway Scenario

Legend:
- Airport Property Boundary
- Runway Protection Zone (RPZ)
- Runway Safety Area (RSA)
- Runway Object Free Area (OFA)
- Runway Obstacle Free Zone (OFZ)
- Proposed Airfield Pavement
- Obstacle Identified through the Planimetric Survey that was completed in January 2014

Note:
1/ In this scenario, the existing paved overruns were reconfigured and lighted as stopways, extending the ASDA in both directions.
Alternative Refinement Concepts – Runway Extension Scenario

In this scenario, the existing paved runways were converted to available runway that can be used for takeoff or landing rollout. Since the existing departure surfaces would remain in place, the TORA distance would only increase by 403 feet and 300 feet for Runway 14 and Runway 32, respectively.

**LEGEND**
- Airport Property Boundary
- Runway Protection Zone (RPZ)
- Runway Safety Area (RSA)
- Runway Object Free Area (OFA)
- Runway Obstacle Free Zone (OFZ)
- Obstacle identified through the Planimetric Survey that was completed in January 2014
- Proposed Airfield Pavement

**Note:**
CRYSTAL AIRPORT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Preferred Development Alternative
The DNL metric is calculated by cumulatively averaging sound levels over a 24-hour period with a 10 dB penalty between 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M.

**CRYSTAL AIRPORT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**Typical Outdoor Community Day-Night Average Sound Level**
Baseline Noise Contour
Preferred Alternative Noise Contour

60 DNL contour shown for informational purposes only.

Number of residential structures:
- Inside 65 DNL: 7
- Inside 60 DNL: 177

2035 Preferred Alternative Noise Contours
Future Land Use Compatibility

Safety Zones are from 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 Crystal Airport Zoning Ordinance.
CRYSTAL AIRPORT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Planning & Development Process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julie Ashken</td>
<td>5643 Zane Ave No</td>
<td>Crystal City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Lam Hinson</td>
<td>6322 45th Pl N Crystal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 55428</td>
<td>743-999-6128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Capozzi</td>
<td>6315 S 58th Ave #1241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff &amp; Andrea Tungsten</td>
<td>5227 Regent Ave N</td>
<td>Home owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Bottlaffa</td>
<td>6030 46th Ave No Crystal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan TROVER</td>
<td>8200 67th Ave N B</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REEN McCleary</td>
<td>6364 Edgewood Brooklyn</td>
<td>Home Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick &amp; Becky Sutton</td>
<td>6301 Florida N-2 N-B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty M. Bieden</td>
<td>6319 S 5th Ave N</td>
<td>boarding volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Krack</td>
<td>7649 Lakeside Rd NE Friday</td>
<td>RAAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sutter</td>
<td>CITY OF CRYSTAL</td>
<td>STAFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mmlerhoff</td>
<td>5700-50 22nd Ave N Crystal</td>
<td>Home Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony McGawley</td>
<td>7017 Dunton Ave Brooklyn BK</td>
<td>IUPAT DC52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin T. Bader</td>
<td>5756 Adam Ave N Crystal</td>
<td>resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Bowman</td>
<td>3916 Edgewood Ave No Crystal</td>
<td>resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe ShallSee Art</td>
<td>6780 Lakeview Circ. Crystal</td>
<td>pilot/tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PLEASE SIGN IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Olson</td>
<td>City Hall, Crystal</td>
<td>City of Crystal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margot Joe Fantoch</td>
<td>5814 Regent Ave., N.</td>
<td>Crystal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Maxloe</td>
<td>6308 Douglass Dr., North</td>
<td>Brooklyn Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence W. knoback</td>
<td>Brooklyn Park, MN</td>
<td>Selves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Nauzer</td>
<td>5537 30th Ave S, MPLS, MN</td>
<td>Thunderbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Petros</td>
<td>5910 Kirkwood Cir, Plymouth</td>
<td>6333 Douglas H. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Peterson</td>
<td>5557 Regent Ave N, Crystal</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Testa</td>
<td>5803 Crystal Dr., Crystal, MN 55429</td>
<td>Thunderbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Silbaugh</td>
<td>5416 60th Ave, N, Crystal, MN 55429</td>
<td>Myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britton A. Toewsing</td>
<td>5514 57th Ave., Crystal, MN 55429</td>
<td>Myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Glyot</td>
<td>6712 Cloverdale Ave, N, Crystal, MN 55429</td>
<td>Myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Gableton</td>
<td>5300 62nd Ave N, B. Center, MN 55429</td>
<td>Myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Stanley</td>
<td>5708 Adair Ave N, Crystal, MN</td>
<td>Myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Pedelgyer</td>
<td>5752 Adair Ave N, Crystal, MN</td>
<td>Myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>REPRESENTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Trulli</td>
<td>7900 16th Ave S, Richfield, 55423</td>
<td>N25WFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Wincek</td>
<td>6367 - 63rd Ave N, Crystal, 55428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Speck</td>
<td>5800 Crystal Airport Rd, Bldg S, 55428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kraus</td>
<td>7629 Lakeside Rd NE, Fridley, MN 55432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Stackhouseman</td>
<td>4230 Ironton Ln, Plymouth, 55441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August Hensel</td>
<td>6533 Georgia Av, B.P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Wright</td>
<td>6004 Lakeland Av N B.P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A Johnson</td>
<td>6424 Lakeland Av No Brooklyn Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marky Cathy Cocker</td>
<td>4133 60200 Scott Av N B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Trober</td>
<td>8200 6th Av N Bl 55428</td>
<td>Pilot President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Dresel</td>
<td>3535 Vue Drive, Ctr Dr, St Paul</td>
<td>SEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Olson/Kathy Noren</td>
<td>5502-57th Ave No Crystal, 55429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Stanley</td>
<td>5708 404th Ave N</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Olson</td>
<td>4817 Pleasant Ave S, Mpls 55419</td>
<td>Wenck Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Lindquist</td>
<td>7585 Maplewood Dr, Maple Grove, 55314</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb Wilsey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crystal Airport
2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

26 January 2017– Crystal Tenant Briefing
LTCP Progress Update

LTCP Progress Update

• Issued Draft LTCP in September
• Public Review Period ended in late October
• Assessing Comments/Input
• Considering concept revisions

Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP Purpose:
• Update view of future facility needs
• Serve as the “road map” to guide our development strategy for Crystal Airport
• Shape the 7-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative

- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP to better align infrastructure with demand
- Convert RWY 14L-32R paved blast pads to stopways
- Utility Runway designations
- Taxiway configuration changes
- FBO Apron expansion
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible

Summary of Comments Received

- 27 total comments
  - 15 from Tenants/Users
  - 10 from citizens/public
  - 2 from municipal representatives

Most Common Themes

- Turf runway
- South parallel runway
- Primary runway length

Common Themes Based on Comments Received
Two-Runway Airfield Capacity vs. Demand

- Airfield Capacity (two intersecting runways)
  - Range of ~60 - 85 operations per hour in mixed operations
  - Factors: direction of flow, touch and go volume, aircraft separation buffers
- Operational hourly demand profile
  - ~30 hourly operations frequent
  - ~40 hourly operations occurs occasionally
  - Peak ~50 hour operations infrequent
- Two runway system appears capable of accommodating projected demand

Turf Runway

- Turf Runway Challenges
  - Adds to airfield complexity: 3 of 8 Hot Spots on the airfield are associated with the turf runway
  - Low usage
  - Airspace/zoning/land use
  - Ageing condition
Adjacent Turf Landing Area Concept

Naples, FL (APF) RWY 5/23 Turf Landing Area

CONCEPT NOT SUPPORTED BY FAA
Shortened Turf Runway Concept

- Reduce Length of Turf Runway 6R-24L to ~1,670 feet
  - Removes TWY F and D crossings from Turf Runway Safety & Object Free Areas
  - 20-foot tail clears approach surfaces
  - Free-flow taxi vs. Approach/Departure hold shorts
  - Mitigates hot spots?

Refined Primary Runway Concept

Convert Portions of RWY 14-32 Blast Pads to Runway

- Published length ~ 3,750 feet
- Provides additional takeoff and landing distance (~3,500 feet) for all users
- Runway shifts NW to improve RPZ compliance
- Implements declared distances
  - Takeoff Run Distance Available
  - Takeoff Distance Available
  - Accelerate-Stop Distance Available
  - Landing Distance Available
- Other factors: noise, airspace
Declared Distance Overview

• **Takeoff Run Available (TORA)**
  – Runway length declared available and suitable for the ground run of an aircraft taking off

• **Takeoff Distance Available (TODA)**
  – TORA plus the length of any remaining runway or clearway beyond the far end of the takeoff run available
  – Distance from brake release past liftoff to start of takeoff climb
  – No clearway @ MIC, so TORA = TODA

• **Accelerate-Stop Distance Available (ASDA)**
  – Runway length declared available and suitable for acceleration and deceleration of an airplane aborting a takeoff

• **Landing Distance Available (LDA)**
  – Runway length declared available and suitable for a landing airplane
  – Displaced threshold

Refined Runway Concept Declared Distances

**RWY 32 Landing Distance Available (LDA)**

LDA ends at new runway end

LDA starts at displaced threshold
Refined Runway ConceptDeclared Distances

Runway 32 Takeoff Run & Distance Available (TORA/TODA)

TORA/TODA starts at new runway end
TORA/TODA ends at opposite end threshold

Runway 32 Accelerate-Stop Distance Available (ASDA)

ASDA ends at new runway end
ASDA starts at new runway end
Refined Preferred Alternative?

- Retain portion of existing Turf Runway 6R-24L
- Convert portion of paved blast pads to usable Primary Runway
- Incorporate declared distances
  - 3,750’ published length/ASDA
  - ~3,500’ TORA/TODA/LDA
- Additional taxiway configuration changes
- Continue to assess feasibility of RWY 32 non-precision approach

Next Steps

- Next Steps for a Refined Alternative
  - Stakeholder engagement
  - MAC Board concurrence to consider Refined Alternative
  - Prepare LTCP Report Addendum
  - Hold supplemental public comment period to solicit feedback
- MAC Board Approval to Submit to Metropolitan Council
- Metropolitan Council Review
- Final MAC Board Adoption
- Environmental & Airport Layout Plan (ALP)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Contact Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dale Hahn</td>
<td>Hangar Owner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmhlc@hotmail.com">dmhlc@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Stichter</td>
<td>Hangar Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Glassow</td>
<td>Yankee Flying Club</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chris.glassow@gmail.com">chris.glassow@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mendenhall</td>
<td>Aircraft Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Wargish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Melsch</td>
<td>Tenant/LA Owner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:themeis1153@bk.com">themeis1153@bk.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Wentworth</td>
<td>Westworth Aircraft</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wentworth@aoi.com">wentworth@aoi.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Duhi</td>
<td>TC Tech Support</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tctechsupp.com">www.tctechsupp.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Finn</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mickfim156@gmail.com">mickfim156@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Nelson</td>
<td>FAA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philip.nelson@gmail.com">philip.nelson@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Wiest</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:heidi.e.wiest@faa.gov">heidi.e.wiest@faa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Fortman</td>
<td>SELK</td>
<td>763-533-9308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Steele</td>
<td>Hangar 3-2B</td>
<td>612-719-4640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Bills</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>mail@<a href="mailto:airmark@aoi.com">airmark@aoi.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Contact Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Pitman</td>
<td>NS270 Q</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mtpitman@industrialinsight.com">mtpitman@industrialinsight.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Davies</td>
<td>Yankee Flying Club</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeffdavies@laserflight.com">jeffdavies@laserflight.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Gerads</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kellygerads@mspmac.org">kellygerads@mspmac.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Killen</td>
<td>Club Cherokee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bruce@brucekillen.com">bruce@brucekillen.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Davidson</td>
<td>SouthMen Hanger N43CR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike@eidecom.com">mike@eidecom.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Johnson</td>
<td>Civil Air Patrol</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richiej40@msn.com">richiej40@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert W. Estley</td>
<td>Hangar Owner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rwxstein@comcast.com">rwxstein@comcast.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb Wiley</td>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barb.wiley@wileyproperties.com">barb.wiley@wileyproperties.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Reid</td>
<td>SEH</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lreid1@schinc.com">lreid1@schinc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wilson</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.wilson@mspmac.org">mike.wilson@mspmac.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick. Cinek</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:executive@gmail.com">executive@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmett E. Diggs</td>
<td>N7596A</td>
<td>N7596A @ Gmail.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Eide</td>
<td>N143CR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Charles@eidecom.com">Charles@eidecom.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8

**CRYSTAL AIRPORT DRAFT 2035 LTCP**

**TENANT BRIEFING SIGN-IN SHEET**

**Crystal Airport – MAC Office/Maintenance Building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Contact Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warren Batzlauff</td>
<td>Private Pilot Hangar 0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:WarrenBatzlauff@gmail.com">WarrenBatzlauff@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bloch</td>
<td>PR Hangar Owner</td>
<td>PRBCOMpany@Yahoocom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Fox</td>
<td>Private Pilot Hangar 0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Patrick@patrickfox.com">Patrick@patrickfox.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:WINTERHILL.STAN@GMAIL.COM">WINTERHILL.STAN@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ulstad</td>
<td>Hangar 74E-Fort Sich</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Keith-ulstand@aproperties.com">Keith-ulstand@aproperties.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crystal Airport
2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

27 January 2017
LTCP Progress Update to Municipal Planners

LTCP Progress Update

• Issued Draft LTCP in September
• Public Review Period ended in late October
• Assessing Comments/Input
• Considering concept revisions

Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP Purpose:
• Update view of future facility needs
• Serve as the “road map” to guide our development strategy for Crystal Airport
• Shape the 7-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative

- “Right-sized” two-runway system from 2025 LTCP to better align infrastructure with demand
- Convert RWY 14L-32R paved blast pads to stopways
- Utility Runway designations
- Taxiway configuration changes
- FBO Apron expansion
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible

Summary of Comments Received

- 27 total comments
  - 15 from Tenants/Users
  - 10 from citizens/public
  - 2 from municipal representatives

Most Common Themes

- Turf runway
- South parallel runway
- Primary runway length

Common Themes Based on Comments Received: 
- Support keeping Turf Runway
- Support extending Runway
- Support keeping South Parallel Runway
- Forecasts not optimistic enough
- Support expanding FBO Apron
- Land Use
- Right Patency Noise
- Improved Instrument Approach

- Tenants/User
- Public
- Municipality
Two-Runway Airfield Capacity vs. Demand

- Airfield Capacity (two intersecting runways)
  - Range of ~60 - 85 operations per hour in mixed operations
  - Factors: direction of flow, touch and go volume, aircraft separation buffers
- Operational hourly demand profile
  - ~30 hourly operations frequent
  - ~40 hourly operations occurs occasionally
  - Peak ~50 hour operations infrequent
- Two runway system appears capable of accommodating projected demand

Turf Runway

- Turf Runway Challenges
  - Adds to airfield complexity: 3 of 8 Hot Spots on the airfield are associated with the turf runway
  - Low usage
  - Airspace/zoning/land use
  - Ageing condition
Shortened Turf Runway Concept

- Reduce Length of Turf Runway 6R-24L to ~1,670 feet
  - Removes TWY F and D crossings from Turf Runway Safety & Object Free Areas
  - 20-foot tail clears approach surfaces
  - Free-flow taxi vs. Approach/Departure hold shorts
  - Mitigates hot spots?

Refined Primary Runway Concept

Convert Portions of RWY 14-32 Blast Pads to Runway

- Published length ~ 3,750 feet
- Provides additional takeoff and landing distance (~ 3,500 feet) for all users
- Runway shifts NW to improve RPZ compliance
- Implements declared distances
  - Takeoff Run Distance Available
  - Takeoff Distance Available
  - Accelerate-Stop Distance Available
  - Landing Distance Available
- Other factors: noise, airspace
Refined Preferred Alternative?

- Retain portion of existing Turf Runway 6R-24L
- Convert portion of paved blast pads to useable Primary Runway
- Incorporate declared distances
  - 3,750’ published length/ASDA
  - ~3,500’ TORA/TODA/LDA
- Additional taxiway configuration changes
- Continue to assess feasibility of RWY 32 non-precision approach

Crystal LTCP Concept Comparison
Refined Runway Concept – Noise Contour

Next Steps

- Next Steps for a Refined Alternative
  - Stakeholder engagement
  - MAC Board concurrence to consider Refined Alternative
  - Prepare LTCP Report Addendum
  - Hold supplemental public comment period to solicit feedback
- MAC Board Approval to Submit to Metropolitan Council
- Metropolitan Council Review
- Final MAC Board Adoption
- Environmental & Airport Layout Plan (ALP)
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) has prepared an Addendum to the draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport. The Addendum describes a Refined Preferred Alternative that was developed in response to public and stakeholder feedback about the original plan, which was issued for public comment in September 2016. The updated plan proposes to (1) provide additional primary runway length to better accommodate the types of aircraft already operating at the airport and (2) keep a portion of the existing grass runway operational.

MAC will be hosting a public information meeting regarding the Addendum:

Thursday, March 30, 2017
5:00 PM to 7:00 PM
Presentation beginning at 6:00 PM
Odyssey Academy
6201 Noble Avenue N
Brooklyn Center, MN  55429

The public is invited to attend to learn more about the proposed changes, as well as provide comments regarding the plan. The meeting offers an opportunity for one-to-one interaction with MAC staff in an open house setting with an overview presentation beginning at 6:00pm.

Beginning Wednesday, March 15, 2017, the public is invited to review the Draft LTCP Addendum and provide written comments to the MAC.

Copies of the draft LTCP Addendum document will be available for distribution, and for viewing on the MAC’s website, beginning Wednesday, March 15, 2017. Written comments will be accepted until Friday, April 14, 2017 at 5:00pm CDT.

http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx

A printed copy of the Addendum document will be available for review at the following locations: MAC General Office building, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis; Crystal City Hall, 4141 Douglas Drive North, Crystal; Rockford Road Library, 6401 42nd Avenue North, Crystal; and at Crystal Airport, 5800 Crystal Airport Road, Crystal. Requests for a paper copy can be sent to the email address below.

Written comments can be submitted via email by sending them to Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or by mailing them to Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.
PUBLIC MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is holding an informational meeting for the public to learn more about proposed refinements to its long-term plans for Crystal Airport.

Please join us!

Thursday, March 30 • 5 to 7p.m.

MAC staff will provide a presentation at 6 p.m.

Odyssey Academy
6201 Noble Avenue N, Brooklyn Center, MN 55429

The MAC is proposing several refinements to the draft Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan in response to public and stakeholder feedback. The original plan was issued for review in September 2016. A summary of the proposed refinements can be found on the MAC’s website at:

metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx

Questions about the plan or the informational meeting?
Please contact Neil Ralston at neil.ralston@mspmac.org or 612-726-8129.
Thank you for attending this supplemental Crystal Airport 2035 Long Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) public information meeting.

We appreciate you taking the time to attend and learn more about the changes we have made to the draft LTCP. Based on feedback received during the first public comment period, the MAC is proposing a Refined Preferred Alternative. This Refined Alternative seeks to fine-tune the recommended improvements to enhance safety and operational capabilities for the current types of aircraft using the airport – but without changing its role as a “complimentary reliever” in the regional airport system.

This handout provides information about Crystal Airport, a summary of the planning process and the refined recommendations.
PUBLIC COMMENTS
The MAC is accepting written comments about the revised plan for Crystal Airport through Friday, April 14, 2017. To provide comments, you can fill out a comment form tonight, mail your form at a later date, or submit your comments via email to Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org. All comments submitted will be made a part of the project record and published in the final report.

ABOUT CRYSTAL AIRPORT
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) owns and operates Crystal Airport. It is one of six general aviation airports within the MAC’s system of airports. The airport plays an important role in this system by attracting general aviation aircraft away from Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP) thereby relieving congestion at MSP. Crystal is the closest MAC airport to downtown Minneapolis.

Crystal Airport has operated continuously since it opened in September 1950. It serves personal, recreational, and some business aviation users in the northwest metropolitan area, including the cities of Crystal, Brooklyn Park, Brooklyn Center, and Minneapolis.

WHY IS THE LTCP BEING UPDATED? WHAT IS ITS STATUS?
An LTCP is a tool used by airport planners to predict an airport’s infrastructure needs into the future. This update to Crystal Airport’s LTCP explores the facility’s needs out to the year 2035 and includes recommendations for its development over the next 5-10 years. It does not, however, authorize construction.


In response to public and stakeholder feedback about the original plan, MAC is proposing to make several refinements to it. An Addendum to the draft 2035 LTCP report, which describes a Refined Preferred Alternative, is also available on the same web page.

WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED REFINEMENTS TO THE PLAN?
The updated plan proposes to (1) provide additional runway length to the primary runway to better accommodate the types of aircraft already operating at the airport and (2) keep a portion of the existing grass runway operational.

• **Primary Runway Length:** The original plan proposed to convert the existing Runway 14L-32R blast pads/overruns pavement on both ends of the runway into stopways to improve safety and offer some operational improvements for aircraft already operating at the airport.

However, several commenters stated that establishing stopways would not result in a significant operational benefit for most users of the airfield. Commenters encouraged the MAC to, instead, consider using the existing pavement blast pads/overruns to increase the length of this runway in order to improve operational capabilities for more aircraft types currently operating at Crystal Airport.

Based on this feedback, MAC is now proposing to convert portions of the existing Runway 14L-32R blast pads/overruns pavement on each end to useable runway. This would result in a runway length of 3,750 feet, approximately 500 feet longer than the existing runway length. This concept also recommends shifting the entire runway approximately 115 feet to the northwest along its centerline, which moves the entire Runway Protection Zone (RPZ), at the southeast end, fully onto airport property. Today, as well as in the original draft plan, a corner of the Runway Protection Zone extends off the airport onto private residential property.

WHAT AIRPORT IMPROVEMENTS ARE PROPOSED IN THE PLAN?
The following improvements are recommended and are shown on the map:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. REFINED:</th>
<th>Convert a portion of paved blast pads/overruns on each end of Runway 14L-32R to useable runway. Includes shifting the runway approximately 115 feet to the northwest to improve Runway Protection Zone compatibility and adding new connector taxiways.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Convert existing Runway 14L-32R into a full-length parallel taxiway and add taxiway lights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Change the runway designation to Utility and use small aircraft design standards to reduce Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. REFINED:</td>
<td>Includes adding edge lighting and additional Runway Safety Area (RSA) grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Expand the Fixed Base Operator apron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Taxiway configuration adjustments to reduce airfield complexity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Pursue the establishment of a new non-precision instrument approach to the Runway 32 end, if feasible (not shown).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lengthening the runway benefits all aircraft users by providing additional useable pavement for takeoffs and landings.

- **Turf Runway**: The original plan proposed closing the turf runway in order to simplify airfield geometry and reduce the number of locations where aircraft could inadvertently cross an active runway.

Several commenters were concerned that this proposal could limit tailwheel aircraft operations and flight training opportunities. In their comments they also noted that the only close-by turf runway (in Forest Lake) had been paved, eliminating that runway as an option for pilots seeking a turf landing option. In fact, the turf runway at Crystal is the last one available at a public-use airport in the metropolitan area.

In response, the MAC identified a concept that reduces the length of the turf runway, lessening the possibility of inadvertent runway crossings. While the MAC believes this plan better meets the needs of airport users, it is subject to further coordination with the Federal Aviation Administration and the Minnesota Department of Transportation.
**CRYSTAL AIRPORT**

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

**STEP-BY-STEP**

1. Research & study refinements to previous plan recommendations
   - Engage MAC board, municipal staff & other key stakeholders
   - Draft report with alternatives including a proposed alternative
   - Request formal MAC board approval to publish draft report for public comment

2. Prepare draft environmental review documents per state & FAA requirements
   - Establish Joint Airport Zoning Board with local governments to update existing airport zoning
   - Prepare & submit Airport Layout Plan to the FAA for review & approval

3. MAC BOARD
   - For final adoption

4. MAC STAFF & AGENCIES
   - Comment on draft report & proposed preferred alternative

5. PUBLIC & AGENCIES
   - Comment on draft report & proposed preferred alternative

6. MAC STAFF
   - Consider public comments, develop refined alternative, initiate supplemental public comment period

7. MAC STAFF & AGENCIES
   - Comment on refined preferred alternative

8. MAC STAFF
   - Incorporate public comments & present final LTCP to MAC Board for approval

9. PUBLIC
   - Comment on refined preferred alternative

10. MAC BOARD
    - For approval

11. METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
    - For reviews

12. MAC STAFF & AGENCIES
    - Finalize environmental review documents & submit to State & FAA for approvals

13. PUBLIC
    - Comment on draft environmental & zoning documents

14. MAC STAFF & AGENCIES
    - Develop final funding plan & request federal/state grant funds for project(s)

15. MAC STAFF & AGENCIES
    - Begin engineering & architectural designs
    - Request approval from MAC board to proceed with bidding projects

16. MAC BOARD
    - For approval of bid award

17. AGENCIES
    - Project funding programmed by FAA/MnDOT

18. AGENCIES
    - Local governments and adjacent communities review & comment on MAC annual Capital Improvement Program

19. MAC STAFF
    - For final adoption

20. MAC BOARD
    - For approval of bid award

21. CONSTRUCTION BEGINS
Crystal Airport
2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)

30 March 2017 – Supplemental Public Information Meeting
Refined Preferred Development Alternative Briefing

LTCP Progress Update

- Issued Draft LTCP in September
- Public Review Period ended in late October
- Assessing Comments/Input
- Refined Preferred Development Alternative

Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP Purpose:
- Update view of future facility needs
- Serve as the “road map” to guide our development strategy for Crystal Airport
- Shape the 7-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
**Crystal Airport Role & Plan Objectives**

- **Primary Role of Crystal Airport**
  - Integral part of the regional Reliever Airport 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

- **Primary LTCP Objectives**
  - Better align airfield infrastructure with demand levels
  - Preserve and, if possible, improve operational capabilities for the current family of aircraft using the facility
  - Enhance safety by simplifying the runway and taxiway layout

---

**Draft 2035 LTCP Preferred Alternative**

- Two-runway system from 2025 LTCP to better align infrastructure with demand
- Convert RWY 14L-32R paved blast pads to stopways
- Utility Runway designations
- Taxiway configuration changes
- FBO Apron expansion
- Additional LNAV non-precision instrument approach if feasible
Summary of Comments Received

- 27 total comments
  - 15 from Tenants/Users
  - 10 from citizens/public
  - 2 from municipal representatives
- Most Common Themes
  - Turf runway
  - South parallel runway
  - Primary runway length

Two-Runway Airfield Capacity vs. Demand

- Airfield Capacity (two intersecting runways)
  - Range of ~60 - 85 operations per hour in mixed operations
- Operational hourly demand profile
  - ~30 hourly operations frequent
  - ~40 hourly operations occurs occasionally
  - ~50 hourly operations infrequent
- Proposed runway system appears capable of accommodating projected demand without south parallel
Shortened Turf Runway Concept

- Reduce Length of Turf Runway 6R-24L to ~1,670 feet
  - Removes TWY F and D crossings from Turf Runway Safety & Object Free Areas
  - Approach/Departure hold shorts
  - Mitigates hot spots

Refined Primary Runway Concept

Convert Portions of RWY 14-32 Blast Pads to Runway

- Published length ~ 3,750 feet
- Provides additional takeoff and landing distance (~ 3,500 feet) for all users
- Runway shifts NW to improve RPZ compliance
Refined Preferred Alternative

- Retain portion of existing Turf Runway 6R-24L
- Convert portion of paved blast pads to useable Primary Runway
- Additional taxiway configuration changes
Refined Preferred Alternative

- Retain portion of existing Turf Runway 6R-24L
- Convert portion of paved blast pads to useable Primary Runway
- Additional taxiway configuration changes
Next Steps

• Supplemental Public Review Period
  – 30-day review period (March 15–April 14, 2017)
    – Public notice in Sun Post
    – Postcard mailing
    – Information posted on MAC website (Crystal Airport page)
      https://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
  – Public Information Meeting
    – Thursday, March 30@ Odyssey Academy (5-7pm)
    – Postcard invitation to airport neighbors
    – Opportunity to submit written comments
      – At public information meetings, via email, or traditional mail
      CrystalAirport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org

• MAC Board Approval to Submit to Metropolitan Council
• Metropolitan Council Review
• Final MAC Board Adoption
• Environmental Review Process

Crystal LTCP Concept Comparison
Question & Answer Session

MAC Staff will be available until 7pm to address any questions you may have
Crystal Airport
Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)
Refined Preferred Alternative

Supplemental Public Informational Meeting – March 30, 2017
## Aviation Activity Forecast Summary

### Aircraft Operations Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Stopway Scenario</th>
<th>Increased Length (3,750')</th>
<th>Change from Base Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 (a)</td>
<td>41,838</td>
<td>41,838</td>
<td>41,838</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>39,496</td>
<td>39,652</td>
<td>39,707</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>39,025</td>
<td>39,196</td>
<td>39,258</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>38,578</td>
<td>38,774</td>
<td>38,845</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>39,904</td>
<td>40,135</td>
<td>40,218</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HNTB Activity Forecasts and MAC analysis*

### Crystal [MIC] Forecast Summary

The Crystal [MIC] forecast summary graph shows a historical trend from 2000 to 2025, with forecasted projections for 2030 and 2035. The graph compares various scenarios, including base case, stopway, and increased length scenarios, with a focus on aircraft operations and based aircraft. The data indicates a decrease in aircraft operations and based aircraft from 2000 to 2025, with projections for 2030 and 2035 showing a slight increase compared to 2025.
CRYSTAL AIRPORT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Refined LTCP Preferred Alternative
CRYSTAL AIRPORT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Refined Preferred Alternative – Primary Runway 14-32 (3,750 feet)
Refined Preferred Alternative – Shortened Turf Runway 6R-24L
Noise Contour Comparison
(Baseline vs. Refined Alternative)
Future Land Use Compatibility (Baseline vs. Refined Alternative)
CRYSTAL AIRPORT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Planning & Development Process

CRYSTAL AIRPORT
2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

MAC STAFF

1. Research & study refinements to previous plan recommendations
2. Engage MAC board, municipal staff & other key stakeholders
3. Draft report with alternatives including a proposed alternative
4. Request formal MAC board approval to publish draft report for public comment

Step-by-Step

1. Comment on draft report & proposed preferred alternative
2. MAC STAFF: Consider public comments, develop refined alternative, initiate supplemental public comment period
3. MAC STAFF: Incorporate public comments & present final LTCP to MAC Board for approval
4. MAC BOARD: For final adoption
5. MAC BOARD: For approval
6. METROPOLITAN COUNCIL: For review
7. Comment on draft environmental & zoning documents
8. Finalize environmental review documents & submit to State & FAA for approvals
9. Prepare draft environmental review documents per state & FAA requirements
10. Establish Joint Airport Zoning Board with local governments to update existing airport zoning
11. Prepare & submit Airport Layout Plan to the FAA for review & approval
12. AGENCIES: Project funding programmed by RWA/MnDOT
13. Local governments and adjacent communities review & comment on MAC annual Capital Improvement Program
14. MAC STAFF & AGENCIES: Develop final funding plan & request federal/state grant funds for projects
15. MAC STAFF: Begin engineering & architectural designs
16. Request approval from MAC board to proceed with bidding projects
17. MAC STAFF: Construction begins
## PLEASE SIGN IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Baker</td>
<td>4225—Unity Ave No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marge Birk</td>
<td>5641 Quail Ave N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Hoover</td>
<td>5001-60th Ave. N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. S. Spencer</td>
<td>6101 Quail Ave. N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. G. Grant</td>
<td>5306 62nd Ave N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Wolter</td>
<td>7674 Everest Ln, Maple Ridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Crimmins</td>
<td>MAC DISTRICT A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Einfeldt-Brown</td>
<td>6315 55th Ave. N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Kostoffen</td>
<td>5300 62nd Ave. N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Bataliff</td>
<td>6603—46th Ave No Crystal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Berry</td>
<td>4640 York Ave S Map S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Benes</td>
<td>11526 8-egen Ave N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Refined Preferred Alternative  
Public Information Meeting  
March 30, 2017

Odyssey Academy  
Brooklyn Center
## PLEASE SIGN IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEFF DUNLAP</td>
<td>5805 Miniwaska Dr.</td>
<td>YANKER FLYING CLUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON HOFF</td>
<td>STILLWATER, MN</td>
<td>SELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Glasser</td>
<td>6100 Chestnut NW</td>
<td>YANKER FLYING CLUB, KMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Anderson</td>
<td>6323 Vale City Ave.</td>
<td>Town Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK EL. J. ORGE</td>
<td>6320-60th Ave. N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Nordstrom</td>
<td>5657 Regent Ave N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes G.</td>
<td>16213 70th N Ave</td>
<td>YANKER FLYING CLUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L.</td>
<td>6319 61st Ave N</td>
<td>MACDOWELL, H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Parks</td>
<td>6409 Florida Ave N</td>
<td>SELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Binder</td>
<td>6417 Florida Ave N</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Johnson</td>
<td>1043 Crystal Ct, Lake City</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEITH USTAD</td>
<td>1602 Woodstone Dr, Victoria, MN 55382</td>
<td>SELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>REPRESENTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Johnson</td>
<td>7785-13th Ave N</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Schmitz</td>
<td>5650 W 63rd Ave N</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Kowalski</td>
<td>5626 57th St</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Goebert</td>
<td>6318 61st Ave</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Olson</td>
<td>City of Crystal</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janlyn Husman</td>
<td>6321 Edgewood Ave W</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger F. Seeman</td>
<td>6318 Lymar Ave</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie LeBlanc</td>
<td>5649 Zane Ave NW</td>
<td>Crystal City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

Charlene Vold being duly sworn on an oath, states or affirms that he/she is the Publisher's Designated Agent of the newspaper(s) known as:

SP Robb/Crystal/NewHope/GoldV

with the known office of issue being located in the county of:

HENNEPIN

with additional circulation in the counties of:

HENNEPIN

and has full knowledge of the facts stated below:

(A) The newspaper has complied with all of the requirements constituting qualification as a qualified newspaper as provided by Minn. Stat. §331A.02.
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DRAFT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
CRYSTAL AIRPORT
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPEN

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) has prepared a draft version of the 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport. The purpose of the LTCP is to identify facility needs at Crystal Airport through 2035. The public is invited to review this document and provide written comments to the MAC. Crystal Airport is located in Hennepin County, approximately seven miles northwest of downtown Minneapolis. It lies within the City of Crystal, with small portions of airport property overlapping into the City of Brooklyn Park and the City of Brooklyn Center. The Draft 2035 LTCP includes a recommendation from the previous plan (completed in 2008) to close existing Runways 14R-32L (parallel to Runway 14L-32L) and 08R-26L (a grass runway), leaving a two-runway airfield in place. Refinements to the previous plan included in this update are: 1) re-designating the remaining runways as “Utility” to better reflect today’s and the airport’s expected future aircraft activity levels, as well as to permit the use of smaller Runway Protection Zones; 2) converting existing Runway 14R-32R overrun pavement into stopways to improve safety and offer some operational improvements for the types of aircraft already operating at the airport; and 3) modifying the taxiway layouts to reduce the possibility of runway crossings on the airfield.

Copies of the draft LTCP document will be available for distribution, and for viewing on the MAC's website, beginning Monday, September 12, 2016. Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 26, 2016 at 5:00 pm CST. http://metransairsports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx

A printed copy of the document will be available for review at the following locations: MAC General Office building, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis; Crystal City Hall, 4141 Douglas Drive North, Crystal; Rockford Road Library, 6401 42nd Avenue North, Crystal; and at Crystal Airport, 5800 Crystal Airport Road, Crystal. Requests for a paper copy can be sent to the email address below.

The public is also invited to attend informational meetings to learn more about the proposed improvements included in the draft LTCP. See below for the times and locations:

Tuesday, September 27, 2016 5:00 to 7:00 pm Crystal Community Center 4800 Douglas Drive North Crystal, MN 55428
Thursday, September 29, 2016 5:00 to 7:00 pm Brooklyn Park City Hall, Council Chambers 5200 85th Avenue North Brooklyn Park, MN 55443

The meetings will include a 6 p.m. presentation by MAC staff, as well as opportunities to ask ques-
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PUBLIC NOTICE
DRAFT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CRYSTAL AIRPORT
REFINED PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE DRAFT PLAN ADDENDUM AND SUPPLEMENTAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) has prepared an Addendum to the draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport. The Addendum describes a Refined Preferred Alternative that was developed in response to public and stakeholder feedback about the original plan, which was issued for public comment in September 2016. The updated plan proposes to (1) provide additional primary runway length to better accommodate the types of aircraft already operating at the airport and (2) keep a portion of the existing grass runway operational.

MAC will be hosting a public information meeting regarding the Addendum:

Thursday, March 30, 2017
5:00 PM to 7:00 PM
Presentation beginning at 6:00 PM

Odyssey Academy
6201 Noble Avenue N
Brooklyn Center, MN 55429

The public is invited to attend to learn more about the proposed changes, as well as provide comments regarding the plan. The meeting offers an opportunity for one-to-one interaction with MAC staff in an open house setting with an overview presentation beginning at 6:00pm.

Beginning Wednesday, March 15, 2017, the public is invited to review the Draft LTCP Addendum and provide written comments to the MAC.

Copies of the draft LTCP Addendum document will be available for distribution and for viewing on the MAC’s website, beginning Wednesday, March 15, 2017. Written comments will be accepted until Friday, April 14, 2017 at 5:00pm CDT.
http://metroairports.org/General-Airports/Crystal.aspx

A printed copy of the Addendum document will be available for review at the following locations:

MAC General Office building, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis;
Crystal City Hall, 4141 Douglas Drive North, Crystal, Rockford Road Library, 6401 42nd Avenue North, Crystal; and at Crystal Airport, 5800 Crystal Airport Road, Crystal. Requests for a paper copy can be sent to the email address below.

Written comments can be submitted via email by sending them to Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or by physically mailing them to Neil Raffles, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55406.
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CRYSTAL AIRPORT 2035 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

INTRODUCTION
The Original Draft 2035 LTCP for Crystal Airport was issued for public review and comment on Monday, September 12, 2016. Two public information meetings were held in September 2016 to provide information about the draft plan to interested stakeholders. The first round public comment period closed on Wednesday, October 26, 2016.

Feedback from the First Round Public Comment Period (September 12 – October 26, 2016)
During the first round public comment period, the MAC received a total of 27 written comments. Of the comments, 15 were from airport tenants and users, 10 from members of the public, and 2 from municipal representatives.

Many of the airport tenants and users expressed concern over some or all elements of the plan. Notably, Thunderbird Aviation, the full-service Fixed Base Operator (FBO) at the Airport, submitted comments in opposition to the proposed plan. The top three themes based on tenants and user comments include:

- Support for keeping turf Runway 6R-24L open;
- Support for keeping south parallel Runway 14R-32L open; and,
- Support for providing additional useable length on Runway 14L-32R beyond that provided by the Stopway concept recommended in the draft plan.
The City of Crystal provided a letter of support for the LTCP Preferred Alternative, while Hennepin County requested coordination in advance of any development/redevelopment initiatives along any county roadway frontage. Of the comments from members of the general public, three were related to concerns over flight patterns and aircraft noise. All common themes that emerged during the comment period are summarized below:

### MAC Response to Public and Stakeholder Feedback

Throughout the public process, MAC made a commitment to consider the concerns voiced by stakeholders and evaluate if any related adjustments to the proposed plan were feasible. In this spirit of this commitment, MAC staff developed a Refined Preferred Alternative in response to public and stakeholder input.

When compared with the Original Preferred Alternative, the Refined concept includes the following adjustments:

- **Primary Runway length**: Convert portions of the paved blast pads on primary Runway 14L-32R to useable runway for a published length of 3,750 feet with declared distances in effect and extend taxiways to new runway ends.
- **Primary Runway location**: Shift the primary runway approximately 115 feet to the northwest along its centerline to locate all of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) for Runway 32R on MAC property, improving land use compatibility over the existing condition.
- **Turf Runway**: Retain a portion of the existing turf runway and operate it in a manner that will reduce runway crossing points, airfield complexity, and incursion potential while preserving turf operational capabilities at a metropolitan area airport.
- **Taxiway configuration changes** as recommended by Air Traffic Control Tower and Airport Operations staff to make the airfield more efficient and to further simplify geometry.

**Feedback from the Second Round Public Comment Period (March 15 – April 14, 2017)**

An Addendum to the Draft 2035 LTCP was prepared to describe the features of and rationale behind the development of the Refined Preferred Alternative.

The Addendum was published for public review and comment on Wednesday, March 15, 2017. A supplemental public information meeting was held on March 30, 2017 to provide more information about the Refined Preferred Alternative to interested citizens. The supplemental public comment period closed on Friday, April 14, 2017.

During the supplemental public comment period, MAC received 16 additional written comments. Of the comments, 12 were from airport tenants and users, 3 from members of the public, and 1 from a municipality.
Airport users and tenants who submitted comments expressed a much greater level of support for the Refined concept than for the original alternative. In particular, preserving a turf runway at Crystal Airport was viewed as a positive factor by many tenants. However, some continued to express reservations about the capacity implications of closing the south parallel Runway 14R-32L.

Notably, Thunderbird Aviation, (the full-service Fixed Base Operator (FBO) at the Airport, submitted comments supporting the refined plan concept – a reversal from their position opposing the original plan recommendations. Key factors that enabled Thunderbird to support the Refined concept are the longer primary runway length and retention of the turf runway to facilitate flight-training opportunities.

The City of Crystal also provided a letter of support for the LTCP Refined Preferred Alternative.

The common comment themes that emerged from the second round of public comment were similar to those received during the first round. In addition, a user suggestion was made to add on-airport service roads around runway ends so that vehicles (including fuel trucks) do not have to cross active runways to reach hangar areas. This recommendation has merit and will be evaluated further during the subsequent environmental review and Airport Layout Plan (ALP) preparation phases.

From a public perspective, comments were submitted that identified recent tree removals as a concern. However, no written comments were received from members of the public in opposition to the proposed improvements contemplated in the refined planning concept.

The common themes that emerged during the second round comment period are summarized below:
RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

General responses were developed to address questions and concerns that were consistent among the comments received during both rounds of public comment about the Draft 2035 LTCP. Specific responses to comments received from municipalities and agencies are provided in the next section. The following topics are covered by the suite of general responses:

1. Support for keeping turf Runway 6R-24L open
2. Support for keeping south parallel Runway 14R-32L open
3. Support for providing additional useable length on Runway 14L-32R beyond that provided by the Stopway concept recommended in the draft plan
4. Forecasts are not optimistic enough
5. Support expanding Fixed Base Operator (FBO) apron
6. Land Use / Future Airport Property Re-Development
7. Flight Patterns and Aircraft Noise
8. Support for improved instrument approaches
9. Tree removals

All written comments received from members of the public are reproduced in their entirety at the end of this appendix.

General responses #1 through #9 follow.

1. **Support for keeping turf Runway 6R-24L open**

   The Draft 2035 LTCP proposed to close and decommission the seasonal turf Runway 6R-24L.

   A key objective for airfield improvements at Crystal Airport is to simplify the airfield geometry by reducing the number of designated “hot spots” on the airfield, which represent the areas with the greatest potential for pilot confusion and incursion errors. This is consistent with a nationwide initiative by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to reduce the number of runway incursions and increase airfield safety. Of the eight existing airfield “hot spots” at Crystal Airport, three of them are associated with taxiways crossing turf Runway 6R-24L.

   Based on manual counts taken by ATCT controllers in 2015 and 2016, the number of annual aircraft operations on the turf runway during the six months it is operational (May – October) is estimated to be approximately 300. This equates to an average of approximately 1.6 operations per day. During the peak operational months (May and June), operations reached an average of approximately 2.5 per day.

   Proponents of the turf runway suggest that it provides several unique benefits to the metropolitan airports system, including operational advantages for tailwheel aircraft – of which approximately 26 are based at Crystal Airport – particularly during landing operations with gusty winds. It also facilitates “soft field” flight training opportunities. Now that the turf runway at the Forest Lake Airport (25D) has been paved, the closest turf runways to Crystal Airport are located approximately 30 miles away at the privately-owned Belle ARS Sport Strip Airfield (7Y7) near Belle Plaine and the Winsted Municipal Airport (10D).
MAC acknowledges the legitimacy of these benefits despite the low usage numbers. However, the contribution of the turf runway to airfield complexity and incursion “hot spots” cannot be disregarded and must be addressed in the long-term plan for the airfield.

Based on the volume of comments received on this item, MAC decided to explore two additional concepts that would preserve some form of turf operational area for pilots while still seeking to reduce overall airfield complexity and the number of designated hot spots. These concepts include:

- Allowing aircraft to land in a designated turf area adjacent to a paved runway, within that paved runway’s operational environment, at the pilot’s own risk; or
- Reducing the length of the current turf runway so that aircraft on Taxiways F and D would no longer penetrate the turf runway’s safety area, object free area, or approach surface.

MAC requested that FAA review these concepts and render a determination as to whether or not they comply with current airport design standards and could be approved on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) for Crystal Airport.

FAA’s preliminary review indicated that they would not support allowing an aircraft to land in a designated turf area adjacent to a paved runway, as this practice would not comply with current airport design standards. However, the concept of reducing the length of the existing turf runway so that aircraft on Taxiways F and D would remain clear of the turf runway’s protected surfaces may have some merit to reduce the number of formal runway crossings, thereby, reducing incursion potential. Although further review will be required during Airport Layout Plan (ALP) development, this concept is now incorporated into the Refined Preferred Alternative.

2. Support for keeping south parallel Runway 14R-32L open

The Draft LTCP proposed to close and decommission the paved south parallel Runway 14R-32L and convert it into a full-length parallel taxiway for primary Runway 14L-32R.

As noted in Response #1, a key objective for airfield improvements at Crystal Airport is to simplify the airfield geometry by reducing the number of designated “hot spots” on the airfield, which represent the areas with the greatest potential for pilot confusion and incursion errors.

Of the eight existing airfield “hot spots” at Crystal Airport, four of them are associated with the close proximity (300-foot separation) of Runway 14R-32L to Runway 14L-32R. Furthermore, the existing pavement on Runway 14R-32L is in poor condition and would require significant rehabilitation to remain serviceable.

Proponents of keeping the south parallel Runway 14R-32L open, including Thunderbird Aviation, suggest that its decommissioning would have a negative effect on Crystal Airport’s ability to efficiently handle air traffic demand during peak operational periods, and further, does not consider the possibility of expanded flight training programs.
Based on the forecasted operational information contained in the Draft LTCP, the proposed airfield configuration without the south parallel runway would easily accommodate projected demand levels on an annual basis. In response to the FBO’s concern about peak-hour capacity, staff conducted further analysis. Using a spreadsheet-based capacity modeling tool recently developed by the Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP)\(^1\), the maximum hourly capacity of the proposed runway configuration at Crystal is estimated to be in the range of approximately 61-89 VFR aircraft operations per hour. The tool takes into account a variety of factors such as runway configuration, touch and go volume, and aircraft separation buffers between departing and arriving aircraft. Due to the configuration of the airfield, it operates more efficiently and thus has more capacity when aircraft are landing and taking off to the south versus the north. The 61-per-hour VFR capacity level is based on north flow operations while the 89 per hour VFR capacity level is representative of south flow operations.

Based on hourly operations data available from MAC’s flight tracking system, MACNOMS, and from the ATC observations, current peak-hour operations at Crystal appear to range between 30 and 50 operations.

- Peak hours with 30-39 operations are somewhat frequent (about 200 hours over the last 3 years);
- Peak hours with 40-49 operations occur occasionally (about 30 hours in the last 3 years); and
- Peak hours with 50 or more operations do occur but rarely (about 3 hours in the last 3 years).

Special event days, such as the annual Crystal Airport Fly-In, were excluded from this analysis due to the atypical operational profile of aircraft movements during these events.

The relationship between expected airfield capacity and demonstrated peak hourly demand is shown in the following graphic.

\(^1\) Per ACRP Report 79, Evaluating Airfield Capacity
With the gap that remains between demonstrated demand volumes of 30-50 movements per hour and an airfield that can handle approximately 61-89 VFR movements per hour, there does not appear to be an operational need to keep the south parallel runway in service.

Based on this assessment, MAC staff remains confident that the proposed two-runway airfield will be able to accommodate future peak-hour demand levels, which are projected to remain relatively stable over the planning period, and could even accommodate some growth. Specifically, the LTCP high-range forecast acknowledges that aircraft operations could grow to a level that is approximately ten percent above the base case forecast if better-than-expected regional economic conditions materialize. Even if the existing busiest-hour demand levels were increased by ten percent, resulting in a peak of approximately 55 hourly operations, this would still be below the predicted airfield capacity level of approximately 61-89 VFR operations per hour.

Therefore, the Refined Preferred Alternative will continue to show Runway 14R-32L as decommissioned and converted into a parallel taxiway.

3. **Support for providing additional useable length on Runway 14L-32R beyond that provided by the Stopway concept recommended in the draft plan**

The Draft 2035 LTCP proposed to convert the existing paved blast pads at the ends of primary Runway 14L-32R into stopways. This concept would increase the accelerate-stop distance for Runway 14L-32R from the existing 3,267 feet to approximately 3,760 feet in both directions. However, the published runway length
would not change from the existing condition, nor would increases in takeoff or landing distances be published.

The Draft LTCP also considered an alternative to convert the existing paved blast pads into useable runway, which would result in a published runway length of 4,267 feet. However, this concept was not selected as the Preferred Alternative as it would likely result in regular use by larger aircraft – thus changing the role of Crystal Airport, something that MAC is not seeking to do since nearby Flying Cloud and Anoka County-Blaine Airports are already well-equipped to handle these types of aircraft.

Several airport users, along with some public commenters, encouraged MAC to consider an “in-between” increase in the primary runway length to make Crystal Airport more attractive to some of the more sophisticated business-use aircraft types that occasionally use the facility today, but that would not likely attract larger, heavier aircraft types on a regular basis. Other users suggested that converting the paved overruns to useable runway pavement instead of stopways, would yield safety and operational benefits to all users by increasing takeoff and landing lengths available, and not just the accelerate-stop distance.

Based on this feedback, MAC is evaluating a Refined concept for primary Runway 14-32 that would convert portions of the existing paved blast pads on each end to useable runway. The concept currently being evaluated would result in a published runway length of 3,750 feet, which is close to 500 feet longer than the existing runway and within the FAA’s recommended runway length range of 3,300 to 3,900 for the design aircraft family of small propeller-driven aircraft with fewer than 10 passenger seats.

Unlike the Stopway concept proposed in the Draft LTCP, all aircraft users would benefit from having additional useable runway pavement available for takeoff and landing movements (approximately 3,500 feet) in the Refined concept. The full pavement length would be available to accommodate accelerate-stop distance requirements. This would require the use of more complex procedures called “declared distances”, meaning that not all of the published pavement would be available for landing and takeoff movements in each direction. Declared distances do add a layer of complexity to the airfield operational environment for pilots, but staff believes this complexity can be overcome through education and awareness efforts.

With the increase in published runway length (from 3,267 feet to 3,750 feet), the number of additional aircraft operations above the base case is estimated to be approximately 314 annually, translating to approximately six additional takeoffs and landings per week. Of the additional operations, the majority are expected to be turboprops (approximately 219 additional annual operations, or 70 percent), with the remaining increase coming from light business jet aircraft (approximately 95 additional annual operations, or 30 percent).

This Refined concept also shifts the entire primary runway approximately 115 feet to the northwest to locate all of the Runway Protection Zones (RPZ) for Runway 32R on MAC property. In the existing condition, and in the original draft LTCP plan, a corner of the Runway 32R RPZ extended beyond the property boundary onto private residential property.
Based on this analysis, the Refined Preferred Alternative incorporates the 3,750-foot runway concept with declared distances, as described above, to further improve safety and operational capabilities without changing the role or character of the airport.

4. Forecasts are not optimistic enough

Several commenters expressed concern that the aviation activity forecasts contained in the Draft LTCP, which predict relative stability in the number of aircraft operations over the 20-year planning period, may not be optimistic enough to account for possible future stimulation of general aviation activity. One possible source of stimulation specific to Crystal Airport identified by commenters is intermodal connections associated with the planned Blue Line Light Rail Transport (LRT) extension and planned station in close proximity to Crystal Airport (at Bass Lake Road).

While it is true that the aviation activity forecast developed for the Draft LTCP does not specifically consider the positive impacts that an adjacent LRT line and station could have on activity levels, it does include a “High Range” forecast to consider the broader impacts of better-then-expected growth in regional income levels. Under the High Range scenario, aircraft operations could increase to over 43,000 annually, an increase of nearly 10 percent over the base case condition. While it is difficult to predict the upside potential of increased multi-modal LRT connectivity at a general aviation airport, it seems reasonable to assume that this activity would be included within the High Range forecast scenario.

5. Support expanding Fixed Base Operator (FBO) apron

The Draft 2035 LTCP indicates that the existing apron serving the Thunderbird Aviation FBO site is small, constrained, and operationally inefficient. The plan proposes an expansion, at the tenant’s cost, to improve aircraft circulation patterns for transient aircraft and the number of parking/tie-down locations.

Several commenters during the first round agreed with this position set forth in the draft plan; however, it is important to note that Thunderbird Aviation was not among them due to their concern with closing the south parallel runway.

It is acknowledged that the existing Thunderbird Aviation site is not the only location on the airfield that can support a full-service FBO. However, the Thunderbird site offers several advantages, such as landside visibility and access, that some of the other sites do not. Also, the area to the southeast of the current Thunderbird site is currently leased to individual hangar owners and thus is not currently available for FBO site expansion.

6. Land Use / Future Airport Property Re-Development

Some commenters expressed concern over the type of development that might occur on Airport property no longer needed for aeronautical purposes.

If MAC elects to pursue non-aeronautical development for any Airport land parcels, dialogue will be initiated with the adjacent municipality (or municipalities) to discuss the potential uses and how the municipalities feel the parcels could best be utilized. If a zoning modification is required, MAC will work the appropriate municipality to make the necessary changes. The development of non-aeronautical uses will not only
benefit MAC, but it will also generate a tax base for the municipality in which the parcel lies.

Retaining a portion of Turf Runway 6R-24L will likely affect the suitability of one parcel for non-aeronautical development that was identified in the Original Preferred Alternative. This parcel is located on Lakeland Avenue N immediately adjacent to the Thunderbird Aviation FBO site. However, the small size (approximately 0.8 acre) and proximity to both the aircraft parking apron and fuel tank already limit the development prospects for this parcel regardless of the disposition of the turf runway.

7. Flight Patterns and Aircraft Noise
There were three comments from two separate individuals during the first round related to aircraft noise and flight patterns.

One commenter expressed concern about noise levels experienced in Brooklyn Center off the end of the crosswind runways. As there are no changes being proposed to the paved crosswind Runway 6L-24R, any change to the noise exposure in the neighborhood to the northeast of the airport will be associated with changes to turf Runway 6R-24L, which experiences low usage. The original draft LTCP evaluated closing the turf runway and shifting all crosswind traffic to paved Runway 6L-24R. From a noise exposure perspective, even the outermost noise contour (60 DNL) remained on airport property to the northeast in both the Base Case and Preferred Alternative conditions. Retaining a portion of the turf runway (see Response #1) will have a negligible effect on the future noise contour due to its low usage.

The noise analysis contained in the LTCP is intended to provide a high-level assessment of potential noise impacts. A more thorough noise impact analysis will take place during the subsequent environmental review process.

A voluntary Noise Abatement Plan is in place to promote aircraft operating procedures that help reduce aircraft noise and overflights for residents living near Crystal Airport. Pilots may also reference the pilot guide for easy access to noise abatement information. The details of this noise abatement plan will be revisited during the environmental review process for the proposed airfield improvements.


Although the MAC continues to evaluate ways to reduce noise impacts around its Airports, there remain many circumstances when the impacts from the airport simply cannot be abated. Federal grant dollar provisions require that the airport be operated in a manner that is neither discriminatory nor poses an undue burden on interstate commerce. The result is that it is extremely difficult to restrict aircraft operations at an airport to control noise in a manner that complies with federal grant assurances.
8. Support for improved instrument approaches

Several commenters expressed support for the draft plan’s recommendation to pursue the establishment of a new non-precision instrument approach to the Runway 32 end, if feasible.

Since the Draft LTCP was published, MAC conducted initial outreach to FAA regarding the feasibility of a non-precision LNAV approach with 1-mile visibility minimums to the Runway 32 end. Preliminary feedback suggests that while challenging from a regional airspace perspective, development of an approach to Runway 32 may be feasible. Based on this outcome, MAC developed a conceptual approach layout and submitted it to FAA for additional consideration, which is still ongoing.

9. Tree Removals

In late 2016, approximately 55 trees were removed from properties in the vicinity of Crystal Airport. These trees were identified as those that penetrated, or nearly penetrated, existing runway airspace obstacle clearance surfaces. These trees were removed at no cost to the property owners, who were also compensated for the assessed value of the removed tree(s). Homeowners are allowed to replace removed trees; however, they are encouraged to plant lower-growth species that will not grow to become airspace obstacle clearance penetrations.

Additional trees and brush were removed on airport property to ensure that airspace surfaces remain clear from vegetation.

Some commenters expressed concern that the tree and brush removals have changed the view shed from their properties, and requested that some of the plant material be replaced with lower-growth types to restore the previous buffer area that existed between their property and the airport.

Under the proposed airfield development plan, it is likely that some additional tree removal will be required to maintain clear runway airspace obstacle clearance surfaces. Specific trees will be identified at the time that the runway improvements are designed based on updated survey data. The following factors will influence the scope of future tree removal programs:

- Runway 32R (southeast end): As a result of the proposed runway configuration, shift to the northwest along its centerline, and recommendation to pursue a non-precision instrument approach to this end, the protected airspace approach surfaces will likely shift to become slightly wider to the southeast of the airport. At a 20:1 slope, this shift should provide an additional 5-6 feet of clearance to the southeast of the airport when compared to the existing condition.

- Runway 14L (northwest end): As a result of the proposed runway configuration and shift to the northwest along its centerline, the airspace obstacle clearance surfaces will likely shift to become slightly lower (approximately 5-6 feet) to the northwest of the airport.

- Turf Runway 6R-24L: The approaches to the retained portion of the turf runway will need to be kept clear of vegetation. However, since the runway length is
proposed to be shortened, the airspace obstacle clearance surfaces will shift accordingly and offer greater clearances than in the existing condition.

Due to the amount of vegetation in the vicinity of Crystal Airport, tree growth is assessed on an ongoing basis and a removal program is needed during a runway improvement project or approximately every ten years.

All written comments received from members of the public are reproduced at the end of this appendix.
RESPONSES TO MUNICIPAL/AGENCY COMMENTS

This section contains responses to comments received from municipalities and agencies about the Draft 2035 LTCP for Crystal Airport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Crystal,</strong> Letter dated October 26, 2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City staff supports the Preferred Alternatives Summary on page XI of the LTCP, including decommissioning both the turf (06R-24L) and south parallel (14R-32L) runways and converting the south parallel runway into a parallel taxiway.</td>
<td>Comments acknowledged. MAC appreciates this statement of support from the City of Crystal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Crystal,</strong> Letter dated October 26, 2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>City staff is interested in the potential for future non-aeronautical development that would benefit the community and Crystal Airport, and looks forward to future discussions with MAC to ensure these uses are compatible with adjacent land uses and neighborhoods.</td>
<td>MAC looks forward to these future discussion as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Crystal,</strong> Letter dated October 26, 2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>In regard to the Metropolitan Council’s Aviation Land Use Compatibility Guidelines, the city does not intend to adopt new noise provisions in city code, but will work in conjunction with MAC to study any potential noise impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour. The City seeks MAC’s concurrence with this position.</td>
<td>Based on follow-up meetings with both the City and Metropolitan Council, MAC is confident that an evaluation process to determine whether the interior noise level of a specific residential structure is high enough to warrant sound insulation treatment, as proposed in Section 7.3.2 of the Draft LTCP, is a prudent approach that will be acceptable to both the City and Metropolitan Council. The MAC intends to conduct this evaluation as a part of the required environmental documentation that will be conducted to implement the LTCP preferred development alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hennepin County Email</strong> dated October 28, 2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Upon any future efforts of the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) to ‘right-size’ the Crystal Airport, should any underutilized portions of land along county roadway frontage - Bottineau Boulevard (CSAH 81) or Bass Lake Road (CSAH 10) be proposed for development/redevelopment we request that the MAC provide an opportunity for Hennepin County Transportation staff to review and provide comment. Minnesota Statutes 505.02, 505.03, and 462.358, Plats</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. MAC will coordinate as requested with Hennepin County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Surveys, allow up to 30 days for county review of preliminary plats abutting county roads. Any changes in land use could have impacts to our transportation network. We do not anticipate adding any additional access locations along either section of these county roads that abut the Crystal Airport. Hennepin County staff review of development proposals along the county roadway system has long been common practice for all Hennepin County municipalities. Recently, with the Flying Cloud Airport in Eden Prairie have we begun to see examples of ‘right-sizing’ efforts from the MAC resulting in leasing out portions of land to be developed along the county roadway system. This opportunity for review and comment allows us greater coordination on access and right-of-way questions in particular, but also allows for opportunity to collaborate on transportation plans including the construction of trails. We hope that through these processes in the future with the Crystal Airport, the MAC will continue to work with Hennepin County in order to optimize a safe and efficient multi-modal transportation network.

We do not foresee any other elements from the Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP having any notable impacts on the Hennepin County Transportation system.
City of Crystal,
Letter dated April 10, 2017

1 City staff is supportive of the following proposed refinements: 1) Conversion of portions of the existing paved blast pads on Runway 14L-32R to usable runway. This increases the published runway length from 3,267’ to 3,750’ and shifts this entire runway approximately 115’ to the northwest to locate all of the runway protection zones (RPZs) onto MAC property rather than on private residential property. 2) Retention of a portion of the existing turf runway but shortening it to reduce runway crossing points and airfield complexity. 3) Taxiway configuration changes to make the airfield more efficient, simple, and safe.

Comments acknowledged. MAC appreciates this statement of support from the City of Crystal.

City of Crystal,
Letter dated April 10, 2017

2 In addition, city staff reaffirms the following comments from our October 26, 2016 letter: 1) City staff is interested in the potential for future non-aeronautical development that would benefit the community and Crystal Airport, and looks forward to future discussions with MAC to ensure these uses are compatible with adjacent land uses and neighborhoods. 2) In regard to the Metropolitan Council’s Aviation Land Use Compatibility Guidelines, the city does not intend to adopt new noise provisions in city code, but will work in conjunction with MAC to study any potential noise impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour.

Item 1) MAC looks forward to these future discussion as well.

Item 2) Based on follow-up meetings with both the City and Metropolitan Council, MAC is confident that an evaluation process to determine whether the interior noise level of a specific residential structure is high enough to warrant sound insulation treatment, as proposed in Section 7.3.2 of the Draft LTCP, is a prudent approach that will be acceptable to both the City and Metropolitan Council. The MAC intends to conduct this evaluation as a part of the required environmental documentation that will be conducted to implement the LTCP preferred development alternative.
MUNICIPAL/AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE FIRST ROUND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

(SEPTEMBER 12 – OCTOBER 26, 2016)
October 26, 2016

Mr. Neil Ralston
Metropolitan Airports Commission
6040 – 28th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55450

RE: Draft Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mr. Ralston:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft Crystal Airport Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP), and for hosting a community open house on September 27, 2016 to inform Crystal residents and property owners of MAC’s vision for the Crystal Airport. City staff offers these comments on the plan:

1. City staff supports the Preferred Alternatives Summary on page XI of the LTCP, including decommissioning both the turf (06R-24L) and south parallel (14R-32L) runways and converting the south parallel runway into a parallel taxiway.

2. City staff is interested in the potential for future non-aeronautical development that would benefit the community and the Crystal Airport, and looks forward to future discussions with MAC to ensure these uses are compatible with adjacent land uses and neighborhoods.

3. In regard to the Metropolitan Council’s Aviation Land Use Compatibility Guidelines, the city does not intend to adopt new noise provisions in city code, but will work in conjunction with MAC to study any potential noise impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour. The City seeks MAC’s concurrence with this position.

If you have any questions about these comments, please contact City Planner Dan Olson at 763-531-1142 or dan.olson@crystalmn.gov

Sincerely,

Anne Norris
City/Manager

cc: Mayor and City Council
John Sutter, Community Development Director
   Dan Olson, City Planner
www.MetroAirports.org
Metropolitan Airports Commission | 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55450 facebook twitter

From: Jason D Gottfried [mailto:Jason.Gottfried@hennepin.us]
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 8:41 AM
To: Ralston, Neil <Neil.Ralston@mspmac.org>
Cc: Carla J Stueve <Carla.Stueve@hennepin.us>; Robert H. Byers <Robert.Byers@hennepin.us>
Subject: RE: Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) -- Comment Period Closing October 26

Hello Neil,

I apologize for the delayed response.

In conducting a cursory review of the Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP), Hennepin County staff offer the following for your consideration:

Upon any future efforts of the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) to ‘right-size’ the Crystal Airport, should any underutilized portions of land along county roadway frontage - Bottineau Boulevard (CSAH 81) or Bass Lake Road (CSAH 10) be proposed for development/redevelopment we request that the MAC provide an opportunity for Hennepin County Transportation staff to review and provide comment. Minnesota Statutes 505.02, 505.03, and 462.358, Plats and Surveys, allow up to 30 days for county review of preliminary plats abutting county roads. Any changes in land use could have impacts to our transportation network. We do not anticipate adding any additional access locations along either section of these county roads that abut the Crystal Airport. Hennepin County staff review of development proposals along the county roadway system has long been common practice for all Hennepin County municipalities. Recently, with the Flying Cloud Airport in Eden Prairie have we begun to see examples of ‘right-sizing’ efforts from the MAC resulting in leasing out portions of land to be developed along the county roadway system. This opportunity for review and comment allows us greater coordination on access and right-of-way questions in particular, but also allows for opportunity to collaborate on transportation plans including the construction of trails. We hope that through these processes in the future with the Crystal Airport, the MAC will continue to work with Hennepin County in order to optimize a safe and efficient multi-modal transportation network.

We do not foresee any other elements from the Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP having any notable impacts on the Hennepin County Transportation system.

Thank for the opportunity to comment on the plan!

Jason

Jason Gottfried
Senior Planning Analyst
From: Ralston, Neil [mailto:Niel.Ralston@mspmac.org]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 10:10 AM
To: 'Tim Benetti' <tbenetti@ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us>; Jason Gottfried <Jason.Gottfried@hennepin.us>; Cindy.Sherman@brooklynpark.org; Todd.larson@brooklynpark.org
Subject: RE: Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) -- Comment Period Closing October 26

Municipal Planning Partners:

Good morning. I wanted to send out a quick reminder that the comment period for the Crystal Airport Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) closes this Wednesday, October 26.

I look forward to receiving any comments that your community may have about the draft plan. Or, please let me know if you plan to submit comments but may not have them ready by the 26th.

Thank you.

Neil

Metropolitan Airports Commission | 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55450 facebook twitter

From: Ralston, Neil
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 4:33 PM
To: 'Dan Olson' <Dan.Olson@crystalmn.gov>; 'Tim Benetti' <tbenetti@ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us>; 'Jason D Gottfried' <Jason.Gottfried@hennepin.us>; Cindy.Sherman@brooklynpark.org; 'john.sutter@crystalmn.gov'; Todd Larson <Todd.Larson@brooklynpark.org>
Cc: Rief, Bridget <Bridget.Rief@mspmac.org>; Schmidt, Gary <Gary.Schmidt@mspmac.org>; Scovronski, Melissa <Melissa.Scovronski@mspmac.org>; Kilian, Mitch <Mitch.Kilian@mspmac.org>; Wilson, Mike <Mike.Wilson@mspmac.org>; Nelson, Dana <Dana.Nelson@mspmac.org>; Gerads, Kelly <Kelly.Gerads@mspmac.org>; Lebedoff Peilen, Lisa <peill@aol.com>; 'brucewiley@wileyproperties.com'; 'John Krack' <av8r00@gmail.com>; 'Gina.Mitchell@faa.gov' <Gina.Mitchell@faa.gov>; 'Jurman, Rylan (DOT)' <Rylan.Jurman@state.mn.us>; 'Gaug, Ryan (DOT)' <ryan.gaug@state.mn.us>; 'Russ Owen (Russell.Owen@metc.state.mn.us') <Russell.Owen@metc.state.mn.us>
Subject: Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) -- Public Informational Meeting Reminder

Municipal Planning Partners:
Good afternoon.

I wanted to send out a quick reminder that we will be holding our two public informational meetings for the Crystal Airport Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) next week.

Details are presented below:

We have also prepared a summary handout to distribute at the information meetings. A copy of the handout has been posted to our website and can be accessed via the link below:

https://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/General-Aviation-Documents/Crystal-OpenHouse-PDF.aspx

Thank you again for your continued engagement and assistance throughout this planning process.

Neil


Metropolitan Airports Commission | 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55450  facebook  twitter
Good afternoon.

As previously indicated, the public comment period for the Draft Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) will open next Monday, September 12.

The following link provides access to the Crystal Airport page of the MAC website, where we have posted information about the planning process: https://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx

From this page, you can view the Draft 2035 LTCP Report, along with the Public Notice that provides information about the upcoming public meetings and methods to submit comments about the plan. The notice was also published in the September 8 edition of the Sun Post.

We would very much appreciate it if you would be willing to help us get the word out by posting information about the public comment period and upcoming information meetings to your respective websites and community calendars. Please let me know if I can provide you with any additional materials to assist in this effort.

Thank you for your continued engagement as we update the LTCP for Crystal Airport!

Neil

Metropolitan Airports Commission | 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55450 facebook twitter

Disclaimer: If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.
MUNICIPAL/AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE SECOND ROUND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

(MARCH 15 – APRIL 14, 2017)
April 10, 2017

Mr. Neil Ralston
Metropolitan Airports Commission
6040 – 28th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55450

RE: Refined Draft of the Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mr. Ralston:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the refined draft of the Crystal Airport Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP), and for hosting a community open house on March 30, 2017 to inform Crystal residents and property owners of the proposed refinements to the plan. City staff is supportive of the following proposed refinements:

1. Conversion of portions of the existing paved blast pads on Runway 14L-32R to usable runway. This increases the published runway length from 3,267' to 3,750' and shifts this entire runway approximately 115' to the northwest to locate all of the runway protection zones (RPZs) onto MAC property rather than on private residential property.
2. Retention of a portion of the existing turf runway but shortening it to reduce runway crossing points and airfield complexity.
3. Taxiway configuration changes to make the airfield more efficient, simple and safe.

In addition, city staff reaffirms the following comments from our October 26, 2016 letter:

1. City staff is interested in the potential for future non-aeronautical development that would benefit the community and the Crystal Airport, and looks forward to future discussions with MAC to ensure these uses are compatible with adjacent land uses and neighborhoods.
2. In regard to the Metropolitan Council’s Aviation Land Use Compatibility Guidelines, the city does not intend to adopt new noise provisions in city code, but will work in conjunction with MAC to study any potential noise impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour.

If you have any questions about these comments, please contact City Planner Dan Olson at 763-531-1142 or dan.olson@crystalmn.gov

Sincerely,

Anne Norris
City Manager

cc: Mayor and City Council
    John Sutter, Community Development Director
    Dan Olson, City Planner
WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE FIRST ROUND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

(SEPTEMBER 12 – OCTOBER 26, 2016)
Hello Neil -

I wanted to contact you regarding the July 22 draft comprehensive plan action document.

I am a Crystal based pilot and resident of Maple Grove.

I would like to request that you take a second look at a few items in this draft plan. Some adjustments would better serve Twin Cities residents, the surrounding communities of the Crystal Airport, pilots, air traffic controllers, and users of MAC's other airports (commercial passengers, pilots, and airlines).

There are some good improvements contained in the plan. There are some ideas in the plan that should not be implemented, especially the decommissioning of runway 14R / 32L.

**Stopways**

I do think that the stopways would be a good improvement and I am happy to see these in the draft report.

**Declared Distances**

Declared distances would be an even better idea. I know pilots who prefer not to use the airport due to the current runway length, and I am confident more of the 4 and 6 seat planes would use the airport with these declared distances. This would also increase safety for takeoff and landing. From the draft report, it appears that the primary reason to not use declared distance is the concern that there would be too many aircraft over 12,500 lbs using the airport with lengthened runways. I do not think this is a good reason to rule this option out. The 4,267 runway length would only marginally increase the number of aircraft able to take advantage of the runways, and only slightly increase the number of over 12,500 lbs pilots who would be comfortable using the airport. Flying Cloud, Anoka, and Saint Paul with precision approaches and 5000 - 6500 foot runways would still be the preference. This increase would likely draw more under 12,500 pound aircraft away from Anoka, St. Paul, Flying Cloud, and non-MAC airports such as Buffalo.

**Thunderbird Expansion**

I do believe Thunderbird has outgrown it's current ramp and building space, so a plan that allows Thunderbird to acquire additional space is a good idea. I do question why Thunderbird could not be expanded using hangar space that currently does not have aeronautical use and / or other FBO appropriate sites at the airport (I have seen listings
where it appears Wentworth is interested in selling the Crystal Shamrock site).

**14R / 32L decommissioning**

The decommissioning of runway 14R / 32L does not make sense to me. Safety, capacity, and pollution (noise / flight efficiency) seem to be greatly improved thanks to this parallel runway. I frequently arrive and depart the airport at busy times (weekday evenings, Sunday evenings, Monday mornings, and all day Saturday) and Air Traffic Control is utilizing the parallel runway to prevent long traffic sequences, prevent extensive traffic holding, and provide separation of faster and slower approaching aircraft without causing long delays for arriving and departing traffic. Being the 3rd busiest airport in the state, the parallel runway is justified for these reasons.

During winter there are also many times where one parallel runway is open while the other one is being plowed.

I have personally observed several occasions where there is debris or an obstruction on the runway and the other runway can be used. (On my own first solo flight, an amphibious plane dropped an oar on 14L right after I took off on 14R, but I was able to continue to land on 14R. It took 20 minutes to have a truck remove the oar and do a runway inspection, the wind was too great to land on 24/6 so I would have needed to divert or hold if a parallel runway was not available).

Decommissioning of this runway will lead to longer traffic patterns / sequencing and holding over nearby neighborhoods and more fuel burn. This will also decrease ability to have traffic continue to land when the runway needs to be closed (especially if difficult wind conditions make use of the crosswind runway unsafe or impossible). The statement that the taxiways are too complex and unsafe at Crystal and this justifies the runway closure does not make sense to me. Crystal has one of the more straightforward configurations I have seen at a busier airport, and there is excellent visibility of the runway environment and great signs and taxiway / runway markings as well as great FAA ground controllers. While fewer runways do mean fewer runway crossings and less possibilities to have an incursion, we are talking about eliminating parallel runways (you only cross one of these runways when you are also crossing it's parallel or going to it's parallel, as a result I would think most who would cause a runway incursion would simply incur the still intact runway (and this would make it more likely there would be landing or departing traffic on that runway actually decreasing safety)).

**Turf runway**

I do realize that the turf runway is the least used runway at the airport. I also have become somewhat of a Minnesota airport history buff and from this I know that many airports have paved over their turf runways or decommissioned the turf runway when it has a paved runway parallel to it. As a result, I am not surprised to see this as part of the proposal to close the turf runway now as well as in 2008. I would like to be sure some points are considered:

- The turf runway at Crystal is used primarily for training and maintaining proficiency in soft field landings. Flight training as well as insurance check out in a new type of aircraft requires soft field instruction and practice and many pilots who use soft fields at other airports like to maintain this proficiency by doing occasional soft field landings. I have really appreciated having the turf runway at Crystal for these reasons and 1 - 2 times per month depart or arrive on this runway.
- If this runway is decommissioned and Forest Lake is paved over (as proposed to occur this month), pilots will need to go to Winstead or Milaca for actual soft field experience. This longer journey will likely decrease metro area pilots proficiency.
- From the 2008 report, and analysis done by other cities with turf runways, I
understand the maintenance cost for a turf runway to be very similar to the cost of maintaining a zone next to an active runway. As a result, closing this runway likely does not save MAC much as far as maintenance is concerned.

- The average usage per day taken in June through August likely would be higher in months with more flight training (April, May, September, October).

**Pilot / public input**

I am subscribed to the MAC email updates and closely watch local news sources for MAC related news. I did not hear about this draft report until after the meetings had occurred thanks to an article in the Brooklyn Center Sun Post that a Brooklyn Center resident shared with me. I have asked around at the airport and have only encountered one person who was aware of the report or the meetings. I know it is difficult to contact local pilots and residents, so the lack of awareness may not be the fault of the MAC, but I am concerned that the analysis may not include good information and ideas from local pilots, air traffic controllers, and nearby businesses and residents.

Thank you for taking the time to read these comments. I would be happy to discuss further with you by email, phone, or in person.

- Eli Wolter
Good Morning,

I just reviewed the Crystal Airport 2035 LTCP and was wondering if you could share who may be working on the preliminary “sufficiently detailed plan” drawings prior to the environmental review and also who may be working the “final project engineering and design?”

Thank you.

Page xvii - An environmental review process cannot begin until there is a sufficiently detailed plan available to evaluate. MAC envisions initiating the environmental review for the proposed Crystal Airport improvements soon after the plan is reviewed by the Metropolitan Council and formally adopted by the MAC Board. A full study of these environmental impact items at this time falls outside the scope of this long-term planning document.

Page xxii - Before any construction can begin, the project(s) must first be depicted on an FAA-approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP), evaluated via an environmental review process, and then compete for funding through FAA and/or State grant programs. Once funding is secured, final project engineering and design will take approximately one year to complete with contractor bidding and construction following thereafter.

Brandon Scherber
Sales Engineer
TrueNorth Steel
701-373-7707 Direct
763-238-1444 Mobile
www.truenorthsteel.com

From road-building to wind farms, TrueNorth Steel Corrugated Pipe has been a critical part of North America’s evolving infrastructure for more than sixty years. Our corrugated steel pipe offers tremendous value and durability for culvert, storm drain, agricultural ventilation, and drainage rehabilitation applications.
Public Comment Form
DRAFT Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan

Public Information Meetings:
Crystal Community Center, September 27, 2016 (5-7pm)
Brooklyn Park City Hall, Council Chambers, September 29, 2016 (5-7pm)

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Development Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1) On this form and left in the comment boxes at either public meeting;
2) Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or;
3) Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 26 at 5:00 PM. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name:  
Address:  

The runways go right over my home.
The noise is continuing to say the least.
I've had many too many TV programs
interrupted by their presence.
The deer problem is another tape.

When guests comment to me on how I
conducted it, I gladly reply to check the
shrub mounds on my roof. 

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Development Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1) On this form and left in the comment boxes at either public meeting;
2) Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or;
3) Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 26th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 26 at 5:00 PM. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name: [Signature]
Address: [Signature]

If you closed the solid
runway the planes would
use the sod runway and
they wouldn't fly over
my house.

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Development Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1] On this form and left in the comment boxes at either public meeting;
2] Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or;
3] Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 26 at 5:00 PM. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name: Roger McGowan
Address: 6064 Edgewood, Brooklyn Park

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Development Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1) On this form and left in the comment boxes at either public meeting;
2) Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or;
3) Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 26 at 5:00 PM. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name: DeLores Johnson
Address: 5624 Regent Ave E

May I suggest the next meeting you have a microphone for both speaker and those in attendance. Those around me agreed they could not hear half of what was said/ commented on.

The question of trees being removed or topped was not addressed. Those around me who tried to speak to others did not feel they got a good answer.

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Development Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1] On this form and left in the comment boxes at either public meeting;
2] Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or;
3] Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 26 at 5:00 PM. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name: Terri Lee Hansen FAIA 763-999-9300
Address: 6322 45th Place NE CRISTAL, MN 55428

Having reviewed the "Book" prior to mentioning plans of the Crystal Community Center, I was impressed with the long term comprehensive plan for the revision prepared for the Crystal Airport. Therefore, I also agree with proposals for achieving its growth and benefits to the community involved.

T.V.H.
9/27/16

Ref. MAC seems the property now attached property. People in the audience were anti-growth of a shopping center on adjacent public land on green space. Why must take a great care in the planning of green issues yet to come...

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
Hello Neil,

I spoke with you last evening. See MS 297A.82. Sub4a.
All of the Mn use tax 6.875% goes into the Mn Airport Fund according to state law.
  I paid an additional 0.25% tax to the 5 County Transit Improvements
  I paid an additional 0.15% tax to Hennepin county local sales and use tax.

Total tax paid on aircraft purchase $7929.75!!!

That is a lot of money that could have gone to buying aviation fuel and flying.
Add that into the "hourly" cost of operating a general aviation aircraft and it should be clear how over taxation and costs of additional regulations are killing general aviation.

It costs a lot of money to maintain, register, ongoing training and operate a general aviation aircraft. I bought a hangar and lease the land from Mac and pay significant lease and property taxes on those properties.

Grass runways are really quite inexpensive to operate and maintain over time. No asphalt or concrete to repair or tear up and replace periodically. I advocate for keeping the grass runway at KMIC airport.

Thanks in advance,
Warren Batzlaff
Sent from my iPad
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Development Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1] On this form and left in the comment boxes at either public meeting;
2] Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or;
3] Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 26 at 5:00 PM. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name: Timothy Stanley
Address: 5708 Aoaik Ave N Crystal, MN

The economic impact of extending the runway 14-32 needs to be examined if the parallel is to be lost. It doesn't make sense to eliminate a runway without gaining the utility of a much longer runway.

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
hello,

I have some additional points to make for keeping the only grass runway that MAC operates in the metropolitan area.

Soft field takeoffs and landings are still part of the training and testing process for pilots. No more access at KMIC training facility. (Forest Lake is now paved over).

Paved runways are prepared and maintained to maximize friction, this can be hazardous with gusty crosswinds 40-50 degrees off the runway heading. (ie: gusty winds of 180 to 200 degrees, or the inverse, vs runways 14/32 & 6/24.) Hazardous for both types of GA aircraft.

Turf runway 6R/24L, is twice as wide as the paved runways, has less friction than pavement, is inherently safer for landing a conventional (taildragger) aircraft, as well as a tricycle (training wheel) aircraft during gusty crosswind operations.

Virtually no tire wear, and less wear and tear on landing gear on turf, versus tires scrubbed off when landing on pavement. The effects of sideways drift/side loading, are decreased when landing on turf, versus pavement designed to maximize friction.

Because turf runways are 2-3 times wider than paved runways (150-250 feet wide) vs. 75 feet, much of the gusty, crosswind operations can be made much safer by taking off degrees of crosswind by landing at a 20-30 degree angle of centerline of turf runway.

Additionally landing more "into the wind" decreases landing roll and landing distances substantially, as well as increasing safety for both types of aircraft at this GA airport.

Reducing training opportunities and safety of GA aircraft should not be a goal of the FAA, or of MAC, at KMIC, Crystal.

Thunderbird's ramp could be expanded to where their dilapidated hangars are now located. Grants could be written and received to move other tenants to other locations, or open hangars with cars, boats, and lawn services operating or being stored there. That ramp location would be inherently safer for aircraft on a ramp, out of direct winds from SW to North, which could have significant hail, foreign object damage caused by being more exposed in the area proposed for closing 24L sod runway.

thanks in advance,
Warren Batzlaff
Mr. Johnson,

I am forwarding this to our email address so your comment is recorded.

Thank you,

Mike Wilson

From: RICHARD L JOHNSON [mailto:richielj40@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 3, 2016 6:53 AM
To: Wilson, Mike <Mike.Wilson@mspmac.org>
Subject: MAC plans for KMIC

Mike I believe you have now inherited the additional duties back at MIC of managing the airport.

I would like to "weigh in" with my comments for the hearing to consider the closing of two runways at MIC.

The grass runway is unique and those who fly "tail draggers" prefer such a runway, but it is probably the most underutilized runway and closing it might not make much difference..

However, 32L-14R does get quite a bit of use and serves the West side of the airport best. I have been flying out of MIC now since 1966 and have seen the airport in its busy years when there were five flight schools operating there. I remember when 32L-14R was a grass strip and then got paved with the additional traffic. My concern now is MIC could easily support another flight school with the increased demand for pilots. I know of one school that strongly considered such a move to MIC. If that were to happen, the extra parallel runway would be advantageous to handle increased training traffic. It might never get to the point of traffic counts in the late '60's, but once you have the additional parallel runway, why not keep it at least to see what happens as the market place spools up to meet the increased demand of training pilots. Maybe another year or two reprieve for that runway might be appropriate.

Dick Johnson
MIC Pilot and Tenant
Plymouth, MN
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Development Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1) On this form and left in the comment boxes at either public meeting;
2) Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org, or;
3) Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 26 at 5:00 PM. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name: Marjanne E. Spencer (widow) since 1999
Address: 6101 Quail Ave NE, Brooklyn Park

The runway over my home is okay, I am happy to know you are improving. I realize the wood across the street helps planes to know take-off, the wood was a fire hazard. I have lived here since Sept 1958. We need your input, please clear the acreage.

We used to have one family, James & Orchard Farm School up to 6th grade & now, since 1999 there is three families in one house & the fire is not kept up & they don't know how it has to be kept up. The people in the house are on 6-1st.

I have fences around the backyard & the fire department cannot get back there. I wish there was a law to keep that open & no fences.

Thank you, Mr. Ralston

Joanne E. Spencer

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
On September 6th 2016 the Metropolitan Airport Commission (MAC) held a Tennant briefing which include a handout with several Long Terms Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) that were considered by MAC.

I do not support the preferred alternative (LTCP), however I would support an LTCP (shown on page 6 of the handout) which converts the existing Overruns to Runway (displaced threshold).

The Statement in the handout “ Increases community noise exposure by moving takeoffs closer to homes” I believe is an incorrect statement. Yes it would move the aircraft takeoff noise (Runway 32) closer to homes on the Southeast side of the airport, however it would actually move the noise farther away from the homes on the Southwest side of the airport.

From the Tennant briefing it appeared that MAC had not considered the additional safety feature this LTCP would bring to the airport for those aircraft currently based at Crystal, but only mentioned the possibility of this LTCP attracting slightly larger aircraft. Our family has been a Crystal tenant since the 1950’s. We currently operate an A36 Beechcraft Bonanza (single engine 6 seat). Looking at the performance charts for my aircraft at a gross weight takeoff:

Takeoff weight: 3650lbs
Flaps approach setting
Pressure Alt 1000’
Headwind 10 kts

From the performance charts for this aircraft the takeoff roll is approximately 1200’, the distance to clear a 50’ obstacle is 2350’. If approach flaps are not used these distances increase by over 35%. With more runway available for takeoff from the above example my aircraft will be higher at the other end of the airport and would allow me to reduce power to a climb setting sooner reducing the noise level of my departure over the homes on the departure end of the runway. Additionally with more runway available if a takeoff should have to be aborted then more would be available for stopping.

This LTCP also mentions “Potential to attract Larger aircraft” I would agree with this statement, however again when we look at performance figures for larger aircraft such as:

Pilatus PC-12 (single engine turboprop) the published 50’ obstacle clearance is 2,600’ less than 10% more than my aircraft.
King Air 250 at MTOW is 2,111’

- Again I believe these examples show what added safety margin would be added to this airport with the LTCP that converted the existing overruns to Runway for those aircraft currently based at Crystal.
• I also attended the City of Crystal working session on September 8th that specific council members supported this LTCP and not the one being proposed.

Other things that should be considered in the LTCP:

• Move the run up areas away from homes
• Minimum hanger exterior appearance requirements (don’t renew leases if this policy cannot be met)
• MAC to build and either lease or sell new hangers
• The need for more ramp space for transient aircraft

As pilots we all have to take into consideration those who live around airports. If we can educate our airport neighbors about the types of aircraft that can operate out of certain airports and what airports can bring to their communities (for example: green space, revenue for local business and even jobs located at the airport) the better neighbor we will be.

This is an excellent time with members of the Crystal city council support to consider the LTCP which converts the overruns to Runway.

Respectfully

Joe Shallbetter
Greetings,

Just wanted to touch base before the comment period is over and give you input from my vantage point. I would like to see the Airport runway extended a bit in order to attract a little larger "corporate" plane. Maybe 10-12 passenger size. With the Blue Line Extension line transit station withing walking distance of the Airport, I would think allowing larger planes could go a long way towards bringing in people to our Community who might spend money in our surrounding retail areas. I would also like to see some development around the perimeter area of the Crystal Airport. Possibly a restaurant, pilot training school, aviation museum, etc.

As far as removing the turf runway, I've talked with several pilots who fly in and fly out of the Crystal Airport and they really do not want to see the turf runway removed. I'm not a pilot and not sure I understand completely why its so important to them to keep it, but since one or two live in the area I represent as a council member, I am just passing along there wishes. If it doesn't cost money to maintain and some pilots like it, why the push to remove it?

Basically, I love the Crystal Airport. It gives our Community something unique that other Communities don't have and I want to see the Airport updated and successful. The residents who live around the Airport (or those that I've spoke to) love the airport too and I have never heard any of them say, they want it closed. Most say they would like to see a little more air traffic. They enjoy watching the planes take off and land, otherwise they would not have purchased a home there.

Personally, and I could be wrong, but I don't think there would be a lot of negative push back from the local residents or the current council members if you do decide to lengthen the runway a little. I'm happy to help you rally the Ward 4 residents surrounding the Airport if you chose to move in that direction.

As always, feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions or comments. My cell phone is 612-306-5808.

Julie Deshler
Council Member-Ward 4
To Whom It May Concern,

I like the idea of having larger planes landing in Crystal.

Thanks!

olga
Please note my attached comments; I appreciate the opportunity to comment!

Chris Glaeser
Comments on 2035 Long Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport

To: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org

Mr. Neil Ralston
MAC Airport Development
6040 28th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55450

Dear Mr. Ralston;

I have just finished reviewing the very comprehensive 2035 Long Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport (MIC), and am very impressed with the scope and effort that went into this plan. As a very active pilot flying out of Crystal in 3 different types of aircraft, I would like to make these recommendations for MAC consideration. I am providing these recommendations in the interest of promoting local aviation and long-term Crystal Airport development and have no financial interests in the airport.

1. Effect of the Blue Line Light Rail Expansion

The western expansion of the Blue Line Light Rail is scheduled to start operations in 2021, with two stations in close proximity to Crystal Airport. The planned station at Bass Lake Road in the city of Crystal will be especially convenient to the airport.

The connection of a major airport (MSP) to a reliever airport (MIC) via light rail is very significant and extremely rare in the USA. Additionally, no train change will be required between Crystal and both terminals of the MSP airport; a direct connection! The light rail will also directly connect Crystal Airport to downtown Minneapolis and a large number of popular sporting and entertainment venues such as the Target Center, new Vikings Stadium, the Target Center, and the Mall of America. Connecting Crystal Airport to the light rail system will allow many new uses of Crystal Airport, and this new connection needs to be highlighted in the 2035 LTCP and supported with the implementation of the recommendations below.
Connecting the light rail station to transient aircraft parking at the airport could be supported by a new FBO shuttle, Uber, Lyft, or conventional taxi services. This connection should be highlighted in all Minnesota state aviation documents.

A few examples of the myriad potential uses of these newly integrated transportation modes:

- Minnesota congressional legislators will be able to fly into Crystal and take the Blue/Green lines to the capital

- Visitors to the Target Corporation headquarters will be able to fly into Crystal and take the light rail to Target headquarters. This may also encourage other major companies to locate new facilities in the city of Crystal, noting the new connection to MSP airport

- Pilots will be able to fly into Crystal from Detroit Lakes, Brainerd, Alexandria, Hayward Lakes, etc., and attend a sporting event. Return to their home airport could occur the same day or the next morning, stimulating business at hotels convenient to the new Blue Line

- Pilots from outstate Minnesota will be able to fly to Crystal Airport, shop or have business appointments in downtown Minneapolis, and then fly out of Crystal.

- Passengers flying major airlines will be able to fly into MSP, take the Blue Line directly to Crystal Airport, and then complete their trip by light aircraft to the western and northern regions of Minnesota.

**Recommendation:** the planned Blue Line station at “Bass Lake Road” should be renamed “**Crystal Airport/Bass Lake Road**”. This will highlight the proximity to Crystal Airport and the city of Crystal location, and ensure that transient pilots can easily identify the proper light rail station.

If the light rail station stimulates transient aircraft utilization as anticipated, parking and hangar space for transient aircraft will be grossly inadequate. However, the planned closing of runway 6R allows for considerable expansion of parking.
As noted on page 2-18 of the LTCP:

“Thunderbird Aviation offers aircraft parking and storage as one of its services with both indoor storage and outdoor apron/tie-down parking available. Outdoor apron storage typically accommodates short-term parking for visiting aircraft or for parking of planes awaiting maintenance or other services. It can also be used for long-term storage of aircraft. The existing FBO apron is relatively small and is often congested due to its configuration.

The capacity of the apron is limited to six single or small twin-engine aircraft simultaneously, and fewer if a larger twin-engine piston or turboprop is parked.”

**Recommendations:**

The LTCP should consider the following impacts of increased daily and overnight transient aircraft to include the following anticipated requirements:

- A need for greatly increased outdoor ramp space with permanent aircraft tie-downs
- A need for greatly increased indoor hangar space (10-20 aircraft) to encourage overnight and longer term transient use; a potential revenue increase for Crystal Airport
- Potential 24 hour pilot access to the transient parking area (perhaps with a coded pedestrian gate)
- Signage from the light rail station to the transient ramp to facilitate taxi service and ride sharing service users

2. **Existing Requirement for a Significant Safety and Operational Improvement**

There is currently no straight-in GPS approach to runway 32R. This reduces the current level of safety at Crystal Airport and should be a high priority, immediate improvement.

As noted briefly in the 2035 LTCP (pg viii):

“Development of a new, non-precision GPS-type instrument approach procedure for the existing Runway 32R end would enhance the operational capabilities of the airport.”
Planning for the establishment of this non-precision approaches is recommended for consideration, if feasible.”

I would strongly recommend that the MAC immediately request the FAA to create a straight-in GPS approach to runway 32R with the lowest possible weather minimums (LPV) if possible. There is a need for this approach today, and the wording in this section of the LTCP should acknowledge this existing need. The FAA can accomplish the creation of this approach at essentially no cost to the MAC. This would provide many immediate benefits to Crystal pilots including:

- Improved safety during lower weather operations
- Additional local instrument training opportunities for pilots at all MAC airports
- Increased operations at Crystal when winds are northerly

3. Run-up and departure delay parking areas

If any of the paved runways are closed, I would recommend a review of the “engine run-up” areas on each side of each runway end. A normal engine sunup and preflight checklist can take 5+ minutes, and an inadequate run-up parking area can result in excessive departure delays. As a planning suggestion, there should be room for at least 3-4 aircraft to perform run-up’s or park (while awaiting clearance, loading flight plans, etc) allowing another standard size light aircraft to pass and takeoff. The existing run-up area to the west of runway 32L is a good example of a properly sized area, while the existing run-up area to the east of runway 32R is clearly inadequate.

I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to submit my comments to this very comprehensive report and am available for further discussions at your discretion.

Sincerely yours,

<signed>

Chris Glaeser
Public Comment Form
DRAFT Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan

Public Information Meetings
Crystal Community Center, September 27, 2018 (5-7pm)
Brooklyn Park City Hall, Council Chambers, September 28, 2018 (5-7pm)

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Development Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1) On this form and left in the comment boxes at either public meeting;
2) Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org; or;
3) Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 8540 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55420

Written comments will be accepted until Wednesday, October 25 at 5:00 PM. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name: JANICE TREVERE

Address: 8200 67th Ave N, Brooklyn Park, Mn 55424

I attended: [X] Crystal Comm Ctr [ ] Brooklyn Pk Ctr Hall
3) meeting in 2008 or 2010 with 4 sets of presented plans.

New development benefit and Aviation mic. (1) Increase in business growth aviation traffic (2) Maple Grove. New business growth. (3) Useful transportation in growing community

Light rail corridor to Crystal Airport. (1) Sports arena and transportation future use. (2) Maple Grove. New suburb future use.

Runway and Crystal Airport. (1) Air traffic controllers prefer option to move planes to Runway of choice. (2) Avoid long lines waiting to land. (3) Grass runway benefit to tailwheel flyers. (4) Safety of everyone with more options.

The Airport Business and Crystal Airport. (1) Lack of commitment to aviation privilege on aviation land.

A long-term strategy. Crystal Airport. (1) Technology and conditions changing aviation possibilities now and the future.

My Aviation Interest: (1) My CHAP. 89 Intention (2) Women Pilots (3) EAA 104 year volunteer flightline watch (4) I was taught to fly at MIC & gained license at MIC

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
From: Drew Johnson
To: Crystal LTCP
Subject: Do not close the sod
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 12:54:28 PM

As a taildragger pilot that is based at KMIC, I frequently use the sod both for safety reasons and training reasons. As the only remaining grass runway at the MAC reliever airports, and in the context of the entire system, it does not seem unreasonable to keep this runway open.

-Drew

Drew Johnson
Oppidan Investment Company
400 Water Street, Suite 200
Excelsior, MN 55331
D: 952-540-4180
C: 612-554-1897
F: 952-294-0151
Hello,

Please find Thunderbird Aviation’s response to 2035 LTCP attached.

Thank you,

Jacob Teske
Operations Manager
Thunderbird Aviation, Inc.
Phone: 763.533.4162 | Fax: 763.971.0116
5800 Crystal Airport Road | Crystal MN 55429
jteske@thunderbirdaviation.com

Email and tell us about your experience at Thunderbird Aviation!
Metropolitan Airports Commission

RE: Crystal Airport Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mr. Neil Ralston:

I am writing in response to the Metropolitan Airports Commission’s Crystal Airport Draft 2035 LTCP on behalf of Thunderbird Aviation, Inc.

It is Thunderbird Aviation’s contention that the proposed decommissioning of runway 14R-32L would have a negative effect on Crystal Airport’s ability to efficiently handle air traffic and, thusly, on Thunderbird Aviation’s operations. The proposed decommissioning of runway 14R-32L fails to take into account the expected growth of Thunderbird Aviation’s operations, and in particular, it’s growing flight training program.

It is also Thunderbird Aviation’s contention that the closing of Crystal’s turf runway (6R-24L) would have a negative effect on our flight training program. Crystal Airport serves as the only soft-field strip in the metro area and its loss would severely limit our ability to conduct soft-field training.

Thunderbird Aviation does not believe that the conversion of overruns to stopways will effectively increase operations at KMIC. We do not believe this is a viable means of drawing transient traffic to the field.

Due to the above listed reasons, Thunderbird Aviation is opposed to MAC’s 2035 LTCP. We hope you will take the concerns above into serious consideration before moving forward with your drafted plans.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jake Teske

Operations Manager – Thunderbird Aviation
I am disappointed with one of the proposed changes at the Crystal Airport. The grass runway is currently the only grass asset in the MAC system. During the presentation from the MAC to the Airport tenants, it was clear that no consideration was given to finding an alternate to closing the grass. I proposed the idea of combining the crosswind asphalt and the grass into one runway, the pilot having the option to land on either side. It would be one runway, just wider. The hosts stipulated that the cost of maintaining the grass was minimal.

One reason given to close the sod was to give Thunderbird a potential expansion area that they have not asked for. With the other 4 FBO’s closed it seems to me that there is plenty of area for FBO expansion without encroaching into an existing runway.

For the many taildragger pilots at Crystal, the sod provides a significant safety margin. Typically when it is windy, the winds are out of the Southwest, which is the way the crosswind runway is orientated. Taildragger airplanes have significant advantages with landing on grass.

When I learned to fly taildraggers and got checked out in my current airplane, initial instruction on the sod was important. I understand the need to “right size” Crystal, but by closing the grass, you will be eliminating one more important option for general aviation. While that may seem insignificant to some, it is very important to others.

At the meeting presentation by the MAC officials, it was clear that groups were consulted about the changes before this proposal was written. Two groups that were not consulted were the tenants and pilots who use Crystal. I question the understanding that the writers of the proposal have of general aviation. One of their taking points, meant to be a positive for the pilots at the meeting was to ask the FAA for a new RNAV approach to the new combined 32. Anyone that had a basic understanding of the airspace around MSP would understand that could never happen. The fixes for such an approach would put it well within the MSP Class B airspace and would conflict with MSP traffic.

Respectfully,

—Patrick Fox
Jeff Dinsmore
5805 Minnetonka Dr.
Shorewood, MN  55331
612-720-9084
jdinsmore@borealflight.com

October 26, 2016
To: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org

Comments on 2035 Long Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport

Mr. Neil Ralston
MAC Airport Development

6040 28th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN  55450

Dear Mr. Ralston

Thank you for all your efforts in the preparation of the Long Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport. The plan is very comprehensive and I am impressed with the variety of factors included.

I am a pilot, flight instructor, and 30+ year user of Crystal Airport. I also have long term experience flying out Flying Cloud Airport, fly a variety of piston aircraft, and very familiar with General Aviation operations.

Upon review of the Long Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport, I have these comments:

1. I am not in favor of the closure of Runway 14R/32L.

   • A single primary runway will concentrate traffic, increase pilot and tower personnel workload, and lead to diminished safety,
• A single primary runway will detract from usability of transient, business aircraft and reduce airport desirability and usage,

• Having both left and right traffic patterns will increase tower workload and extend traffic patterns,

• Extended traffic patterns will not be practical when Target Field TFR’s are in effect, and

• The current runway arrangement provides traffic relief for arrivals and departures for 14L/32R. Ease of use will promote transient aircraft use of Crystal Airport

2. Converting Runway 14L/32R overruns to stopways is a positive change leading to increased usage including turboprop aircraft.

3. If taxiways are extended for 14L/32R to take advantage of stopways, more attention to run-up areas will need attention. Current areas for performing run-ups and pre-takeoff procedures are small particularly for Runway 32R.

4. In general the plan may make the airport more difficult to use leading to less usage by transients and even tenants.

5. Forecast airport usage appears pessimistic as well as inconsistent with projected population growth for the region. While Crystal Airport has seen decline in recent years, my experience over the last 6 to 12 months is activity is steady to slightly increasing. The usage data presented ends in mid 2015. Assuming the economy stays flat or even improves marginally, I believe airport activity will stay flat or increase.

6. The forecast airport usage does not reflect aviation industry training requirements. With the potential of increased training needs, airport activity will be affected.

7. The overall plan I believe negatively impacts desirability and, therefore, will lead to less usage of the airport. If the airport is more desirable, then the possibility of supporting future, additional operators, is greater.

Recommendations:

1. Retain Runway 14R/32L in the current configuration for daylight use.

2. Consider enhancements to runup areas to add surface area and promote ease of use.

3. Revise airport usage information to include data to the most present time and include aviation industry projections.
Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Jeff Dinsmore

ATP, CFI

Safety and Education Officer, Yankee Flying Club
Thank you for giving us the opportunity to respond to the proposal.
CRystal AIRPORT RUNWAY 32L CLOSURE PROPOSAL

October 26, 2016

We attended a meeting in Brooklyn Park a couple of weeks ago sponsored by the Metropolitan Airports Commission to discuss the closure of runway 32L and 24L at Crystal Airport. We were encouraged to submit in writing our concerns about these proposed runway closures. Additionally, we recently received an email requesting input.

First of all, we are in favor lengthening runway 32R. Our major concern is the removal of an asset that has proven to be invaluable when traffic volume warrants the use of the parallel runways. Frequently you will hear controllers issue instructions for a pilot to change from 32R to the 32L parallel in order to expedite traffic or to provide a safer traffic environment. In addition, the location of downtown Minneapolis and the Twins Ball Park prohibits aviation traffic from routinely extending the pattern to the southeast of Crystal Airport. The purpose of the reliever airport concept, of which Crystal Airport is an important element, is to encourage smaller aircraft to use the reliever system instead of flying into Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport. Historically Crystal has been a heavy training facility. Removal of a runway would seriously jeopardize its primary function as a Twin Cities Reliever Airport and training facility. In accordance with the October, 2016 Airline Pilot Association monthly magazine, the major air carriers including Delta Airlines will require 2,000 pilots in the next year and that number will substantially increase to 23,000 per year in the year 2025 due to mandatory retirements in the airline industry. This applies to the majors only and does not include the regionals. Additionally, this does not include early mandatory medical retirements. Pilots historically prefer to fly out of their home base close to where they grew up. Delta has a base in the Twin Cities and will need multiple twin cities pilots trained at our local facility. If the parallel runway at Crystal is removed, the ability to provide efficient training when the airlines are in desperate need of qualified pilots will be sacrificed.

In addition, the Minneapolis Northwest Corridor Light Rail is projected and funded to pass right by Crystal Airport and will provide transportation to the numerous events and attractions that occur throughout the year in Minneapolis, St. Paul and suburbs. Crystal Airport would be the only reliever airport located next to the popular light rail transportation.

The aviation traffic volume may not be comparable to the volumes during the 1960’s – 1970 heydays. However to remove a perfectly functional runway prematurely would certainly indicate the Metropolitan Airports Commission is guilty of using extremely poor judgement.

Sincerely,

WILEY ENTERPRISES, INC.

Bruce Wiley, Crystal RACC and pilot

Barb Wiley, retired Northwest Airlines captain.

Alan Lindquist, retired air traffic controller and former Crystal Tower Manager.
After listening to comments at several meetings and reviewing the Crystal Airport Long Term Comprehensive Plan, I suggest that MAC seriously consider two changes:

1. Maintain a grass strip in some form

2. Turn the overrun pads at the ends of runway 14L/32R into usable runway with displaced thresholds rather than stopways

**Background:**

I think we all agree that a major objective is to make the Crystal airport more attractive to potential tenants/subtenants and to transients. For a number of reasons, it has experienced a dramatic decline in based aircraft and operations over the last decade or so, and many of us would like to see that trend reversed and the airport grow. With its close proximity to downtown Minneapolis, its amenities such as the control tower and crosswind runway, and its past activity, it clearly has the potential. A more robust airport would offer economic benefits to the local communities, and additional revenue to the MAC to help support the GA system.

The most economic benefit comes from the higher end of the design spectrum (piston twins, turboprops, and light jets) as these operators would typically use their aircraft for business, and would buy more fuel and patronize local businesses more than would the lower-end recreational operators. However, if the airport were made more attractive to recreational operators, we could expect to see more aircraft base there and add to the operations counts. In addition, more activity would add to the "ambiance" of the airport, and could entice another FBO to set up shop, bringing more services and competition to the airport.

My suggestions are offered with the above commentary in mind.

**Grass Strip**

I've talked to several tailwheel operators who are passionate about using grass runways whenever possible. They say that landings are easier, particularly in crosswinds, and that the grass is much easier on their tires, particularly the large "tundra" tires. MAC staff says that the usage of the Crystal grass strip has been
low, about 60 operations per month during the months the grass runway is open, but they also acknowledge that the grass runway is very inexpensive to maintain. So why not keep it? The strongest arguments for closing it seem to be to open up space for Thunderbird to expand their ramp, and to reduce potential "hotspots." I see two possibilities to address these objectives:

1. Shorten the runway to, say, 1500 feet, and/or narrow it to, say, 50 feet, which should accommodate most smaller tailwheel aircraft.
2. Move the grass runway to be adjacent (or close) to 6L/24R, and impose a registration requirement for its use. This concept is used in Naples, FL, and requires operators wanting to use the grass to register their aircraft in advance so they can be briefed on the appropriate procedures.

With Forest Lake paving their runway, there might be an incentive for some Forest Lake operators to move to Crystal. In any case, offering a grass runway option would send a "you're welcome here" message to tailwheel operators, and if it can be done at a reasonable cost, it should be.

**Runway 14L/32R**

Several people have commented at the LTCP meetings that the airport usability and safety would be significantly increased if the 500' overrun pads at each end of runway 14L/32R were converted to usable runway with displaced thresholds for landing to keep aircraft higher over the surrounding neighborhoods. We heard Bruce Wiley note that taking off in his 172 on amphib floats can get dicey on hot days in low headwind conditions. MAC's concerns about inviting larger than intended aircraft are acknowledged, but how significant is this risk compared to the advantages to larger aircraft in the design class (which we want to attract), such as the Cessna 400-series aircraft, of having the additional runway length? The concern that starting the takeoff roll 500 feet closer to houses may be valid, but there's still about 850 feet between the departing aircraft and the adjacent houses. Pre-takeoff runup might be a bigger problem since the noise would be longer in duration, but that could be addressed by encouraging runups prior to the departure end of the runway for larger aircraft.

Further, Table 4-4 (Takeoff Length Requirements) and the subsequent paragraph indicate that 3,600 feet would be the preferred runway length to accommodate all takeoff and landing distance categories, while the recommended option only supports the accelerate-stop distance. Supporting all categories, I would suggest, makes the airport more attractive to more aircraft within the design class, and significantly enhances safety for all users.

If the concerns cited above are deemed to be serious enough to not proceed with opening the full length of the runway, perhaps we could "split the difference" and
use 250 feet at each end for usable runway, with the additional 250 feet as stopway, resulting in a usable runway length of 3768 feet, a major improvement for aircraft in the higher end of the design range, and well above the desired 3600-foot minimum length. In any case, the concept should be included in the Plan as a potential future option should sufficient interest/need arise to justify it.

Finally, there's the concern about the public's possible reaction to the potential of larger aircraft and more noise from a longer runway. I attended both the Crystal and Brooklyn Park public meetings, and heard no concern about this issue. I also heard anecdotally that at a meeting with the Crystal city council, at least three members seemed to support a longer runway. This may be because the right people weren't there, or because the extension wasn't considered an option, but I would suggest it be recommended in the Plan and see what kind of feedback ensues. If a strong enough case is made against it, it can always be removed, but at least we'll have vetted the subject.

Certainly cost is a factor, but in my opinion, reasonable investment in infrastructure to encourage the future growth of the airport sends a strong message to the aviation community that MAC is behind this airport and is serious about facilitating its growth. I believe that supporting these two changes to the LTCP would go a long way to encouraging more operators to use this airport, and to demonstrate MAC's proactive support.

I hope you'll give these suggestions some serious thought, and look forward to the next version of the Crystal LTCP.

Thanks and Regards,

John Krack
Chair, Reliever Airports Advisory Council
I attended the Crystal Airport 2035 Long Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) public informational meeting held on 9/29/16 at the Brooklyn Park with great interest.

As background, I am responding on behalf of Odyssey Entertainment, Inc. a Maple Grove based business that owns a larger hanger near Thunderbird Aviation on the east side of the field that supports its well equipped Cessna turbo Cardinal RG aircraft. Odyssey’s business model requires it to travel frequently to many small cities spanning from West Virginia to Western North Dakota and many points in between not served by scheduled air carriers, often on short notice. Odyssey’s growing business requires a larger hanger to handle aircraft and employees and in 2014 after a long search was successful in acquiring a hanger that met its needs.

While Crystal Airport is convenient and has good access from our Maple Grove offices, the airport is sufficiently lacking in several areas that we believe constrains its highest and best usefulness as a reliever airport supporting GA operations. Those deficiencies include:

- Short Runways to safely support higher performance longer range aircraft that businesses such as ours often use;
- Lack of instrument approach options to support reliable arrival dependency:
  - NO instrument approach to Runway 32. Not even a non-precision GPS approach;
  - Lack of precision approaches. WAAS LPV for both Rwys 14 and Rwys 32 would be extremely useful especially in the darker and cloudier late fall / winter / early spring months that often require arrival instrument approaches;
- Embarrassingly, marginal, deficient and limited ground support services and facilities available:
  - Only one monopolistic FBO on the field;
  - Marginal aircraft, guest and pilot services;
- Limited ramp space for larger aircraft. The small ramp in front of the only FBO quickly becomes congested with larger aircraft which then backs up aircraft into the taxiways in and round the FBO and often in between the taxi hangers including ours;
- Limited fuel Options:
  - NO self serve fuel currently offered on the filed. Fuel only available during regular business hours;
  - There is only option for fuel on the field with means mean lack of competition for availability and high prices. Not surprisingly, average fuel prices are some of the most expensive in the MAC reliever airport system. Many aircraft avoid the field for this fact alone.

What Crystal Airport has going for it is it’s the most convenient airport to DT Minneapolis and is next door to many prominent west Metro businesses that would likely use the airport if the deficiencies identified above were addressed. Also, inbound transient business aircraft would increase use of the Crystal Airport too. Case in point late last week we met a small business owner from Atlanta GA who flew in for a business meeting and ended up needing some assistance after hours. This gentleman
arrived earlier that day in his Twin Rockwell Commander (N680RR) to meet with his client Artic Cat corporate in DT Minneapolis. When I asked him why he chose Crystal Airport he replied due to its close proximity to DT Minneapolis and the fact it was a VFR arrival that day. I asked him if he had ever been to Crystal Airport before and he said no. I then asked him what he thought of the airport and if it met his needs. He responded how surprised he was how marginal the services available were for a busy metro airport. I then asked if he’d ever return and he said unlikely, and definitely not in IFR conditions since the runway was “a little short” for his Twin Commanders’ 8,000lb weight and his taste.

For our purposes, at some point we would like to upgrade to a higher performance turboprop aircraft that offers better all weather capabilities and performance but are hesitant to do so due for the following reasons:

- Crystal’s marginal runway length. These aircraft cross the threshold a some 20kts faster than our current aircraft which lowers the margin for error, especially in instrument arrival conditions and low traction conditions such as in the winter;
- Lack of and instrument approach to Runway 32. Rwy 32 is often the prevailing wind option during the darker and cloudier winter months and has no published instrument approach of its own. The only access to Rwy 32 in instrument conditions is to use a non-precision Rwy 14 approach and circle to land on Runway 32. This is a risky and dangerous approach especially at night which is why many pilots won’t fly them and most commercial flight operations prohibit them. This limits arrival dependability to the airport;
- Limited FBO support for these types of aircraft.

In conclusion, we believe the Crystal Airport has basic merits to be an attractive reliever airport if the deficiencies identified above are addressed. We believe many of the recommendations identified in the LTCP would go along way in reducing or eliminating the problems currently plaguing the Airport. Crystal has an excellent location, one of the best and most accessible in the metro area especially for Northwest Metro based businesses like ours that depends on GA aircraft to support its businesses. If the recommendations identified above are adopted we believe the airport can better and safely support higher performance aircraft that will in turn attract more transient aircraft, business aircraft and base aircraft to the field. As activity increases (reversing the current negative trend) then so will demand for aircraft and business support services which will likely have the beneficial causal effect of attracting additional badly needed, aircraft support businesses and jobs.

Sincerely,

Bryan Sieve
VP Finance & Business Development
Odyssey Entertainment, Inc.
Maple Grove, MN
ph. 763-746-0228 ext. 443
e-mail: bsieve@odysseytheatres.com
Please reconsider the decision to close the last grass runway in the MAC system. It will be a loss for Crystal airport, a loss for the MAC and a big loss for tailwheel pilots based there or transiting through.

Crystal airport contains the ONLY grass runway left in the MAC Reliever system. The current MAC Long Term Capital Plan proposal is to close it. The main argument to do so is to eliminate incursion "hot-spots" and to provide expansion room for the one remaining FBO on the field.

I'm not sure how Thunderbird (the one remaining operator at KMIC) feels about the need for expansion space, but with four closed former FBOs on the field, that type of real estate is hardly at a premium.

As for eliminating incursion friction points, tail-wheel pilots cherish the grass runway, both to learn their technique when transitioning to "conventional gear", and to use as a "safe-harbor" when the winds are strong and/or gusty, no matter how experienced they are. When the wind make the grass runway an option, every tail-dragger pilot I know that is based on the field will opt for it every time. I can't quote statistics to back this claim, but I suspect that today's tail-wheel pilot population is generally more experienced, higher-time, and more situationally aware than the average. I'm sure that they (we) can still cause runway incursions, but with a tower and ground control on the field, the exposure is manageable. I hope this issue can be explored more fully, and all options considered before an irreversible decision is made.

Thank you
Keith Ulstad.

Sent from my iPhone
WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE SECOND ROUND
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

(MARCH 15 – APRIL 14, 2017)
From: john roder [mailto:johnroder1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 11:58 AM
To: Ralston, Neil <Neil.Ralston@mspmac.org>
Subject: Re: Follow-Up from Crystal Airport Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) Briefing (3/15/17 Update)

Neil:

It's a little late for my comment, but it's perhaps a small change. I think that alignment from the area near the MAC north airport maintenance building that's proposed should be looked at. Persons unfamiliar with the airport can, and often do, drive down taxiways. My concern is that the transition from Zane Avenue to the beginning of the runway is basically a straight shot with just one 45 turn in there and a couple small signs to get a driver to realize they should not be driving there. I think there needs to be some break in there so, even if someone does drive to the wrong place, they aren't apt to drive into the landing zone.

Hope it helps!

John Roder
6200 Zane Avenue North
Minneapolis, MN 55429

612-325-2500 main
612-326-4374 (desk)
612-805-5747 (cell) - best way to reach me.
I support the refined airport plan. It increases safety by providing for more takeoff run. It maintains the grass runway for safer operations of conventional (tail wheel) aircraft. Maintaining the airport for operations that already exist, are important for general aviation.

Sent from my iPad
Good morning Neil.

Just received your email notice. A question that has been in the back of my mind to ask either you or Mike Wilson is regarding this Long term Project for Crystal Airport. While it is billed as the "long term project", it does have some specific near term recommendations for the airport: Namely closing 32 L runway, shortening the sod 6R runway, and lengthening 32R runway.

Projects like this have to have a beginning, and I am wondering how or where the beginning of this project originated. Was it one person--a director and I would imagine if so it started fairly high up the chain of command, or was it some mandate, was it a budgeting restriction--but if this reduces costs then it is hard to imagine the cost necessary to close the runway and extend the other one. Just asking as it has been pressing on my mind as to how or who started this ball rolling down hill.

I happen to own an in ground pool in my back yard. It was built in 1984 when my kids were young. They now have families of their own and grand kids come over to enjoy the pool. A pilot friend of mine who is in real estate said to me once I should close down my pool and fill in the hole with a bulldozer. That might sound like a good idea except for when I inquired about the cost, which would be as much as I paid for the pool initially. To keep it open costs a few dollars each year but it is a fraction of one percent of the cost of getting rid of the pool.

This analogy strikes me in the same way as closing the one runway at Crystal. Oh sure we have heard the concerns about safety from the FAA, but as many have said we have operated safely in that environment when traffic at KMIC was triple what it is now.

Dick Johnson
Tenant
763-473-2939H
612-859-8458C
richielj40@msn.com
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about its Refined Preferred Alternative for the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1) On this form and left in the comment boxes at the public meeting;
2) Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org or;
3) Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Friday, April 14th at 5:00 pm. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name: [Unknown]
Address: 

SHRUB CUTTING IN NE CORNER REDUCED BUFFER
AND RESULTED IN CLEAR VIEW OF AIRPORT - CAN ANYTHING BE DONE TO REPLACE THE SHRUBS?

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
Public Comment Form
DRAFT Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan
Refined Preferred Alternative

Supplemental Public Information Meeting:
Odyssey Academy, Brooklyn Center, Thursday, March 30, 2017 (5-7pm)

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about its Refined Preferred Alternative for
the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1) On this form and left in the comment boxes at the public meeting;
2) Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org or;
3) Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Friday, April 14th at 5:00 pm. All written comments received will become
part of the project record.

Name:  Dean Schwartz
Address:  5656 Pikoos Avenue North

Good plan, good compromise, good logic.
We like the airport and want it to stay.

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
Public Comment Form
DRAFT Crystal Airport 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan
Refined Preferred Alternative

Supplemental Public Information Meeting:
Odyssey Academy, Brooklyn Center, Thursday, March 30, 2017 (5-7pm)

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is seeking public input about its Refined Preferred Alternative for the Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for the Crystal Airport.

Written comments can be provided:
1) On this form and left in the comment boxes at the public meeting;
2) Via email to the following address: Crystal-Airport-LTCP-Comments@mspmac.org or;
3) Via mail to: Neil Ralston, MAC Airport Development, 6040 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55450.

Written comments will be accepted until Friday, April 14th at 5:00 pm. All written comments received will become part of the project record.

Name: [Signature]

Address: 5300 62 Ave N.

Why does the airport resemble a war zone?

Please use the back side of this form for additional comments.

More information about the plan can be found at: http://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Airports/Crystal.aspx
I am a northwest metro resident and Crystal based pilot.

I wanted to share comments regarding the updated Crystal Airport Draft LTCP.

Over the past several months, it has been apparent that MAC staff has undertaken considerable effort to collect feedback about the LTCP from airport users and the community.

The information contained in the revised LTCP draft demonstrates that the MAC has made an effort to respond to collected feedback and revise the plan to better reflect the best interests of airport users and the surrounding communities.

I believe that all of the changes to the draft LTCP are positive and will improve the airport. The lengthening of the primary runway will increase safety, a RNAV approach to 32 will improve safety as well as utility of the airport, retaining the only turf runway in the metro area will be a nice feature for flight training as well as taildragger operations, and the changes to taxiway configuration to meet FAA standards will also likely increase safety.

The south parallel runway is a benefit to the airport for peak capacity, keeping the airport open during snow removal operations, keeping the airport open during runway maintenance, and traffic pattern safety. This runway would also be of significant future benefit should the average daily operations of the airport increase. I also understand that based on study, the current number of average daily operations can be served without the parallel, and do understand that continuing to maintain the south parallel runway may not be the best use of MAC funds, especially when there are other initiatives at Crystal Airport that likely could be funded.

Thank you for the informational meetings, materials, your willingness to listen and respond to comments as well as to modify the draft LTCP to reflect positive changes for the airport.

Thank you,
- Eli Wolter
I support the refinements to the Kmic plan. Single engine aircraft cost to run and contribution to the economy is about $300.00 to $500.00 per hour of operation. Twin engine is significantly higher.
Training, insurance, taxes, storage, maintenance, overhaul, routine engine and airframe upgrades, avionics and radio maintenance and upgrades all contribute to these hourly operation costs. There are a significant number of conventional aircraft (taildraggers), about 29 based at Kmic. Grass runways afford greater safety for these types of aircraft: antique, WWII, cubs, Supercubs, Stinson, Citabria, T6 Texans, decathlon, husky, aerobatic aircraft. The wider footprint of the grass runway affords greater safety in mitigating crosswind landings by having the option of landing at a slight angle to decrease a 50 degree crosswind, to something less than that, which affords more safety when the wind direction favors neither runway.
GA therefore has a significant impact on the economy.
The mission of the airport should be to continue to support the types of aircraft that are already based there.
Thank you.
Sent from my iPad
Dear MAC,

Thank you for considering the suggestions of the Crystal Airport tenants and pilots. The plan which eliminates runways 14R-32L can be justified from a federal funding position, although it will be an expensive inconvenience for us users. That has been repeatedly discussed and appears to be a closed topic. However the shortening of the grass runway to reduce hotspots is still arguable. There have been no accidents at MIC due to runway incursions. Adding more runways at MSP certainly has increased the mathematical likelihood of a collision but that did not prevent the runways from being built.

At the meeting at MSP in February it appeared that about a half a billion dollars will be spent on many things that mostly consider people comfort and revenue generating. At Crystal Airport the only thing that seems to get reported is what was removed. Lots of money was spent removing the massive Shamrock ramp and the helicopter flight hanger. As of today there is no self service gas, no windsock, and of course no bathroom on the west side. The earth is getting pretty yellow between the hangers.

I see no justifiable reason a few comparable dollars can't be spent on the basic necessities of a metropolitan tower controlled Airport. If you are really serious about keeping MIC viable it needs to be more than just an overflow storage lot in the MAC system. Please do something to promote Crystal Airport to attract some revenue generating tenants.

Sincerely,

Bob Meisch
Tenant and 50 pilot

Sent from my iPad
I am a 20 year tenant of the airport. My partners and I operate tailwheel airplanes and one of the reasons we use KMIC is the sod runway. It is a valuable training ground for tailwheel proficiency and it is much easier on the tundra tires that we use than the asphalt. It is one of the very few remaining grass strips in the metro area and is an asset to the field. Please keep it open.

John Breitinger
john@headwaters-aero.com
(612) 867-2512
Hello-
My name is Keith Ulstad. I am a private pilot based out of Crystal airport (KMIC). I have been based there for 20 years, and have, in that time owned and flown many different aircraft out of that field, including several “tail-draggers”. I currently own a Cessna 180 (tailwheel). I use the sod runway whenever conditions (ground and wind direction) will allow it. It adds a margin of safety and a BIG margin of comfort when the winds are strong, gusty and/or varying in direction. I and many others in the tailwheel fraternity sincerely appreciate the efforts that MAC Planners have made to keep the sod open (albeit shortened). It’s importance as a :

- Safety aid
- Training/transitioning tool
- Fun and (sadly) increasingly unique experience

should not be underestimated. Forest Lake is now paved, Winsted is on the docket to be paved, and soon there will be no grass runways left within reasonable flying distance of the metro area for pilots to learn and hone those skills.

Thanks again for your efforts. I sincerely hope that you are successful in maintaining a grass runway at Crystal Airport.

Keith Ulstad
612.325-8486

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Cambridge, Shelly

From: Jacob Teske <jteske@thunderbirdaviation.com>
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2017 9:12 AM
To: Crystal LTCP
Cc: Wilson, Mike; Ralston, Neil
Subject: [Potential spam] Comments re: Crystal Airport LTCP
Attachments: MIC MAC LTCP Addendum TBA Response.docx

Please find Thunderbird Aviation’s response attached.

Jacob Teske
Operations Manager
Thunderbird Aviation, Inc.
Phone: 763.533.4162 | Fax: 763.971.0116
5800 Crystal Airport Road | Crystal MN 55429
jteske@thunderbirdaviation.com

Email and tell us about your experience at Thunderbird Aviation!
Metropolitan Airports Commission

RE: Crystal Airport Draft 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (Refined Preferred Alternative Addendum March 15, 2017)

Dear Mr. Neil Ralston:

I am writing in response to your latest revision of the Metropolitan Airports Commission’s Crystal Airport Draft 2035 LTCP on behalf of Thunderbird Aviation, Inc.

It is our belief that the extension of runway 14R-32L will accommodate and entice a more diverse group of transient aircraft and more frequent transient operations, while maintaining a suitable and safe environment for our flight training program.

The retention of runway 6R-24L will allow Thunderbird Aviation to continue with its soft-field training in the metro area, making it a valuable asset for our flight school.

We believe it would be beneficial to introduce service roads to your future plans, considerably reducing tower and GSE work load, and runway incursions.

Provided serious consideration is taken into the addition of service roads, the latest addendum to the LTCP adequately takes into account the current and future operations at Thunderbird Aviation and Crystal Airport’s operations as a whole.

For the above reasons, Thunderbird Aviation approves of the current changes proposed in the Refined Preferred Alternative Addendum for Crystal Airport.

Sincerely,

Jake Teske
Operations Manager – Thunderbird Aviation
I am pilot and hanger owner at KMIC. This email is to respond to the updated comments from the Draft 2035 long-term plan for KMIC.

I am strongly voicing my support for the sod runway to remain open in its present condition at KMIC.

With the recent paving of Forest Lake, the metro area is losing sod options that are important for training and maintaining tailwheel proficiency.

Sincerely,
-Drew

Drew Johnson
Oppidan Investment Company
400 Water Street, Suite 200
Excelsior, MN 55331
D: 952-540-4180
C: 612-554-1897
F: 952-294-0151

OPPIDAN
I think that it is very important to keep the sod runway open at the Crystal Airport. It is the only grass asset in the MAC system and is very important for safety with the tail dragger community and for training student pilots. I use it often and the existence was one reason that I chose to purchase a hangar at Crystal.

Respectfully,

—Patrick Fox
I would like to first commend Neil Ralston, Mike Wilson, and their entire team for their very responsive and thorough public coordination in a very open process discussing the Crystal Airport 2035 Long Term Comprehensive Plan.

Overall, the plan is well conceived and I strongly support the shifting and lengthening of runway 32R. I would like to make a few recommendations:

1. I understand a request has been made to the FAA to implement a RNAV (GPS) approach to 32R. This is the #1 most important safety and operational improvement that can be made to Crystal Airport for a number of reasons, and must be considered an immediate priority. These safety improvements include:
   a. It will eliminate the need to circle from current approaches to 14R. Circling is well known to be a high risk maneuver, especially with low ceilings and poor visibility (including at night). This also reduces the risk to the neighbors living near Crystal Airport.
   b. It will eliminate a lot of low altitude maneuvering over the residential neighborhoods surrounding Crystal Airport, enhancing the quality of life for the airport's neighbors.
   c. During the winter of 2016-2017, there were many NOTAMs posted prohibiting circling to runway 32R at night. This made it impossible to arrive after dark when the weather was below or near VFR minimums, aggravated by the early sunsets during the winter.
   d. Crystal Airport supports many instrument training flights. When the winds are out of the north, the lack of a published instrument approach forces local aircraft to fly to other airports.
   e. The implementation of this RNAV (GPS) approach may be made at little or no cost to the MAC.
   f. Circling allows pilots considerable variability in maneuvering, and is a very challenging maneuver. Eliminating the need to circle will provide greater predictability for air traffic control purposes.
   g. This RNAV (GPS) approach is the biggest potential improvement in operational safety at Crystal Airport. Therefore, the MAC should aggressively pursue the implementation of this approach to the lowest possible minimums in the near future.
2. The latest plan shows enlarged runup areas runup areas at the North and South taxiways on the Northeast side of the shifted runway 32(R). This is a good improvement and an important addition that will allow enhanced access to the single runway 32(R). The MAC should ensure that these runway areas are designed so that 2-3 aircraft can simultaneously use these areas, while allowing another aircraft unblocked access to the runway. Consideration should be giving to mirroring these runup areas on the west side of runway 32(R) when the parallel runway has been removed.

I appreciate the opportunity to make these comments and sincerely appreciate the efforts of the MAC to implement these improvements to Crystal Airport.

Sincerely

Chris Glaeser