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Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Crystal Airport
Stakeholder Engagement Plan

1. **Stakeholder engagement objectives**

Stakeholder engagement facilitates and supports public involvement of interested members of the public – providing the opportunity for all stakeholders to participate and be heard. This plan describes coordination and communication efforts intended to inform, educate, and engage the public and airport users as part of the Federal Environmental Assessment (EA)/State Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for Crystal Airport, as well as the approach for documenting the outreach process. The EA will be carried out according to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the EAW will be carried out according to the requirements of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). The two environmental processes will be carried out in parallel and the public engagement will include both processes. For the purposes of this Stakeholder Engagement Plan, the EA/EAW process will be referred to as the “environmental review.”

The focus audience for the strategy will be members of the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) policy board, airport tenants, the general public and community leaders (elected and other) in the vicinity of the Airport, and stakeholders who actively participated in the recent long-term comprehensive plan (LTCP) process. When the term “the MAC” is used in this plan, it means the collective staff and board of commissioners and committee members acting in their respective roles and carrying out their respective responsibilities. When a specific staff or commissioner role is intended, that role is included in the reference.

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan is created to help the MAC achieve all of the following objectives:

- Strengthen the MAC’s relationship with its stakeholders
- Build stakeholder trust and support
- Proactively identify areas of interest and concern in a collaborative setting
- Formalize a system to reach a wide variety of stakeholders and interest groups
- Streamline agencies’ review

In addition to achieving the above objectives, this strategy is designed be mutually beneficial to the community members and other stakeholders. This plan sets a framework for an inclusive process so that interested stakeholders can be informed and engaged throughout the environmental review. It provides clarity on the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the process, communication platforms, and how public comments will be addressed through the environmental process.

By nature, this Stakeholder Engagement Plan is dynamic. The participatory and transparent long-term comprehensive planning process was used to define both the scope of stakeholder engagement as well as the stakeholder groups interested in the project. One of the objectives for the Crystal Airport improvements is to improve airfield safety by reducing the rate and risk for runway incursions. Since the improvements would largely address this pressing safety issue, coupled with the fact that the public
comment process from the long-term comprehensive plan effectively addressed many of the public questions and concerns, this Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been streamlined and is designed to be specific to the Crystal Airport environmental review. Additionally, once the technical work on the environmental review begins, there may be circumstances that require an amendment to the plan in order to better achieve the above objectives. If the plan is amended, stakeholders will be made aware of the change through the project website and a notification through an electronic news (E-news) subscription service (see Section 6 Project Outreach Platforms).

2. **Project roles and responsibilities**

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan is designed to create a shared ownership of the engagement process for the Crystal Airport environmental review. There are several major stakeholder groups described here including the MAC, the FAA, the Airport Community Panel (ACP) and the interested public. The Plan is built on the following roles and responsibilities.

**The MAC:** As the owner and operator of the Crystal Airport, a critical part of the MAC airport system, the MAC has the overall responsibility to conduct the environmental review. As the project sponsor, the MAC must submit the federal Environmental Assessment to the Federal Aviation Administration, which has the final decision-making authority (see below). The MAC takes action on the final state Environmental Assessment Worksheet as the responsible government unit under MEPA. The MAC developed the project scope, and approved this Stakeholder Engagement Plan in consultation with stakeholders and regulatory agencies.

**Mead & Hunt, Inc.:** The MAC contracted with Mead & Hunt, Inc. to provide technical consulting services for the environmental review. In this role, Mead & Hunt provides information and makes recommendations to the MAC. Mead & Hunt together with MAC staff serve as the Project Team in the environmental review.

**Federal Aviation Administration (FAA):** The FAA is the federal regulatory agency responsible for the national system of airports and the national air space. The FAA has well defined roles and responsibilities in the airport federal Environmental Assessment process. The FAA is responsible for publishing the Federal Register notice, handling public comments received from the notice and taking action on the federal environmental document once it is submitted to the FAA. The FAA takes action on the final Environmental Assessment document as the lead agency under NEPA.

**Airport Community Panel (ACP):** The ACP is an advisory board representing major stakeholder groups that is more closely involved in the environmental review than the public at large. The ACP serves several important functions, including: representing a broad range of stakeholder groups; receiving information about the environmental review and sharing it with constituencies; providing input to the environmental review as the voice of key stakeholders; and, in some cases, providing technical advice to the Project Team. Experience has shown that environmental review projects can benefit from the creation and participation of an ACP as part of the environmental review process. See Section 3 for more information on the ACP.
It is important to note that the ACP is advisory only to the environmental review. That is, the ACP may offer opinions, advice and guidance, but ultimately the environmental process will need to conform to federal and state environmental policies and the proposed airport improvements will need to conform to FAA design standards; therefore, the MAC has the sole discretion to act on the ACP recommendations.

Interested Public: Given the complexities of an environmental review and the fact that the MAC airports are public facilities, members of the public who have an interest in the environmental review have a role to play. Members of the general public are encouraged to stay informed of the environmental review progress by visiting the project website, registering for project notifications through the E-news subscription service, participating in public meetings, and submitting comments on the draft environmental review document. See Section 6 for a discussion of communication outreach tools.

Note: public input is one of the factors that the Project Team will consider in airport improvement projects. Conformance to design standards, operational safety and feasibility, federal and state environmental policies, and project cost are also critical factors.

3. ACP membership – key stakeholder groups

In order for the ACP to be effective and to be representative of all of the key stakeholders, it must be composed of a diverse group of stakeholders including, but not limited to, community representatives, aircraft operators, and affected jurisdictions. While representation needs to be broad, the ACP needs to remain a reasonable size so that deliberations are efficient and meetings are effective.

Key stakeholder groups will be represented on the Airport Community Panel (ACP) by the following representatives:

- City of Crystal Representative
- City of Brooklyn Park Representative
- City of Brooklyn Center Representative
- Airport Tenant/User Representative
- Local Citizen Representative
- MAC Commissioner
- MAC staff (2 representatives)
- Hennepin County Representative

The MAC will work with the surrounding communities and tenant groups to identify specific members to serve on the ACP and extend an invitation to participate. The public will be encouraged to use their ACP representative as another means for engaging with the process and representatives will be expected to speak on behalf of their constituents. The first ACP meeting will be held in spring 2018 to provide background information on the environmental process and this Stakeholder Engagement Plan, review the LTCP components, and discuss the Purpose and Need of the airport improvements and the design.
alternatives being considered in the environmental review. See Section 2 for a description of the roles and responsibilities of the ACP.

4. **Approach to development of project messaging**

The Project Team, using plain language, will develop materials and messages that are clear and relevant to lay members of the community. While this approach will strive for brevity and clarity, the information will also be complete – erring on the side of too much information rather than too little. This will be achieved through strategies that include:

- Use of plain language – minimizing the use of acronyms and technical jargon that would likely be unfamiliar to a public audience
- Providing definitions of unfamiliar or technical terms when used in project messages
- Providing explanations related to the requirements of the environmental review at each stage of the process
- Providing explanations of aviation terms and regulations and airport operations that are relevant to project messages (such as Purpose and Need, No-Action Alternative, etc.)
- Using easy-to-understand graphics, tables and charts in addition to narrative descriptions
- Reviewing public comments received in response to public messaging and providing additional explanation or clarification when needed through follow-up outreach
The Project Team may develop suggested messaging text and presentations, and the ACP may be invited to comment on draft material. However, the MAC is the owner of the environmental review process and will make all final decisions related to printed content and graphic material produced for the project.

5. **Timing, notification, and format for engaging stakeholder groups**

In order to create an open and transparent process and to encourage public involvement, the Project Team will follow a standardized process for engaging stakeholder groups for each public and ACP meeting. That process is described here. More information about each public outreach tool is provided in Section 6.

**Project Website:** A project website will be developed and maintained during the environmental review process to share information. The website will be accessed through the current Crystal Airport page of the Metroairports.org website.

**Project Updates:** Regular project updates will be sent out through the E-news subscription service to all project subscribers. Additional notifications will be sent out if information is time sensitive.

**Initial Project Schedule:** An initial project schedule is included at the end of this Stakeholder Engagement Plan based on current expectations and assumptions. A current project timeline will be maintained on the project website and will be updated as needed to reflect project progress. If substantial changes are made, that information will be shared on the project website and included in a project update sent through the E-news subscription service.

**MAC Commission/Committee Meetings:** The Project Team will update the members of the MAC Commission or Planning, Development, and Environment (PD&E) Committee as necessary. The public may attend these meetings and public input will follow the established protocols governing public comments during the meeting. Meeting minutes and video recordings will be made available by the MAC based on the standard practice of the MAC for these meetings.

**ACP Meetings:** Two ACP meetings will be held during the Crystal Airport environmental review process. The first ACP meeting will be held in spring 2018. At the first ACP meeting, the Project Team will introduce the environmental process and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, review the long-term comprehensive plan, discuss the objectives of the airport improvements (“Purpose & Need”), and review design alternatives. Subsequently, the Project Team will schedule a second meeting with the ACP, anticipated in the summer of 2018. At the second ACP meeting, the Project Team will present the results of the environmental effects from the preferred design alternative and the “No-Action” alternative and plans for the public hearing. At least two weeks prior to each ACP meeting, the Project Team will identify specific goals and objectives for the meeting. The dates, times and locations of these meetings will be posted on the project website and the meetings will be open to members of the general public who may attend as observers. If a change is made to the ACP meeting date, a notification will be sent through the E-news subscription service to all project subscribers. Presentation materials including PowerPoint slides, graphic boards, and handouts will be posted to the project website no later than 3 days following the meeting. Mead & Hunt will be responsible for developing draft meeting minutes for the MAC. The ACP meeting minutes will be posted to the project website within 14 days.
Public Meeting Events: The environmental review process will include one public meeting and one public hearing.

The public meeting will provide an opportunity to introduce the environmental review requirements and process, share the objectives of the airport improvements ("Purpose & Need"), review the project design alternatives, present the results from the environmental effects evaluation for the preferred alternative and the "No-Action" alternative, and outline next steps for the public to submit comments during the subsequent public comment period.

A public hearing will be held during the public comment period to provide the general public with an opportunity to comment on the draft environmental review document. Comments recorded during the public comment period (including at the public hearing) will be responded to in the environmental review document. General responses may be developed and included in the document to address questions and comments that are consistent among comments received.

A date, time and location will be determined for these two public meetings at least 21 days before each event. As soon as a date, time and location are determined, the information will be shared in several ways:

- Posted on the project website
- Sent out through the E-news subscription service to all project subscribers
- Emailed to ACP members and members of the MAC Commission
- Publishing a notice in the Sun Post, Robbinsdale/Crystal/New Hope edition

6. Project outreach platforms

The Project Team will communicate through the following platforms:

Special presentations for elected officials/city staff: Special presentations for elected officials and city staff may be made on request.

Project Newsletter: An initial project newsletter will be developed and printed in advance of the first public meeting. The newsletter will include information about the event such as date, time and location as well as messages and content associated with the event and supporting graphics and photographs. The newsletter will also provide information about subscribing to the E-news subscription service and about the project website.

The newsletter will be mailed directly to homes and businesses near the airport in Crystal, Brooklyn Center, and Brooklyn Park. At the same time, printed copies of the newsletter will be available at public locations and will be posted on the project website.
The newsletter will contain four (4) pages and ½ page will be reserved for mailing space. Printed newsletters will be produced on an 11 x 17” sheet size, folded in half.

**Project Website:**
A project website will be maintained during the environmental review process to share information. The website will be accessed through the current Crystal Airport page of the [Metroairports.org](http://Metroairports.org) website.

At a minimum, the website will include:

- Public meeting information
- Public project documents (reports, newsletters, presentations, fact sheets, etc.)
- Frequently asked questions
- Information on how to provide public comment
- Information on how to sign up for the E-news subscription service notifications (see below)
- The project timeline

**E-news subscription service:** A project account will be made available for the Crystal Airport environmental review project using the E-news subscription service. Stakeholders and members of the public will be informed of the opportunity to subscribe. Also, email addresses will be collected at the first public meeting and added to the E-news subscription service account if permission is granted on the sign-in sheet (check box to be added). Project updates will be sent out through the E-news subscription service to all project subscribers. Additional notifications will be sent out if information is time sensitive.

**Public Notices:** Public notices will be developed in advance of the two public events by the Project Team and will be distributed by the MAC to media outlets in and around the project area. Notifications will include information about public event logistics as well as the environmental review project messages.

7. **Communication platforms – public input**

Throughout the environmental review process, the Project Team will gather input through a variety of specific input streams:

- Public comment via the project website
- Written public comment submitted at the public events or mailed to an address posted on the project website
- At the public events

While many opportunities will be provided for public input, the Project Team may not respond directly to individual comments. Rather, comments will be addressed in one or more of the following ways:

- Comments may be addressed as part of the FAQs offered on the project website.
• Comments may be answered verbally as part of a question and answer session.
• Comments received during the public comment period will be reported in the draft final environmental review document with a written response.

This policy supports the desired outcome of a transparent process by making the same information available to all members of the public, by presenting information that is consistent through the project and by creating a process to consistently document all comments and responses (see Section 8).

8. Approach to documenting and incorporating public feedback

Documenting: Mead & Hunt will collect, organize and save public comments received during the Crystal Airport environmental review project and will also collect, organize and save responses provided by the MAC if applicable (see Section 7). A master spreadsheet will be developed to track input. The spreadsheet will note the submitter name, date received, and method of input (i.e., written letter, website comment, public meeting, response to comment, etc.) as well as information such as address, zip code or email address that may be provided with the comment.

Incorporating Public Feedback: Public comment is a valuable part of an environmental review and each comment will be thoughtfully considered. During the course of the Crystal Airport environmental review, public comment will be considered and incorporated as follows:

In some cases, concerns and objections expressed through the public comment process indicate a lack of understanding or a misunderstanding on a specific topic. In this instance, the Project Team will refine the FAQs on the project website, include more information at the public meeting and/or include the topic as an agenda item at an ACP meeting in order to get more information out to the public.

In some cases, public comments express support or opposition to the project and may include reasons for the opinions. These opinions are welcome, and they may provide valuable insight for the environmental review in terms of both project benefits and areas where concerns may need to be mitigated.

In other cases, public comments may raise a new issue or provide information that needs to be considered in the environmental review process. These comments will be vetted by the Project Team and included in the environmental review process as appropriate.

Comments received during the public comment period will be responded to in writing in the final environmental review document, except that similar comments on a common theme may be grouped together and addressed with one collective response.

Input received from stakeholders is one of the factors that decisions makers will be considering in the Crystal Airport environmental review process. Conformance to design standards, operational safety and feasibility, federal and state environmental policies, and project cost are also critical factors to consider.
Project Timeline

Project Elements

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

Meetings & Workshops

- Public Event
- Airport Community Panel (ACP) Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Kick-Off</td>
<td>KO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose &amp; Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Federal EA/State EAW Review - FAA &amp; MAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Federal EA/State EAW Public &amp; Agency Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Comments &amp; Prepare Final Federal EA/State EAW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Review
Crystal Airport

Note: Schedule updated January 8, 2018. Subject to change. Assessment of environmental effects dependent on suitable weather for field work.
The Metropolitan Airports Commission, owner and operator of Crystal Airport (located just north of Bass Lake Road off Bottineau Boulevard in the City of Crystal) has commenced a study to determine environmental effects associated with improvements it is proposing for the airport. The MAC adopted the improvement plans in 2017 after concluding a long-term planning process that resulted in a Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for Crystal Airport. The LTCP was developed with input from stakeholders and the public and provides guidance and a roadmap for possible improvements over the next 20 years.

The environmental effects study (also referred to as an environmental assessment – or EA) is being led by the MAC and its consultants Mead & Hunt. Together they make up the “project team.” Over the past several months, the team has developed a statement outlining the purpose and need for the improvements, and identified a preferred plan – also known as a preferred alternative (more on the purpose and need and alternatives inside this newsletter). The project team is also researching and collecting information regarding environmental and socioeconomic resources that may be affected by the project. That research includes in-person surveys of wetlands, identification of any historical structures near or on the property that could be affected, and other resources that may be affected by the preferred alternative.

The Environmental Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is used by the federal government to determine whether proposed projects—in this case the Crystal Airport improvements—will have significant environmental effects. In order to qualify for federal funding, the Crystal Airport improvements plan must undergo a NEPA review.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

COMMUNITY EVENT

Tuesday, October 30, 2018
6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
(Presentation at 6:30)

Crystal Community Center
4800 Douglas Drive N
Crystal, MN 55429

www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Crystal-Airport-Environmental-Assessment/Overview.aspx
The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the lead federal agency for this environmental review, has determined that an environmental assessment (EA) is what’s needed to make a determination. The state of Minnesota also requires an environmental review, under the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MPEA) and related Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB) guidelines. Therefore the MAC must complete an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) process for the Crystal Airport improvements. Specifically, an EAW is required because the preferred alternative plan includes a runway/taxiway extension and the expenditure of more than $2,000,000. Because both processes are required, the MAC will complete the state EAW requirements simultaneously with the Federal EA, with the combined report referred to as an EA/EAW.

Noise and Compatible Land Use
Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety
Visual Effects (including light emissions)
Water Resources (including wetlands, floodplains, surface waters, groundwater, and wild and scenic rivers)

The Purposes of the proposed improvements at Crystal Airport:
- Develop Land for Non-Aeronautical Use
- Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety
- Visual Effects (including light emissions)
- Water Resources (including wetlands, floodplains, surface waters, groundwater, and wild and scenic rivers)

The Needs for the proposed improvements at Crystal Airport:
- Simplify airfield geometry
- Provide adequate runway length for aircraft using the Airport
- Enhance aircraft approaches and minimize obstacles for the main runway
- Improve Airport ground vehicle circulation
- Increase aircraft apron parking capacity
- Develop excess Airport property for non-aeronautical use

The Preferred Alternative
A federal EA typically evaluates more than one alternative, while a state EAW does not require analysis of alternatives. Because much of the proposed project was evaluated and refined in the most recent LTCP efforts, this EA/EAW will explain the previous alternatives that were examined and how the preferred alternative was reached. The impacts of the preferred alternative will be compared to the no-action alternative, which represents what would occur if the MAC were to make no changes to the existing airport layout. A no-action alternative does not mean that there would be no impacts, because existing infrastructure would need repairs and aircraft would still operate at the airport. The preferred alternative includes the following improvements:
- Decommission Runway 06R/24L & convert to parallel taxiway
- Convert portions of Runway 14L/34R blast pads to usable runway
- Reduce length of Runway 06R/24L (turf) to clear Taxways D & F from the runway safety area
- Establish a straight-in GPS instrument approach to Runway 32R
- Remove various taxiways and construct new taxiways
- Expand fixed base operator (FBO) airport parking apron
- Develop airport land for non-aeronautical use along 63rd Avenue North

Why are the Airport Improvements Necessary?
Purpose and Need statements are included in every federal EA. These statements clearly and concisely explain the justification for the project and therefore become the foundation of the document.

Airport Community Panel
Environmental review projects benefit from the participation of a range of stakeholders such as officials representing local communities and counties, users of the airport, and members of the community. The Metropolitan Airports Commission has established an Airport Community Panel (ACP) to serve in an advisory role. ACP members serve several functions, including sharing information about the environmental process with their communities; providing input as the voice of key stakeholders; and, in some cases, providing technical advice to the project team. The first ACP meeting occurred on August 28 with one more to follow prior to publication of the draft EA/EAW.

Anticipated EA Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAC Adopted Crystal Airport LTCP</td>
<td>OCTOBER 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Process Begins</td>
<td>JANUARY 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Impacts and Alternatives (Spring-Fall 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EA/EAW Legal Review</td>
<td>WINTER 2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EA/EAW Public Comments</td>
<td>SPRING 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Comments Prepare Final EA/EAW</td>
<td>SPRING 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final EA to FAA Determination</td>
<td>SUMMER 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more detail, see the Stakeholder Engagement Plan on the project website. Schedule is subject to change. Any significant schedule updates will be published on the project website and distributed to e-news subscribers, as appropriate.
Stay Involved

The best way to keep current on what’s happening with the project is to sign up to receive updates via our e-news subscription list. Go to the project website, www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Crystal-Airport-Environmental-Assessment/Overview.aspx, to sign up. Regular updates will be sent to this email list, including up-to-date information such as public event details, public project documents (reports, newsletters, presentations, etc.), answers to frequently asked questions, and information about how to provide public comment on the project website.

You can also share your questions and comments throughout the process. Look for the Contact Project Team section of the website, where you’ll find instructions for submitting questions and comments.

Please Plan to Attend the First Community Event!

Tuesday, October 30, 2018
6:00 to 8:00 p.m. (Presentation at 6:30)
Crystal Community Center
4800 Douglas Drive N
Crystal, MN 55429

We want your input! The purpose of this first public meeting is to provide information and to give community members an opportunity to ask questions about the Crystal Airport EA/EAW process. Here you will learn more about: Why the proposed improvements are necessary, what specific improvements are being considered (preferred alternative) and the next steps for public comment.

The event begins at 6:00 p.m. with a formal presentation at 6:30 p.m. Community members will have an opportunity to ask questions as part of the question and answer period, or by speaking with individual team members.
The attached report represents this writer's interpretation of items discussed during the meeting. Any corrections or additional information should be brought to our attention for clarification.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Introduce the role and goals of the Airport Community Panel.
- Provide background on the MAC, previous Crystal Airport planning efforts, and an overview of the environmental assessment process.
Meeting Minutes

- Introduce the Purpose & Need and Alternatives portions of the environmental process, and answer questions from the ACP on the material presented.
- Outline future public engagement opportunities.

Items discussed and Q&A were as follows:

Dana Nelson began by going over introductions and the purpose of the meeting and the panel. Some of these materials were sent to the panel in advance. The panel was assembled to promote stakeholder engagement during the environmental review process and includes people with diverse backgrounds and expertise who represent a broad range of stakeholders. Panel members may provide technical advice and best practices for outreach to their constituents and the broader public.

Dana went over a slide with guidelines for the panel, including its advisory role. ACP meetings will include fairly technical information, and public meetings will be held where information will be more accessible to a broader audience. Meeting minutes will be shared after each meeting, so that any panel members can be kept up to date if they are unable to attend. Dana asked whether there were questions or concerns on the listed guidelines—there were none.

Dana discussed the orientation packet materials, including a handout about what the ACP is, a write-up of various key stakeholders and their roles, and a flow chart graphic depicting stakeholders and authorities involved in airport regulation, maintenance, operations, planning, funding, and review. The chart shows that there are many people and entities involved in airport functions. The packet also included a list of FAQs and a glossary of terms that cover technical terms and acronyms.

Dana gave an overview of the stakeholder engagement plan and its objectives to strengthen relationships, build trust, and identify potential concerns so that resources can be allocated to address or respond to the concerns effectively throughout the process. Tools for this process include a project website that hosts FAQs, project and contact information, and the eventual draft EA/EAW document for public comment. Project updates will be sent out via e-news updates to people who sign up to receive them. In addition, area homes will receive a newsletter prior to the first public meeting. There will also be a public meeting and public hearing to record testimony on the draft EA/EAW document. The stakeholder engagement plan is meant to be flexible, and if the ACP feels more meetings are necessary, more can potentially be added.

Cindy Sherman asked if the locations for the public meetings have been set. Dana responded that locations have not yet been determined and they will be near, but not at, the Airport.

Councilwoman Julie Deshler asked if a similar process was completed recently, as it seems familiar. Dana responded that a stakeholder engagement process was conducted for the recently updated long-term comprehensive plan (LTCP). The current environmental review process is a first step in implementing the plan, while the previous process was for the planning effort.

Dana presented a slide with background information about the MAC, its formation, its status as a public entity, its leadership structure, and its legislative mandate. The legislative mandate is important because it states that the MAC should develop and promote safe and efficient aviation in the metro area, and also promote the overall goals of state environmental policies. This is partially why the environmental processes are taken so seriously by the MAC.

Warren Batzlaff noted that it is important to have the airports in the reliever role, to separate smaller, slower planes from the larger, faster jets that use MSP for safety reasons.

Evan Barrett presented slides describing the previous LTCP process. The LTCP was published in 2016 and approved in 2017 after multiple public meetings. A refined alternative was developed based upon public
Meeting Minutes

and user comments. The LTCP recommendations didn’t propose changing the role of the Airport or the aircraft that use the facilities. LTCP goals were to right-size the Airport facilities for current users, to improve operational capabilities, and to enhance safety. The existing four runways at Crystal are more than is needed for existing and projected operations. The environmental document will draw from the goals and recommendations in the LTCP.

Evan outlined the LTCP recommendations, accompanied by slides. These included closing the parallel runway and converting it to a taxiway, reducing the length of the turf runway, and simplifying the taxiways to reduce incursions at the Airport. Evan defined incursions as when there is something or someone on the runway that shouldn’t be, and noted that there have been several of these incidents at Crystal. The project is aiming to simplify the taxiways to reduce the likelihood of this occurring. The project also includes adding perimeter roads to improve ground circulation so that vehicles can go around runway ends. Neil Ralston pointed out that the perimeter roads were not included in the LTCP, but were suggested through comments on the refined LTCP, and then included in the proposed project and the alternatives for the environmental document.

Evan covered other project elements, including the conversion of blast pads to lengthen the primary runway, which will also center the runway on Airport property. Warren Batzlaff noted that this increases safety for airplanes that currently use the Airport in scenarios involving high humidity, high temperatures, and maximum takeoff weight.

An instrument approach will be added to allow straight-in approaches on both ends of the primary runway. In addition, the project will increase aircraft parking, as there is not much available for transient aircraft today. Neil pointed out that the apron and parking expansion is being evaluated in the environmental review, but will not be funded by MAC. The FBO will build the additional apron to serve their business. The last piece of the project is to develop some Airport property along 63rd Avenue North for non-aeronautical use.

Evan outlined the environmental process. Two agencies are the primary drivers of the environmental review. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead federal agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and will need to make a finding about whether the project has significant environmental impacts. The MAC is the responsible government unit under the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA), which has a separate but similar set of rules. The document will be a joint federal/state document that meets both sets of requirements.

Evan presented the project timeline and noted that the first ACP meeting is being held about half way through the process to keep the stakeholder engagement events closer together. This ACP meeting will provide a sense of what might come up at future community meetings and give the panel members time to reach out to their constituents regarding the public event.

Evan noted that the review document will have three pieces, the purpose and need (which is why the project is occurring), the alternatives (how the project will be accomplished), and the environmental effects. This meeting will focus on purpose and need and alternatives, and the next meeting will have more information about the environmental impacts. This meeting and the public meetings will help to ensure that no potential environmental effects are overlooked.

Commissioner Katie Clark-Sieben asked if the dates for the public meeting are known yet. Evan responded that dates are not yet set and the date for the first public meeting will be determined in the next few weeks. Dana suggested that panel members contact her if there are dates that don’t work for them.
Evan explained that when the draft is complete, the FAA will complete a legal review, and some adjustments will be made to the document. The next ACP meeting will be held at around this time. There will then be a 45-day public comment period on the draft document and a public hearing, after which the EA/EAW will be refined, finalized, and re-published.

Evan presented information about the purpose and need, including FAA guidance regarding this important statement. The goals of the LTCP are distilled into simple statements that are easily communicated. The purpose includes the overarching project goals that came from the LTCP, and the need involves the specific problems to be solved by the project. Evan spoke about the six objectives of the project individually.

**Simplify airport geometry:** Evan explained the concept of hot spots, and that hot spots at Crystal Airport result from two sets of closely spaced parallel runways. Each hot spot is at a location where a pilot must decide whether to cross a runway. Warren Batzlaff noted that current FAA standards would place the runways twice as far from each other as they are right now. Evan agreed and noted that close spacing of runways and the number of runway crossings contribute to runway incursion issues. Neil noted that there is no option other than to address this issue, and that the FAA has been very active in addressing runway incursions nationwide. The project will reduce the number of hot spots, which the FAA strongly encourages.

**Meet runway needs for existing users:** Evan reviewed the group of design aircraft for Crystal Airport. He noted that the primary runway, 14L/32R, should be designed to meet the needs of the more demanding aircraft using the Airport. A slide with a chart depicting useful loads and associated runway lengths was presented. Evan explained that weather conditions can also affect the needed runway length beyond what is depicted on the chart. The intent is to accommodate more of the existing Airport users in more scenarios.

Cindy Sherman asked about what the chart represented—the dashed red line is the current length of the runway, and it appears to not accommodate several of the aircraft depicted on the chart. Does that mean that these are not currently operating at the facility, or that they do and operate marginally? Warren Batzlaff explained that it depends upon circumstances. If the weather is hot and humid, or the aircraft are at gross weight, they couldn’t operate on the existing runway length. However if there’s a headwind, it is cold and the pavement is dry, the aircraft would have enough room to operate. It depends upon the weather and the capability of the aircraft. Evan noted that there is more activity at the Airport in the summer, so at peak times aircraft tend to be more limited. A pilot could reduce the amount of fuel, passengers, or cargo to below 75% weight, but it may not be effective to fly at all if the capacity is reduced too much. Neil pointed out that the listed aircraft types are all currently at the Airport, and that the plan is not attempting to attract other types of aircraft. With a longer runway, the Airport could allow aircraft that are already there to fly more often or operate more efficiently—meaning that they could carry enough fuel to get to their destination without stopping to refuel.

Evan discussed the turf runway, and how the shortened length was determined to meet user needs. This will remove crossing taxiways out of the runway safety area, eliminating hot spots. Councilwoman Deshler asked whether the turf runway would be removed completely. She noted that at the last meeting she attended it was very important to commenters to keep the turf runway. Evan responded that the turf runway will be maintained but at a shorter length. Evan noted that it is the only turf runway in the Twin Cities metro area, which can be important from a training perspective.

**Instrument approach for Runway 14L:** Evan explained that the project will establish a straight in approach to both ends of the primary runway; there is currently only one. With GPS advancements this is becoming more cost effective, as you don’t need to install expensive ground-based instruments.
an environmental perspective, the instrument approach means looking at obstructions that may need to be removed.

Evan touched briefly on the last three objectives: improving ground circulation, increasing aircraft parking capacity, and developing Airport property for non-aeronautical uses. Cindy Sherman asked about the non-aeronautical land use development in Brooklyn Park and whether the MAC would lease the land, sell the land, or develop the non-aeronautical project itself. Gary Schmidt explained that the MAC would typically lease the property for someone else to develop. Cindy surmised that this would be a long term 99-year lease, or something similar, and asked whether these areas are shown in the LTCP. Evan noted that there are several areas designated for non-aeronautical use by the LTCP, but only one area will be assessed by this environmental review for this purpose due to its location and existing surrounding land uses. Neil agreed and reiterated that the other parcels are marked for non-aeronautical uses, but their development will occur farther in the future. The area along 63rd Avenue is most ripe for near-term development. Dan Olson asked whether a similar environmental review process will be undertaken when the other parcels are developed. Evan explained that there is no state requirement, but there would be a federal approval required. It would likely be a smaller review effort, depending upon what is proposed. Neil agreed that it wouldn’t be the full EA process for a future non-aeronautical development proposal, and that the FAA land-release process includes a streamlined environmental review. Commissioner Clark-Sieben noted, as background, that the MAC Commission discussed this topic during a recent strategic planning process and found that land releases are often a response to a developer approaching them with a project. The MAC intends to think more strategically about developing their property for such uses rather than responding to offers. There are no specific projects planned for this land, but it is part of a broader vision to think more strategically about appropriate uses. Cindy Sherman explained that Brooklyn Park will need to consider this because their draft comprehensive plan shows airport use only, and they will need to plan for non-aeronautical uses. Gary Schmidt noted that the area shown is already separated from the airside. He also noted that the MAC tries to work with communities so that proposed development won’t violate their zoning or interfere with how development is planned within the community.

Warren Batzlaff noted that the runway planned for decommissioning is at the end of its useful life and would need to be replaced anyway, which would not be eligible for federal dollars. By rolling the projects together, there will be funding partnership with the FAA.

Evan next explained alternatives analysis and how each alternative was identified. The FAA guidance does not require a specific number or range of alternatives. The alternatives analysis draws heavily from previous planning work and is meant to thoroughly explain how the preferred alternatives were identified and why other alternatives were ruled out. Evan explained the no-action alternative, and how it provides a baseline for assessing environmental impacts. The no-action alternative does not mean no impacts, as it still involves repairs to existing facilities and continued aircraft operations at the Airport. This alternative will be carried through the environmental review for comparison purposes. The document will also analyze off-site alternatives, such as relocating the Airport, or using a different MAC airport in lieu of improving Crystal Airport. These alternatives were eliminated early on, as they are not reasonable and do not meet the project purpose and need.

Evan explained the environmental resource categories, as shown on a slide, and noted that the ones listed on the slide were the ones that will be examined most carefully considering the location and conditions of the Airport. The FAA establishes significance thresholds for each category. If a threshold is exceeded, then an environmental impact statement would be necessary. Not all impacts are considered significant by FAA guidance. The EA will document the impact in each category and compare it to the significance threshold. The MAC does not anticipate that any impacts would exceed those thresholds.
Categories began with air quality and aircraft noise. Evan then explained the DOT Section 4(f) category regarding the use of any public park resources. There are a number of parks on and around the Airport, including MAC Park, the recreational trail on the west side, and parks along the sides of the Airport. One park, Edgewood Park in Brooklyn Park, is in the approach for Runway 14L. Some trees will need to be removed or trimmed in the park. More detailed survey work will be conducted in the park in the fall to determine which trees will be affected, and conversations have begun with the City of Brooklyn Park concerning how to reach a positive outcome. Cindy Sherman expressed agreement with this. Evan noted that the FAA will be involved in this process because they need to issue a specific determination on the significance on impacts to the park. Melissa Scovronski asked if tree removal was associated with the project or if it would need to be conducted regardless. Neil explained that the majority of the removals are trees that would become problematic under the no-action alternative as they grow, but the timing of removal is affected by the runway shift by a couple of years. Ultimately there would need to be some action on most or all of the trees that will be discussed in the coming months. Commissioner Clark-Sieben suggested exploring giving trees to the city for replanting. Neil noted that this has been discussed regarding Edgewood Park, and that the MAC also provides homeowners with the fair market value of the trees when they are on private property, as they did with previous tree removals around Crystal Airport. Evan explained that the goal is to identify trees that need to be removed or trimmed by the next time the group meets. Cindy Sherman pointed out that the discussions so far had been very selective regarding trees, and hadn’t suggested any clear cutting, which would be more concerning. Dan Olson asked if any trees would be taken from MAC Park. Evan responded that they would not. There would be a few dozen additional targeted trees on private property, but no others on park property. Councilwoman Deshler noted that residents she’s spoken with that have had trees removed by the MAC have seemed pleased with the process and the compensation.

Warren Batzlaff asked if the non-aeronautical use area was taxable to the city it is in, or if it is no tax because it is on the Airport. Gary Schmidt explained that it would pay a personal property tax on improvements to the taxing district, in this case, Brooklyn Park. The Airport will receive rent for use of the land.

Evan described the rest of the resource categories including hazardous materials, and an overview of a recently completed historical and archeological resources study. Evan explained land use compatibility and that the existing airport zoning ordinance will need to be updated. He noted that the environmental justice category is being examined because there are low income and minority populations close to the Airport.

Evan explained that a wetland delineation report has been completed, and that the findings will need to be submitted to the local government unit designated by the Wetland Conservation Act. He asked if the City of Crystal was the reviewer for projects within the city limits. Dan Olson said that they haven’t done a lot of wetland review, and that it may be useful to get in touch with the city engineer, who may refer to the local watershed district.

There are several other NEPA and MEPA categories, but those Evan discussed specifically are the primary issues for this project. The final analysis will also identify cumulative effects when considering other past, present, and future projects in the area.

Evan noted that the next steps include sending a newsletter to residents near the Airport. Dana said that the MAC has previously reached out to those within two miles of the Airport and asked the panel for feedback on whether this radius is suitable. She noted that there are minority areas around the Airport and asked if there are any languages that the cities typically use for engagement that may be relevant to these areas. Evan explained that the newsletter will provide an overview of the project and notify the public of the upcoming event.
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Commissioner Clark-Sieben asked how the panel makes a decision about what their recommendations will be without taking a vote. Dana explained that the important piece is understanding what the concerns are and considering differing opinions throughout the process, ensuring that the team takes the viewpoints into consideration, and then communicating the justification for decisions around those viewpoints to the FAA.

John Grosen clarified that the environmental document was not a go/no-go for the implementation of the project. Evan confirmed this and said that after environmental approval the MAC will take steps towards design and implementation. Some preliminary design will be done in order to determine impacts.

Warran Batzlaff asked whether the existing ponds or retention basins that ice over will change. Evan pointed out that one basin will be filled in for a proposed taxiway, and its function will need to be replaced because the project can not result in a net runoff increase. Warren noted that these areas are a concern for wildlife such as geese in an air traffic control blind spot, and due to slippery areas if aircraft happen to leave a runway, especially at the ten o’clock position off the 32 runway. If a plane goes off the runway, it goes into a large ditch rather than level ground. It may be useful to extend the culvert out to change the ditch. Evan noted that this is not currently planned but could be considered. Neil said this could be looked at in the preliminary design phase, and it seems like this could be improved.

Dan Olson asked if the cities should publicize the public meetings through social media and other means. Evan responded that the MAC appreciates and encourages any outreach assistance the cities can provide.

Gary Schmidt asked who approves the study. Evan explained that the FAA makes the federal finding, and the MAC makes the determination for the state EAW.

John Grosen asked if the assessment is an approval document, or just a step for approval of the implementation of the project. Evan said that the environmental process is not typically undertaken without intent to implement the project. Neil agreed that the MAC is invested in the environmental process with the intent of moving the project forward, and the FAA is supporting the project in order to reduce the runway incursion potential.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.
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Introductions
Airport Community Panel (ACP) Purpose

Work directly with the Project Team

• Representing a broad range of stakeholder groups;

• Receiving and then sharing information with constituencies about the environmental review process;

• Providing input as the voice of key stakeholders;

• Providing technical advice to the Project Team
ACP Guidelines

• Acknowledge and respect the opinions and interests of all ACP members at all times
• No formal meeting or voting procedures will be established
• ACP is advisory; MAC retains decision-making authority
• ACP members are encouraged to disseminate project information to their constituent groups and the general public
• ACP members are discouraged from misrepresenting meeting proceedings to their constituent groups, the general public, or the media
• Observers may attend ACP meetings but are asked to refrain from interrupting the meeting
• Future meetings will be scheduled at least one month in advance and every effort will be made to identify dates and times that work for all ACP members
• MAC’s consultant will take meeting notes and attendance logs for the public record, which will be made available on the project website
ACP Orientation Materials

- ACP Overview
- MAC Glossary of Terms
- MAC Stakeholders
Stakeholder Engagement Plan Objectives

• Strengthen relationships with stakeholders
• Build stakeholder trust and support
• Proactively identify areas of interest and concern
• Support and document a thorough and effective process
• Formalize a system for reaching a wide variety of stakeholders
• Create opportunities for MAC board members to recognize stakeholder engagement in the EA/EAW process
• Streamline agencies’ review
Public Outreach Platforms

• Project website
  • Overview
  • Community Involvement
  • Documents and Links
  • FAQs
  • Contact Project Team
• E-news subscription project updates
• Project newsletter mailed to homes near the airport
• ACP meetings (2)
• Public meeting events (2)
• Public notices
• MAC Commission/Committee meetings
Messaging Strategies

• Use of plain language
• Provide a glossary of terms
• Explain requirements of the environmental review at each stage of the process
• Use infographics, tables and charts
• Review public comments and identify community focal points for targeted, clear, and accurate messaging
• Detail the next steps of the environmental process
Metropolitan Airport Commission

- Public corporation created by Minnesota Legislature
- Owns and operates airports within 35 miles of downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis
- MSP International Airport
- Six general aviation airports
- User-fee based funding
- Limited property taxing authority unused since 1960s
Board Makeup

- Gov. appoints chairman and 12 commissioners (8 metro, 4 outstate)
- Minneapolis and St. Paul mayors each appoint one
Legislative Mandate to Effectively Enable Aviation

(1) promote the public welfare and national security; 
serve public interest, convenience, and necessity; 

promote air navigation and transportation, international, national, 
state, and local, in and through this state; 

promote the efficient, safe, and economical handling of air commerce; 

assure the inclusion of this state in national and international 
programs of air transportation; 

and to those ends to develop the full potentialities of the metropolitan 
area in this state as an aviation center, and to correlate that area with 
all aviation facilities in the entire state so as to provide for the most 
economical and effective use of aeronautic facilities and services in 
that area;

Minn. Stat. § 473.602
Legislative Mandate to Effectively Enable Aviation

Minn. Stat. § 473.602

(2) assure the residents of the metropolitan area of the minimum environmental impact from air navigation and transportation, and to that end provide for noise abatement, control of airport area land use, and other protective measures; and

(3) promote the overall goals of the state's environmental policies and minimize the public's exposure to noise and safety hazards around airports.
Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP)
Planning & Development Process Steps 1 through 11

Initial request to publish Draft LTCP in August 2016
Public/Stakeholder Engagement
MAC adoption of the Final LTCP in October 2017
Crystal Airport Role & Plan Objectives

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

• Primary Planning Objectives
  – Better align airfield infrastructure to match existing and forecasted activity levels
  – Preserve and improve operational capabilities for the design aircraft family
  – Enhance safety by simplifying the runway and taxiway layout
The Proposed Project

Addressing the Objectives

• Align infrastructure with demand and simplify airfield geometry:
  • Close Runway 14R/32L and convert it to a parallel taxiway
  • Reduce turf runway length to remove crossing taxiways from its safety area
  • Remove, convert, and/or replace various taxiways and run-up areas
  • Improve ground vehicle circulation on the Airport by constructing perimeter roads
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- Improve operational capabilities for the design aircraft family:
  - Convert portions of Runway 14L/32R blast pads to usable runway
  - Shift the runway 115 feet to the northwest
  - Enhance instrument approach capability for the primary runway
  - Increase aircraft parking capacity by expanding the Fixed Base Operator apron
The Proposed Project

Addressing the Objectives

• Align infrastructure with demand and simplify airfield geometry:
  • Close Runway 14R/32L and convert it to a parallel taxiway
  • Reduce turf runway length to remove crossing taxiways from its safety area
  • Remove, convert, and/or replace various taxiways and run-up areas
  • Improve ground vehicle circulation on the Airport by constructing perimeter roads

• Improve operational capabilities for the design aircraft family:
  • Convert portions of Runway 14L/32R blast pads to usable runway
  • Shift the runway 115 feet to the northwest
  • Enhance instrument approach capability for the primary runway
  • Increase aircraft parking capacity by expanding the Fixed Base Operator apron

• Develop excess Airport property for non-aeronautical use
Environmental Process Overview

• **Federal** requirements identified by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and associated Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) implementation guidance

• **State** requirements identified by the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and associated Environmental Quality Board (EQB) implementation guidance
Project Schedule

Project Elements

- Purpose & Need
- Alternatives Analysis
- Environmental Effects
- Draft EA/EAW - FAA Legal Review
- Draft EA/EAW - Public Comment Period
- Respond to Comments & Prepare Final EA/EAW

Stakeholder Outreach Meetings
- Public Event
- Airport Community Panel (ACP) Workshop

Develop Draft Document | Public Comment Period | Revisions to Address Comments | A | Airport Community Panel (ACP) Workshop | P | Public Event | PH | Public Hearing

Environmental Review
Crystal Airport

Schedule updated August 3, 2018. This schedule is based on timely agency reviews and assumes no unforeseen issues.
Purpose and Need
FAA Guidance

• Explains why a project is being proposed.
• A defensible Purpose and Need statement should be:
  • Clearly written
  • Concise (incorporating any detailed supporting data by reference)
  • Understandable to those unfamiliar with aviation
• The **Purpose** is a general statement of over-arching project goals.
• The **Need** is a more detailed statement describing:
  • Problems to be solved by the project, and
  • Specific objectives for resolving these problems and achieving the project goals.
Purpose and Need

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

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

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

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

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

1) Simplify airfield geometry;
2) Provide the required runway length for critical design aircraft needs;
3) Enhance instrument approach capability and mitigate penetrations for both ends of the primary runway;
4) Improve airport ground vehicle circulation;
5) Increase aircraft apron parking capacity; and
6) Develop excess Airport property for non-aeronautical use.
P&N Objective 1: Simplify Airfield Geometry

- Eight hot-spots identified on FAA Airport Diagram
  - Hot-spots are locations where heightened attention is necessary due to complex or confusing configuration.
  - Most hot-spots result from closely-spaced parallel runways.
- Project seeks to minimize runway crossings
P&N Objective 2: Meet Runway Length Needs for Existing Users

- Optimum runway lengths are based on the needs of the “design aircraft” for each runway.

- Current Runway 14L/32R length (3,268 feet) does not meet accelerate stop distance requirements of design aircraft (see chart at left).

- Current Runway 6R/24L length (2,123 feet) exceeds takeoff and landing distance requirements of design aircraft at maximum takeoff weight.
P&N Objective 3: Enhance Instrument Approach Capability

- Instrument approach procedures allow safer access to the airport, especially during inclement weather.
- Upgrading the runway approaches to modern navigational technology will improve airport safety and accessibility.
P&N Objectives 4, 5, & 6

- Objective 4: Improve airport ground vehicle circulation
- Objective 5: Increase aircraft apron parking capacity
- Objective 6: Develop excess Airport property for non-aeronautical use
Alternatives

FAA Guidance

• Alternatives considered should:
  • Represent the range of reasonable alternatives.
  • Provide a clear basis for choice among options.
• No requirement for specific number or range of alternatives.
• Generally, the greater the degree of environmental effects, the wider the range of alternatives that should be considered.
• An EA may limit alternatives to the proposed action and no action if there are no conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.
• A preferred alternative should be identified by the EA.
• The EA should briefly explain why certain alternatives were eliminated from further study.
Range of Alternatives Considered

• No-Action Alternative
• Off-site Alternatives
• 2025 LTCP Alternatives
  • Maintain one primary runway and one crosswind runway
  • Maintain two parallel runways
  • Maintain one runway only
  • Maintain three runways and close the turf crosswind
  • Extend primary Runway 14L/32R using declared distances
  • Maintain one runway and reduce its length.
• 2035 LTCP Alternatives
  • Turf runway alternatives
  • Primary runway alternatives
  • Taxiway system alternatives
  • Aircraft apron alternatives
Turf Runway Alternatives

• Alternative A: Reduce length to 1,669 feet (preferred)
• Alternative B: Designate turf area adjacent to paved runway
Primary Runway Alternatives

- Alternative A: Convert Blast Pads to Stopways
- Alternative B: Convert Blast Pads to Runway
- Alternative C: Convert Portions of Blast Pads to Runway and Shift Runway to Northwest (preferred)
Taxiway System Alternatives

- Two alternatives considered with minor differences
- Preferred alternative shown to the left
- Preferred perimeter road alternative also shown
Aircraft Apron Expansion

- Preferred alternative shown to the left
- Increases parking capacity and removes aircraft parking from runway protection zone (RPZ)
Environmental Analysis and Cumulative Impacts

- Air quality modeling
- Aircraft noise modeling
- DOT Section 4(f) resource review
- Hazardous materials inventory
- Historic/architectural and archeological resource assessment
- Land use compatibility and zoning assessment
- Socioeconomics and environmental justice analysis
- Vegetation management strategies
- Wetland delineation
- Other NEPA categories
- Cumulative Impacts – consideration of projects that are connected, cumulative and similar (common timing and geography)
Next Steps

• Mail newsletters to airport neighbors
• First Public Meeting Event – September/October 2018
CRYSTAL AIRPORT FEDERAL EA / STATE EAW

Airport Public Meeting Minutes
Crystal Community Center Game Room
October 30, 2018
6:00 P.M. Open house with informational boards
6:30 P.M. Presentation followed by Q&A

MAC/Mead & Hunt Attendees Representing
Dana Nelson Metropolitan Airports Commission
Neil Ralston Metropolitan Airports Commission
Bridget Rief Metropolitan Airports Commission
Gary Schmidt Metropolitan Airports Commission
Melissa Scovronski Metropolitan Airports Commission
Brad Juffer Metropolitan Airports Commission
Naomi Pesky Metropolitan Airports Commission
Phillip Tiedeman Crystal Airport Manager
Katie Clark-Sieben MAC Commissioner District C
Evan Barrett Mead & Hunt
Sarah Emmel Mead & Hunt

Presentation slides and informational boards presented at this meeting provided as handouts to the public, as well as a project newsletter, are available on the project website at: https://www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Crystal-Airport-Environmental-Assessment/Documents-and-Links.aspx

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Provide background on the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC), previous Crystal Airport planning efforts, and an overview of the federal environmental assessment (EA) / state environmental assessment worksheet (EAW) process.
- Introduce the EA/EAW Purpose & Need, Alternatives, and completed portions of the Environmental Consequences chapters to the public.
- Respond to inquiries from community members.

Items discussed in the formal presentation at 6:30pm were as follows:

Neil Ralston, Airport Planner with the MAC, welcomed and thanked everyone for coming. He noted that the purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the current environmental assessment study that is underway. The environmental review process is the next step in implementing the recent long term comprehensive plan (LTCP). Introductions were made for MAC and Mead & Hunt staff.
Neil provided an overview of the MAC, its history and mission, and the place of Crystal Airport within the larger metropolitan airport system. He emphasized that the MAC is its own legal entity, not part of the state, city, or Metropolitan Council. Capital improvements at MAC airports are funded by aviation users through FAA and/or state aviation grant programs, along with MAC generated funds. No local sales or property taxes are used for improvements at MAC airports.

The environmental review process allows the MAC to reengage with the public and Airport users that were involved during the LTCP, and to reach out for new voices. Neil highlighted the project website that relates specifically to the environmental review, the email update subscription, and the newsletter that was mailed to Airport neighbors.

Neil provided an overview of the Airport Community Panel (ACP), a ten member advisory body made up of representatives of different local stakeholders. This includes the three municipalities adjacent to the Airport (Crystal, Brooklyn Park, and Brooklyn Center), Airport users, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, Hennepin County, citizens, and the MAC. The members have important functions, such as representing a broad range of stakeholder groups, receiving information about the environmental review process and sharing it with their constituents, and providing input back into the process. The first meeting of the ACP took place on August 28. Materials from this meeting are available on the project website. The next ACP meeting will occur in early 2019 and members of the public are welcome to attend.

Evan Barrett from Mead & Hunt noted that there will be a question and answer session after the presentation, and suggested attendees keep questions in mind to ask at that time. He also noted that the slides and the handouts included the same information in case anyone could not see the screen.

Evan explained the anticipated project timeline, which picks up after the completion of the LTCP. The environmental assessment process began in early 2018 and has been underway ever since. The ACP event occurred in August, which brings the process to today’s public event. Looking forward, the remaining environmental studies and analysis will be finished, and a draft document will be completed. This draft will be published on the project website and will be available in some physical locations in early 2019. At that time, there will be an opportunity for comments on the record at a public hearing and through written comments during a comment period.

Evan provided an overview of the regulations governing the environmental review process. Environmental review is mandated at the federal and state level by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). He explained that the federal and state requirements will be addressed within a single combined EA/EAW document.

Evan explained that the role of Crystal Airport is to accommodate small aircraft with less than 10 passenger seats traveling to and from this part of the metro area. The project goals grew out of the previous LTCP that revealed the need to modernize and right-size the Airport, which hasn’t had significant changes in decades. Updates should also maintain the Airport’s operational capabilities and enhance safety. Project objectives include simplifying the airfield; providing more runway length; adding enhanced approach procedures; adding perimeter roads to enhance safety by limiting the need for vehicles to cross runways; adding aircraft parking on an expanded fixed base operator (FBO) apron; and designating some property not needed for Airport operations for non-aeronautical use to enhance MAC revenue streams at the Airport.
Evan explained the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has designated hot spots on the Airport Diagram. These indicate areas of increased likelihood of confusion, incidents, and accidents at the Airport. In Crystal's case, the hot spots are related to closely spaced runways. Closing several taxiway connections to the runway, closing the parallel runway, and building perimeter roads so vehicles do not have to cross the runways would help to eliminate these hot spots and simplify the airfield.

Evan explained the concept of “design aircraft” for the primary runway and went over the runway length needs chart shown in the slides and on the boards. This shows the existing and proposed runway length and the design aircraft runway length requirements. The design aircraft is not changing, but the proposed plan would better accommodate the needs of the existing family of aircraft. The chart also illustrates that larger jet aircraft have runway length needs beyond that proposed for Crystal Airport and are unlikely to use the Airport on a regular basis.

Next, Evan discussed the turf crosswind runway. The recent LTCP process initially proposed closing this runway. Ultimately, through stakeholder engagement, a plan to keep the runway in place while reducing its length by approximately 500 feet was developed. The proposed changes would remove taxiways from the turf runway safety areas, eliminating additional hot spots.

Evan then noted that NEPA and MEPA implementing guidance identify specific environmental categories that must be analyzed during the environmental review process. Some of them are more applicable in this situation than others. FAA and state guidance are used to look at each category. Evan then discussed environmental issues for each category specific to the EA/EAW being developed for the proposed project at Crystal Airport.

**Noise and compatible land use:** The proposed project would change aircraft noise patterns surrounding the Airport, but these changes would be minor. The changes are due to closing one runway and redirecting its traffic to the other. The primary runway would be slightly longer, and runway ends would be in slightly different locations and centered on Airport property to more evenly distribute noise. A detailed study of areas with potential noise impacts is in progress as part of the review. To reduce noise, the MAC has a voluntary noise abatement plan that it encourages aircraft users to follow, and the MAC maintains a noise complaint hotline for reporting any issues.

**Climate:** A greenhouse gas emissions inventory model will be developed to review the difference between the no-action scenario and the proposed project.

**Tree removal:** Imaginary surfaces that come off the ends of runways need to be cleared of obstacles for the safety of aircraft arrivals and departures. The MAC needs to apply and follow FAA criteria to determine which trees need to be removed to provide clear surfaces. Areas have been identified for further study for individual tree removal or trimming. Some of the affected trees are in a public park (Edgewood Park in Brooklyn Park), and therefore require an extra level of scrutiny under the federal Department of Transportation Act Section 4(f). Under this regulation, any impacts to the park need to be mitigated, or a study needs to be done to show no adverse effects would result from the proposed project. The MAC is collaborating with the City of Brooklyn Park and the FAA regarding this issue.

**Air Quality:** An emissions inventory model will be developed to review the difference between the no-action scenario and the proposed project.

**Natural resources and energy supply:** Quantification of construction materials and energy needs will be completed as part of the review.
Protected species: The MAC is coordinating with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) to confirm no protected species would be impacted. No protected species have been found at Crystal Airport.

Visual effects: The proposed project would result in minor changes to airfield lighting systems. Some lights would move, and there would be some new lights. The environmental document will examine what that means in terms of visual effects to nearby land uses.

Land use: The airport zoning ordinance enacted in 1983 would need to be updated due to the changes to the runway ends. This effort would take place after the EA/EAW is complete, but the EA/EAW will examine its effects.

Historic, archeological, and cultural resources: A detailed study has been completed and submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office. The project would not affect any of these resources.

Hazardous materials: There are potential sources of contamination on and around the Airport, so the EA/EAW will document these sites to make sure that they are not disturbed during construction.

Water resource: A wetland delineation was completed, and a storm water analysis will be completed to make sure there is no increase in runoff from Airport property into surrounding areas. This is a requirement of one of the permits that must be obtained prior to construction.

Evan then went over next steps, including the second ACP meeting, FAA legal review, publication of the draft EA/EAW document, a public comment period, and the public hearing, which will be held in early 2019.

Evan asked for questions from attendees.

Items discussed in the question and answer session were as follows:

An attendee asked about the hours of operation once the project is completed. Evan noted that the Airport is open 24 hours per day, and Neil provided the hours that the tower is staffed. The proposed project would not affect the hours of operation. Evan clarified that most of the activity occurs at the Airport during the day; the noise study indicated that only approximately four percent of activity occurs at night.

An attendee asked which park is affected by potential tree removal. This is Edgewood Park, at the corner of 63rd and Florida. Neil clarified that not all trees would be removed; it would only be large cottonwoods. Evan explained that the surfaces that must be cleared in this location are high up in this location, and while there are other species of trees in the park, only the cottonwoods are growing high enough to be a concern.

An attendee asked how to stay informed about the process prior to the spring hearing. There will be periodic e-news updates to the subscription list. These will be on at least a monthly basis. The project website also has a “contact project team” option for any questions or comments. Neil agreed that the e-news subscription will be the best way to stay up to date. The attendee asked if there was any particular person to contact. Neil directed people to use the “contact project team” option on the website to reach the necessary people.

An attendee asked to clarify whether the tree removal in the park a block away is due to the runway lengthening, as it seems quite far away to have an effect on park vegetation. He commented that Airport expansion should remain within the existing Airport boundaries. He asked if aircraft would fly
that low in this area. Neil noted that the cottonwoods in this particular area get quite tall. He also explained that most of the trees affected by the proposed project would grow into the existing height limitations within a few years in the no-action scenario. By moving the runway end and associated imaginary surface a little closer to the park, these trees would have to come down sooner than they would without the project. The trees would ultimately be an issue with or without the project. The attendee asked if the MAC has trimmed in the park before. Neil did not believe so. The attendee thought that it sounded then that the removal or trimming was due to the runway lengthening. Neil reiterated that the timing of the tree removal is related to the project, but as the trees grow they will become an issue with the runway in its current location partially due to the tendency of the species to grow taller than most other trees in the park.

Cindy Sherman from Brooklyn Park noted that the Brooklyn Park zoning map already shows an area of impact of the Airport, and the trees are within that designated area. Evan clarified with a graphic that the park is directly off the extended centerline of the runway, and under the threshold siting surface (TSS), which the FAA requires to be cleared. FAA enforcement of this surface has become more stringent in recent years to promote safety at airports. The FAA is aware of potential concerns with the park and wants to work with the city to come up with a solution that could ultimately improve the park in combination with tree removal. Neil noted that the TSS has a 20:1 slope from the ground at the runway end.

An attendee explained that the reason she came to the meeting was due to the potential for tree removal in the park, as it is the only wild area nearby. She lives kitty-corner from the park. She has concerns that if the park is “improved,” duck and bird habitat will be destroyed. If some trees are removed, it is hard to make sure that trees next to them are not also damaged, so there will likely be non-cottonwoods affected. She is concerned that the community will lose the forest habitat, which is rare in this area. The speaker also asked whether cottonwoods in surrounding yards would also require removal if the trees in the park are too tall. Evan explained that an arborist went out to look at the trees in potentially affected areas and prepared a detailed report of species found there. Evan explained that the report showed very few cottonwoods in the neighborhoods, which have mostly red maple and other tree species. Cottonwoods are concentrated in the park due to Twin Creek and wetlands in the park, which are attractive growing areas for cottonwoods. There are not wetlands on properties outside of the park, meaning that conditions are not right for the trees elsewhere. In addition, most people do not purposely plant cottonwoods in their yards, so it is less likely to affect trees in lawns. Neil reiterated that the MAC will be working with the City to end up with a positive effect in the park.

The commenter also noted that she heard that the Airport may be growing, and asked whether there are plans to expand the Airport outside of the footprint within twenty years. Neil explained that the current steps correspond with the twenty-year plan, so there are no plans to increase the size of the Airport beyond the current proposed action. The MAC is trying to modernize and optimize the Airport, rather than expand it.

An attendee brought up the runway shift to the northwest, and asked for clarification about where the current and future runway ends are on the graphic. Neil noted that the runway would shift 115 feet northwest along its centerline. Evan pointed out the current and projected runway ends. Neil clarified that there is already pavement in the form of the existing blast pads where the ends of the runway would ultimately be.
An attendee asked about a culvert at 61st and Douglas Drive, and noted that it doesn’t drain well. He asked if the project would improve drainage or make it worse. Evan explained that there would need to be new stormwater containment or infiltration on-site in order to make sure there is not increased runoff from the site. This is a requirement of an MPCA permit that the MAC has to get in order to construct the project. The EA/EAW will document where stormwater facilities are being removed, and where they might be replaced. This would be finalized in the design phase, and is just conceptual at this stage. There is a requirement to keep stormwater on-site, so the project would not make the problem any worse.

Neil confirmed there were no more questions, thanked attendees for coming, and invited them to the next meeting.
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- Next Steps
Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC)

- Owns and operates seven airports within 35 miles of the St. Paul and Minneapolis downtowns, including MSP and six general aviation airports
- Public corporation created by the Minnesota Legislature
- Provides and promotes safe, convenient, environmentally sound and cost-competitive aviation services to its customers
- Funded via self-generated income, issuing bonds, and acceptance of federal airport improvement funds. No local taxes are used to operate the MAC’s airports.
Stakeholder Engagement

- Sign-up to receive updates via our e-news subscription program
- Visit the project website for up-to-date information
- Attend the public hearing in early 2019
- Share your thoughts via the “Contact Project Team” tab of the website or at the public hearing

Project Website

https://www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Crystal-Airport-Environmental-Assessment.aspx
Anticipated Environmental Assessment Timeline

For more detail, see the Stakeholder Engagement Plan on the project website. Schedule is subject to change. Any significant schedule updates will be published on the project website and distributed to e-news subscribers, as appropriate.
Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA)/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

**What is it?** NEPA requires federal agencies to assess environmental effects of proposed actions prior to making decisions. MEPA requires an environmental review process, similar to the federal NEPA process, to be used by local governments to analyze the potential environmental effects of proposed projects.

**What does it require?** A Environmental Assessment (EA) will be completed to satisfy NEPA requirements. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is required by MEPA for MAC reliever airport projects that involve construction of a runway or taxiway extension and the expenditure of more than $2 million.

**How will it be accomplished?** We will prepare the Federal EA and a State EAW concurrently as they share many of the same informational requirements.
Airport Role & Project Goals

Airport Role
- Crystal Airport is an integral part of the MAC airport system
- Accommodates personal, recreational, and some business aviation travel to and from the adjacent communities
- Primarily serves small, propeller-driven aircraft with fewer than 10 passenger seats

Project Goals
- Better align available runways, taxiways, and aprons with existing and forecasted aircraft activity
- Preserve and improve operational capabilities for aircraft using the airport
- Enhance safety by simplifying the runway and taxiway layout
Project Overview & Objectives

- Simplify the airfield layout
- Provide adequate runway length for aircraft currently using the airport
- Provide aircraft with enhanced arrival capabilities, while minimizing obstacles to the main runway
- Improve airfield roadways for airport vehicle circulation
- Expand the airfield apron for additional aircraft parking
- Develop airport-owned property that is not used for airport operations for other uses
Project Objective: Simplify Airfield

FAA has identified 8 Hot Spots on the airfield at Crystal Airport

- **Hot Spots (HS):** designated areas where heightened attention by pilots and drivers is necessary due to a complex or confusing configuration. They are typically located where the pilot or vehicle driver must make a decision or get approval from air traffic control to cross a runway or taxiway.

How will the preferred alternative help?

- Simplifying taxiways and closing a runway will minimize the number of complex intersections and runway crossings.
- New perimeter roads will reduce the need for vehicles to cross runways or taxiways.
Project Objective:
Provide Adequate Runway Length
Preferred Alternative: Turf Crosswind Runway 6R/24L

- Runway 6R/24L will be shortened to remove Taxiways D and F from the Runway Safety Area (RSA)
- Associated hot spots and areas of pilot confusion, due to crossing the RSA, will be eliminated
- Airport user feedback led to keeping the turf crosswind, the only one in the metro area
- Proposed runway length of 1,669 feet will meet existing user needs
What environmental effects are considered?

Noise & Compatible Land Use

- How might airport noise levels be affected?
  One runway is closing. Traffic on this runway will shift to other runways. The primary runway will be slightly longer and will move closer to the northwest side of the airport. The turf crosswind runway will be shortened, moving the ends farther from neighbors.

- What does this mean for neighbors?
  There will be minimal changes from current conditions.

- What efforts are employed to help reduce aircraft noise?
  Pilots are asked to follow the airport’s noise abatement plan, which instructs them on methods for keeping aircraft as quiet as possible when operating at the airport.

Climate

- Greenhouse gas emissions will be quantified.

Trees

- Why is tree removal needed?
  Areas off runway ends must be clear of obstructions for the safety of aircraft in flight.

- Tree removal or trimming is required even without the airport improvements.

  The proposed project shifts the primary runway to the northwest, so some trees may need to be trimmed or removed a few years earlier than in a no-action scenario.

Department of Transportation Section 4(f)

- Some trees that will be removed or trimmed are located in a public park. When a project impacts a park, further analysis is required to evaluate potential impacts to these resources.
What environmental effects are considered?

- **Air Quality**
  - Added pollutant emissions resulting from the project will be quantified.

- **Natural Resources & Energy Supply**
  - Use of construction materials and changes in energy consumption resulting from the project will be quantified.

- **Protected Species**
  - Endangered rusty-patch bumble bees and threatened northern long-eared bats are found in Hennepin County, but not on or near the Airport.

- **Visual Effects (including light emissions)**
  - Changes to lighting systems will be evaluated with respect to nearby light-sensitive areas.

- **Land Use**
  - Changes to the existing 1983 airport zoning ordinance will be considered.

---

**Historic, Architectural, & Cultural Resources**

- Historians and archaeologists surveyed the airport and did not find any historic buildings eligible for protection, or any evidence of archaeological materials.

---

**Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste & Pollution Prevention**

- Potential waste sources will be documented and minimized.
- Existing sources of hazardous materials will be avoided.

---

**Water Resources**

- Changing and adding pavement at the airport affects stormwater runoff and drainage.
- **Will this affect neighbors?**
  Stormwater runoff to the surrounding neighborhoods will not be affected.

---

**CRYSTAL AIRPORT DRAINAGE DIAGRAM**
Next Steps

For more detail, see the Stakeholder Engagement Plan on the project website. Schedule is subject to change. Any significant schedule updates will be published on the project website and distributed to e-news subscribers, as appropriate.
Stay Involved

- Sign-up to receive updates via our e-news subscription program
- Visit the project website for up-to-date information
- Attend the public hearing in early 2019
- Share your thoughts via the “Contact Project Team” tab of the website or at the public hearing

Project Website
https://www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Crystal-Airport-Environmental-Assessment.aspx
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Environmental Assessment: Crystal Airport
Anticipated Environmental Assessment Timeline

- **MAC Adopted Crystal Airport LTCF** (October 2017)
- **EA Process Begins** (January 2018)
- **Analysis of Impacts and Alternatives** (Spring-Fall 2018)
- **Draft EA/EAW FAA Legal Review** (Winter 2018-2019)
- **Draft EA/EAW Public Comments** (Spring 2019)
- **Respond to Comments Prepare Final EA/EAW** (Spring 2019)
- **Final EA & FAA Determination** (Summer 2019)

**Draft EA Process**

- **Public Information Meeting**
- **Airport Community Panel (ACP) Workshop**
- **Public Hearing**

For more detail, see the Stakeholder Engagement Plan on the project website. Schedule is subject to change. Any significant schedule updates will be published on the project website and distributed to e-news subscribers, as appropriate.
The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is committed to a transparent and open community involvement process, which includes establishing an Airport Community Panel for this project. This advisory panel represents a broad group of stakeholders and will provide input to the project team, as well as share information out to their respective communities about the environmental review process.

- **Sign-up to receive updates via our e-news subscription program**
- **Attend the public hearing in early 2019**
- **Visit the project website for up-to-date information**
- **Share your thoughts via the “Contact Project Team” tab of the website or at the public hearing**

**Project Website**
https://www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Crystal-Airport-Environmental-Assessment.aspx
Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC)

- Owns and operates seven airports within 35 miles of the St. Paul and Minneapolis downtowns, including MSP and six general aviation airports
- Public corporation created by the Minnesota Legislature
- Provides and promotes safe, convenient, environmentally sound and cost-competitive aviation services to its customers
- Funded via self-generated income, issuing bonds, and acceptance of federal airport improvement funds. No local taxes are used to operate the MAC’s airports.

Environmental Assessment
Crystal Airport
What is it? NEPA requires federal agencies to assess environmental effects of proposed actions prior to making decisions. MEPA requires an environmental review process, similar to the federal NEPA process, to be used by local governments to analyze the potential environmental effects of proposed projects.

What does it require? A Environmental Assessment (EA) will be completed to satisfy NEPA requirements. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is required by MEPA for MAC reliever airport projects that involve construction of a runway or taxiway extension and the expenditure of more than $2 million.

How will it be accomplished? We will prepare the Federal EA and a State EAW concurrently as they share many of the same informational requirements.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Process

Initiate the Environmental Process
- Will the project have any significant effect on the environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>MAYBE</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exclusion (CatEx)</td>
<td>Are there extraordinary circumstances that merit further review?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment (EA)</td>
<td>Will the project have any significant effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)</td>
<td>What are the significant environmental effects of the proposed project that cannot be avoided, minimized, or mitigated?</td>
<td>Record of Decision (ROD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
**Airport Role & Project Goals**

**Airport Role**
- Crystal Airport is an integral part of the MAC airport system
- Accommodates personal, recreational, and some business aviation travel to and from the adjacent communities
- Primarily serves small, propeller-driven aircraft with fewer than 10 passenger seats

**Project Goals**
- Better align available runways, taxiways, and aprons with existing and forecasted aircraft activity
- Preserve and improve operational capabilities for aircraft using the airport
- Enhance safety by simplifying the runway and taxiway layout

---

**CRYSTAL AIRPORT PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

- Increase Runway 14L/32R Usable Length by 483 Feet
- Reduce Runway 06R/24L (Turf) Usable Length by 454 Feet
- Convert Runway 14R/32L to Parallel Taxiway
- Develop Land for Non-Aeronautical Use

---

**Environmental Assessment**

**Crystal Airport**
Project Overview & Objectives

- Simplify the airfield layout
- Provide adequate runway length for aircraft currently using the airport
- Provide aircraft with enhanced arrival capabilities, while minimizing obstacles to the main runway
- Improve airfield roadways for airport vehicle circulation
- Expand the airfield apron for additional aircraft parking
- Develop airport-owned property that is not used for airport operations for other uses

CRYSTAL AIRPORT PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

- Increase Runway 14L/32R Usable Length by 483 Feet
- Convert Runway 14R/32L to Parallel Taxiway
- Reduce Runway 06R/24L (Turf) Usable Length by 454 Feet
- Develop Land for Non-Aeronautical Use
Project Objective: Provide Adequate Runway Length

EXISTING RUNWAY 14/32 LENGTH: 3,267' PROPOSED RUNWAY 14/32 LENGTH: 3,750'

NOTE: Propeller-driven aircraft runway lengths are based on accelerate-stop distances and jet-driven aircraft runway lengths are based on balanced field length takeoff distances, as identified in the respective aircraft performance manuals. Accelerate-stop distance is the length required to accelerate from a full stop to near lift off speed and then decelerate to a full stop. Balanced field length considers the accelerate-stop distance along with other safety factors as required for federal certification of these larger aircraft types. Lengths are calculated for a temperature of 83.4°Fahrenheit, a field elevation of 869 feet above mean sea level, and typical takeoff flap settings.

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).

USEFUL LOAD: An aircraft's useful load can be used to transport fuel, passengers, baggage, and/or cargo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
<th>RUNWAY LENGTH IN FEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PILATUS PC-12</td>
<td>3,100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEECH KING AIR 200</td>
<td>3,150'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPER PA-31</td>
<td>4,000'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 441</td>
<td>3,100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 330I</td>
<td>3,200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEECH KING AIR 200</td>
<td>3,150'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPER PA-31</td>
<td>4,000'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 441</td>
<td>3,100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 330I</td>
<td>3,200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 441</td>
<td>3,100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 330I</td>
<td>3,200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 441</td>
<td>3,100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 330I</td>
<td>3,200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 441</td>
<td>3,100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNA 330I</td>
<td>3,200'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Assessment
Crystal Airport
**Project Objective:** Simplify Airfield

FAA has identified 8 Hot Spots on the airfield at Crystal Airport

- **Hot Spots (HS):** designated areas where heightened attention by pilots and drivers is necessary due to a complex or confusing configuration. They are typically located where the pilot or vehicle driver must make a decision or get approval from air traffic control to cross a runway or taxiway.

**How will the preferred alternative help?**

- Simplifying taxiways and closing a runway will minimize the number of complex intersections and runway crossings.
- New perimeter roads will reduce the need for vehicles to cross runways or taxiways.
Public Event

Preferred Alternative: Turf Crosswind
Runway 6R/24L

- Runway 6R/24L will be shortened to remove Taxiways D and F from the Runway Safety Area (RSA)
- Associated hot spots and areas of pilot confusion, due to crossing the RSA, will be eliminated
- Airport user feedback led to keeping the turf crosswind, the only one in the metro area
- Proposed runway length of 1,669 feet will meet existing user needs
What environmental effects are considered?

- **Air Quality**
  - Added pollutant emissions resulting from the project will be quantified.

- **Natural Resources & Energy Supply**
  - Use of construction materials and changes in energy consumption resulting from the project will be quantified.

- **Noise & Compatible Land Use**
  - How might airport noise levels be affected?
    One runway is closing. Traffic on this runway will shift to other runways.
    The primary runway will be slightly longer and will move closer to the northwest side of the airport. The turf crosswind runway will be shortened, moving the ends farther from neighbors.

  - What does this mean for neighbors?
    There will be minimal changes from current conditions.

  - What efforts are employed to help reduce aircraft noise?
    Pilots are asked to follow the airport’s noise abatement plan, which instructs them on methods for keeping aircraft as quiet as possible when operating at the airport.

---

**Source:** Aircraft sound levels are estimated based on noise monitoring data for aircraft arrivals at approximately one mile from the runway threshold.
What environmental effects are considered?

**Climate**
- Greenhouse gas emissions will be quantified.

**Trees**
- Why is tree removal needed?

Areas off runway ends must be clear of obstructions for the safety of aircraft in flight.

Tree removal or trimming is required even without the airport improvements.

The proposed project shifts the primary runway to the northwest, so some trees may need to be trimmed or removed a few years earlier than in a no-action scenario.

**Department of Transportation Section 4(f)**
- Some trees that will be removed or trimmed are located in a public park. When a project impacts a park, further analysis is required to evaluate potential impacts to these resources.

**Protected Species**
- Endangered rusty-patched bumble bees and threatened northern long-eared bats are found in Hennepin County, but not on or near the Airport.

**Visual Effects (including light emissions)**
- Changes to lighting systems will be evaluated with respect to nearby light-sensitive areas.
Public Event

What environmental effects are considered?

**Historic, Architectural, & Cultural Resources**
- Historians and archaeologists surveyed the airport and did not find any historic buildings eligible for protection, or any evidence of archaeological materials.

**Land Use**
- Changes to the existing 1983 airport zoning ordinance will be considered.

**Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste & Pollution Prevention**
- Potential waste sources will be documented and minimized.
- Existing sources of hazardous materials will be avoided.

**Water Resources**
- Changing and adding pavement at the airport affects stormwater runoff and drainage.
- Will this affect neighbors?
  Stormwater runoff to the surrounding neighborhoods will not be affected.
The attached report represents this writer’s interpretation of items discussed during the meeting. Any corrections or additional information should be brought to our attention for clarification.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Conduct a debrief of the October 30th public event and get the Airport Community Panel’s (ACP’s) feedback on what went well and what could be improved for the public hearing.
- Provide an overview of the environmental impacts of the proposed development (preferred alternative) and get feedback from the ACP on the material presented to incorporate into the presentation for the upcoming public hearing.
Meeting Minutes

- Share with the ACP the next steps in the EA/EAW process.
- Continue to equip ACP members to be the point of contact for information sharing, both to and from the community and MAC, and to respond to inquiries from their constituent groups.

Neil Ralston, MAC Aviation Planner, and Evan Barrett, the consultant team Project Manager from Mead & Hunt, presented and facilitated the meeting. A copy of the meeting presentation can be found at: https://metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Crystal-Airport-Environmental-Assessment/Documents-and-Links/MIC-ACP-Meeting-2-Slide-Deck-03-05-2019.aspx

The Panel discussion occurred as follows:

Warren Batzlaff asked if the cities and municipalities surrounding the airport’s runway protection zones (RPZs) are cooperating with zoning and land use restrictions, such as having appropriate regulations for building height development, tree heights, etc. Neil explained that part of the plan is to move the RPZs for the primary runway fully onto airport property. For the crosswind runway there are still some portions where the RPZs cross roads or go off-airport. Warren asked whether a process was in place to make sure that the cities involved in those areas have the appropriate regulations. Evan responded that it was the MAC’s intent to convene a Joint Airport Zoning Board (JAZB) as part of the project implementation. The JAZB would involve all those jurisdictions. Neil confirmed there is currently a zoning ordinance for both land use and height in place, but it needs to be refreshed. Neil confirmed that through these planning and environmental processes, the MAC is renewing its partnerships with the local municipalities to minimize incompatible uses around its airports. He also noted that, as Crystal is a relatively developed area, there’s not much to develop around the Crystal Airport, and that tree growth is the primary issue. Warren clarified, that from a zoning standpoint, his point was that people should know they can’t plant trees that will grow to unacceptable heights, so the MAC doesn’t have to spend money every 20-30 years to cut down trees and plant appropriate low-growing species.

Warren Batzlaff asked if there was an overall increase in green space and decrease in the amount of total pavement coverage for the proposed project. Evan responded that, while the project will remove a lot of pavement, there is approximately a net acre of increased pavement. He noted this includes the roads, apron, runway and taxiway extensions. Neil clarified MAC will not remove the entire runway that’s being closed, it’s being narrowed, but extended out to the new ends of the runway.

During the Department of Transportation Section 4(f) portion of the presentation, when Evan stated there were approximately 30 trees in Edgewood Park that would need to be removed, John Grosen asked “out of how many?” Evan replied it was about 30 out of several hundred trees, pointed them out in a photo within the presentation, and said they had not been intentionally planted. He mentioned the team has been working with the City of Brooklyn Park—the owner of the park—to establish a tree replacement plan that should improve the park. He also said the team has worked with the FAA over the last several months to establish a de minimis determination. That determination says that, while there are impacts to the park, those impacts will not adversely affect the park. He then handed out a tree fact sheet handout that the team developed in response to several questions about tree removal that came up at the October 30th public meeting. He said the fact sheet will be made available on the project website and distributed at the public hearing. The handout explains the tree impacts associated with the project and outlines what the MAC intends to do to minimize impacts and replace trees. He asked for the panel’s feedback on the fact sheet so that any suggested improvements could be considered and addressed prior to distributing the fact sheet at the public hearing and posting it to the project website. Warren suggested considering adding that the tree removal also benefits the safety of the community.
He also pointed out that silver maples are another non-hardwood tree and that those and cottonwoods (two of the tree species to be removed) are susceptible to storm damage and falling on houses and other property. He pointed out the dual benefit in trying to change the mix a bit. Dan Olson mentioned that the City of Crystal has an approved tree species list on their website with 60-70 trees included—a mix of softwoods and hardwoods—and asked if the MAC was open to having those trees planted as replacement trees. Neil said they would want to screen the list for slow-growing vs. fast-growing trees. Evan asked whether the list identifies the types of trees the City would use when replacing trees. Dan confirmed it was, and Evan said the team would review at the list. Neil reiterated the team knows this is a sensitive topic for many community members. He said the plan as of now is to work with the City of Brooklyn Park to replace the trees that are removed in Edgewood Park with more appropriate, slower-growing trees. For private residential properties, they will negotiate the fair market value of the trees with the homeowners, not just coming in and cutting down the trees without compensation. Evan also mentioned that, as part of the team’s coordination with the City of Brooklyn Park, they worked with the Parks Department and their consultant who is developing a natural resource management plan for the park system as a whole to establish specific tree species they’d like to see planted in the park. He noted they’re trying to move toward a native species type of plan where there are not as many exotic type species planted in the parks.

During the Historic and Archeological Resources section of the presentation, Gary Schmidt asked if the project team knew that the airport was relocated to its current site in the late 1950s. Evan confirmed that the team was aware of that and noted the detailed report resulting from this analysis would be available as an appendix to the EA/EAW.

During the Zoning section of the presentation, Dan Olson asked if the JAZB would be convened after the EA/EAW process. Evan and Neil confirmed that was correct.

Dan Olson asked if the Environmental Justice analysis was based on census tracts? Evan replied it was based on census block groups using the EJSCREEN tool on the EPA’s website. Sarah Emmel confirmed the analysis used the 2016 five-year community survey data from EJSCREEN. John Grosen asked if proportionate or disproportionate was strictly based on geographic area and population? Evan replied that it’s somewhat subjective but said the intent is to make sure that any project does not have more of an effect on a minority population than a non-minority population. He noted that the project team’s conclusion is that the effects of the project are fairly evenly distributed throughout the affected area and he stated the FAA is likely to concur with that conclusion.

Regarding tree removal on private properties, John Grosen asked if the MAC has the legal authority to just take the trees, and whether it is just a matter of when and how. Neil responded that the MAC is generally able to come to an agreement with homeowners; however, there have been some cases in which the MAC has not been able to come to an agreement with a homeowner. In those situations, the MAC has elected to not take the trees without an agreement in place. He further stated this would be one of the discussions during the zoning process—how the JAZB sets standards on height limitations, spreads the word, and enforces the zoning standards because they haven’t been enforced in quite some time. He noted there weren’t hundreds and hundreds of trees that would be removed, but about 50 off-airport trees that aren’t in the park. Warren added, that if you have a big silver maple or one of those cottonwoods and it comes down on your house, it could cost several thousand dollars to get it out of the yard. Neil concurred, and said the MAC would be compensating homeowners for the fair market value of the tree. Warren noted that any tree replacements would likely be with a slower-growing hardwood tree. Neil clarified that for the residential tree removals, the MAC would be offering fair market value for the tree, and then homeowners could choose to replace it if they wished—he wanted to make it clear that the MAC would not be offering fair market value AND replacing the trees on the private residential.
lots. Warren suggested getting information from the tree companies on estimated costs for removing these trees and sharing that information with the affected homeowners. He shared that he has a neighbor who just bought a house in Crystal and couldn’t get insurance until they removed a silver maple overhanging their house. He said he wouldn’t fail to mention that it is an advantage to the homeowner in that scenario, because a lot of people aren’t trimming their trees because they can’t afford it. Neil said it’s a process to work through, but something the MAC is familiar with doing and has quite a high success rate. John Grosen added that based on the public comments at the last public meeting, it seems that trees are going to be the MAC’s biggest issue. Dan Olson stated he believed those are the same comments the MAC received during the comprehensive planning process. Neil confirmed they were. Naomi Pesky mentioned it will be helpful that the team has the visuals now of what the tree removal impacts will look like.

Neil asked the panel if there was anything else they saw in the presentation that struck them as a potentially sensitive issue. Dan Olson asked about the four properties that are impacted by the noise contours and what the process was for contacting them and doing the analysis. Dana Nelson explained that the MAC would put together a plan for how they would measure noise, based on different FAA guidance documents on the topic. They would then work with the City and FAA to get their approval of that plan. The MAC would then reach out to homeowners and conduct acoustical testing. This involves going into the homes and doing interior as well as exterior noise level testing. They would then analyze the level of sound insulation the home provides to see if it triggers the threshold set by the FAA. She noted the MAC has done this a couple different times in the past—once around MSP and once around Flying Cloud Airport—so they have a good template to use. She then invited Dan or anyone else at the City who was interested to accompany the team when doing the testing. Dan responded that the building official had expressed interest. Dana further explained how they do the testing, using a big speaker and pink noise (on the same frequency level as white noise). She said they only test habitable rooms, such as bedrooms and living rooms. John Grosen said it’s surprising that they’d have to do this testing since these homes are already inside that existing 65 DNL. Gary Schmidt said it’s required because they are making a change in the runway configuration. Dan said he imagined people would be open to having this done. Dana said she would hope so, and noted that in the past, people have been open to it. MAC needs to request access to the home but can typically be in and out of each home in a couple hours. She said that because it’s only four homes, they would test each home. In the past, when it’s been a larger area, they’ve tested a sampling of the homes.

Warren Batzlaff asked what the funding outlook looked like. Evan responded the MAC is doing the EA because it’s a requirement in order to get federal funding, so it is the MAC’s intent to get a federal grant to do the construction for the project. Neil mentioned it’s a high-priority project for the FAA because of the hot-spots. Evan said there are a lot of pieces to the project; the runway and taxiway pieces of the project would be eligible for federal funding and noted those are the lion’s share of the cost of the project. He said the perimeter roads, aprons and other project components might not compete as well for federal funding, so it remains to be seen if they’ll get significant federal assistance. Warren asked about the timing for construction. Evan responded they’re targeting construction starting either late 2020 or early 2021.

Dana Nelson then outlined the next steps in the process. She stated the MAC Commission Planning, Development and Environment (PD&E) Committee would be the hearing officers for the public meeting. One option for the public hearing is to hold it as part of a PD&E Committee meeting, which are held at MSP, beyond security. She noted this option is not very conducive to inviting the public. The other option is to have it at a city hall-type location near the Crystal Airport and invite the PD&E committee members out to the community. She stated the latter is the MAC’s preference but wanted to get input
from the ACP members. Timing is anticipated for late May. Dan Olson said he thought it would be nice to have it in the community. He offered that the Crystal City Hall or Community Center could host it. Evan said the team anticipates publishing the draft EA/EAW for public review on or around April 22nd. It will be available on the Crystal EA/EAW project website, and subscribers to the email list will also get a notification.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:40 p.m.
Crystal Airport
Federal Environmental Assessment (EA)/
State Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW)

March 5, 2019 – Airport Community Panel Meeting #2
Environmental Impacts Overview
Presentation Outline
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Timeline

MAC Adopted Crystal Airport LTCP (OCTOBER 2017)

EA Process Begins (JANUARY 2018)

Analysis of Impacts and Alternatives (SPRING-FALL 2018)

2018

Public Information Meeting

2019

Airport Community Panel (ACP) Workshop

Draft EA/EAW FAA Legal Review (FEBRUARY 2019)

Draft EA/EAW Public Comments (SPRING 2019)

Respond to Comments Prepare Final EA/EAW (SPRING 2019)

Final EA & FAA Determination (SUMMER 2019)

For more detail, see the Stakeholder Engagement Plan on the project website. Schedule is subject to change. Any significant schedule updates will be published on the project website and distributed to e-news subscribers, as appropriate.
Public Meeting Recap: October 30, 2018

• Objective: Provide information and give community members an opportunity to ask questions about proposed improvements

• Agenda:
  • Open house with project boards and one-on-one engagement
  • Presentation
  • Session Q & A

• 17 community members attended

• Topics of questions from attendees
  • Tree removal, including Edgewood Park and wildlife habitat
  • Location of runway ends after the runway shift
  • Whether the airport is likely to expand in the future
  • Drainage at 61st and Douglas Drive
• Preferred Alternative compared against No Action Alternative to determine effects for each environmental category

• No Action Alternative represents what would occur if MAC were to maintain the existing airfield configuration and runway lengths
Environmental Analysis and Cumulative Impacts

• Air quality modeling
• Aircraft noise modeling
• DOT Section 4(f) resource review
• Vegetation management strategies
• Hazardous materials inventory
• Historic/architectural and archeological resource assessment

• Land use compatibility and zoning assessment
• Socioeconomics and environmental justice analysis
• Wetland delineation
• Other NEPA categories
• Cumulative Impacts – consideration of projects that are connected, cumulative and similar (common timing and geography)
Air Quality

- Emissions evaluated with reference to National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and Clean Air Act requirements
  - NAAQS pollutants include CO, NO\textsubscript{x}, SO\textsubscript{x}, O\textsubscript{3}, Pb, and particulate matter
  - Other pollutants identified in charts at right are provided by the FAA model for informational purposes

- Operational emissions
  - 2025 “with project” emissions comparable to 2017 baseline emissions
  - Will not exceed FAA Air Quality Handbook de-minimis thresholds for NAAQS pollutants
  - Considers taxi out, takeoff, climb out, approach, landing, and taxi in operations

- Construction emissions
  - Will not exceed FAA Air Quality Handbook de-minimis thresholds for NAAQS pollutants
  - Considers all construction activities

De-minimis thresholds are the minimum thresholds (in tons) for which a Clean Air Act conformity determination must be performed, for various criteria pollutants in various areas. In Hennepin County, these pollutants are CO and SO\textsubscript{x}. 
Noise Model

- Off-Airport residential parcels in 65 decibel day night average sound level (DNL) noise contour are projected to reduce from eleven to four with the Preferred Alternative.
Department of Transportation
Section 4(f)

• 4(f) protects public parks and wildlife areas from impacts of transportation projects
  – Projects must examine all feasible alternatives and include all possible planning to minimize harm to 4(f) lands
  – If the project would not adversely affect the activities or features qualifying a park for Section 4(f), the FAA may make a *de minimis* determination about the use of the property

• Edgewood Park
  – Several trees will penetrate the Threshold Siting Surface for Runway 14 in both no action and preferred alternatives, requiring removal
  – Trees are projected to penetrate the TSS sooner under the preferred alternative
  – All of the park’s approximately 30 trees requiring removal are cottonwoods
  – FAA issued initial *de minimis* determination
Renderings of the southwest corner of Edgewood Park showing trees before and after the proposed removal.
Other Tree Removal

- Approximately 50 additional trees are outside Edgewood Park in the approaches to Runway 14L in Brooklyn Park, Runway 24R in Brooklyn Center, and Runways 6L and 32R in Crystal.

- Most of these trees are located on private residential lots and the rest are located in public rights-of-way.

- Based on arborist observations, most of these trees are silver maples, but other species include green ash, Siberian elm, white poplar, blue spruce, and honey locust.

- Homeowners can expect to hear from the MAC in early to mid-2020.
Hazardous Materials & Solid Waste

• Known hazardous materials sites on or adjacent to Airport property were identified and evaluated with reference to various federal and state legislative requirements

• None of the sites will be affected by the project
Historic and Archeological Resources

• Cultural resources (above and below ground) were evaluated with reference to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requirements

• FAA made determination of *No Historic Properties Affected* and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred

• Architectural history
  • Historians conducted a Phase II Historic and Architectural property inventory for on-airport resources.
  • Airport facilities were evaluated as potential examples of post-World War II general aviation architecture, but did not have significant design for this period. Post ’70s buildings are located throughout, and many buildings built during the period of study were altered from their historic appearance.

• Archaeology
  • The Airport is in a developed area, and soils have previously been disturbed.
  • No archeological materials were discovered during a Phase I archeological survey.
Land Use

- Proposed action shifts Runway 14L/32R northwest approximately 115 feet and decommissions Runway 14R/32L.
- No significant changes to flight traffic patterns or land use impacts.
Zoning

- Number of residences within Safety Zones A and B projected to decrease with the preferred alternative
- The MAC will convene a Joint Airport Zoning Board (JAZB) consistent with Minnesota Statutes
Socioeconomics

• The action will not significantly influence economic activity or cause any relocation or disruption of the community.
• Proposed non-aeronautical development on the north side of the Airport may result in some new economic activity, and generate some traffic in the area, but will not be significant in this developed urban area.
Environmental Justice

Definition: the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, with respect to environmental laws and policies

- Environmental justice populations are present near the Airport
- The proposed project does not disproportionately affect these residents.
Wetlands

- Wetlands evaluated with respect to federal Clean Water Act and state Wetland Conservation Act requirements
- Estimated wetland impacts of less than 1,000 square feet
- Disturbance likely below *de minimis* threshold; does not require replacement plan
Surface Water and Stormwater

- Changing and adding pavement at the Airport affects stormwater runoff and drainage
- Net increase of 1.2 acres of impervious surface
- Runoff to surrounding neighborhoods will not be affected
Other NEPA Categories

• Climate
  • Potential for preferred alternative to affect future climate conditions is limited

• Coastal Resources
  • No resources present

• Natural Resources and Energy Supply
  • Demand for natural resources and energy will not exceed available supplies

• Farmland
  • No resources present

• Protected Species
  • Endangered rusty-patched bumble bees and threatened northern long-eared bats are found in Hennepin County, but not on or near the airport

• Children’s Environmental Health and Safety
  • No disproportionate impacts are expected
## Summary of Environmental Consequences (DRAFT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact Category</th>
<th>Impacts: No-Action Alternative</th>
<th>Impacts: Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>Required Permitting/Mitigation &amp; Associated Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Minimal impacts during construction</td>
<td>Implement EPA-recommended best management practices (BMPs) and control strategies during construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Biological Resources (including fish, wildlife, and plants)** | Tree removal (ongoing maintenance) | Tree removal | - Tree removal to occur during NLEB dormant season (October 1 – April 30).  
- Implement April 2015 USFWS/AUSDOT NLEB avoidance and minimization measures.  
- Tree removal to occur outside of migratory bird nesting season (May – October). |
| **Climate**                   | None                           | None                           | None                                             |
| **Coastal Resources**         | None                           | None                           | None                                             |
| **DOT Section 4(f) Lands**    | Tree removal in Edgewood Park  | Tree removal in Edgewood Park  | FAA determination and City of Brooklyn Park Concurrence.  
- Tree removal BMPs.  
- Tree replacement and/or compensation. |
| **Farmlands**                 | None                           | None                           | Dispose of construction materials and solid waste in accordance with state and local laws. |
| **Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention** | None                           | None                           | None                                             |
| **Historic/Architectural & Archeological Resources** | None                           | None                           | None                                             |
| **Land Use**                  | Residential parcels in R1Z and state Safety Zones | Residential parcels in R1Z and state Safety Zones | Convene Joint Airport Zoning Board (JAZB) to revise the existing Airport Zoning Ordinance. |
| **Land Use**                  | R2Z conflicts                  | R2Z conflicts                  | None                                             |
| **Non-Aeronaautical**         | None                           | Change from airport zoning in non-aeronaucational development area | Change to City of Brooklyn Park land use zoning. |
| **Natural Resources and Energy Supply** | None                           | Minor increase in energy demand | None                                             |
| **Noise and Compatible Land Use** | Total of 11 residential parcels exposed to 65 DNL noise contour | Residential exposure to 65 DNL noise contour reduced to 4 parcels | Conduct noise level reduction testing of homes within the 65 DNL noise contour.  
- Update voluntary noise abatement plan.  
- Hold educational briefings with pilots. |
| **Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Health & Safety** | None                           | None                           | Energy efficient light-emitting diode (LED) light fixtures and visual screening methods to be considered during project design. |
| **Visual Effects (including light emissions)** | None                           | Extended airfield light systems | Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.  
- Onsite Best Management Practices.  
- NPDES Multi Sector General permit.  
- SCWMC permit. |
| **Water Resources**           | Surface Water & Stormwater     | None                           | None                                             |
|                                | Floodplains                    | None                           | Compliance with Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act.  
- Minnesota Pollution Control Act.  
- MPCA CWA Section 301 Water Quality Certification. |
|                                | Groundwater                    | None                           | None                                             |
|                                | Wetlands                       | None                           | None                                             |
|                                | Wastewater                     | None                           | None                                             |
| **Cumulative Impacts**        | No substantial impacts         | No substantial impacts         | None                                             |
Next Steps

- Publish Draft EA/EAW for public review and comment
- Public Hearing