

Metropolitan Airports Commission



Noise Oversight Committee

Regular Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, January 20, 2010

1:30 pm

msp
[mshairport.com](http://mspairport.com)

www.mshairport.com

**METROPOLITAN AIRPORTS COMMISSION
MSP NOISE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

20 January 2010, 1:30 p.m.
General Offices, Lindbergh Conference Room

Call to Order

A regularly scheduled meeting of the MSP Noise Oversight Committee (NOC), having been duly called, was held Wednesday, 20 January 2010, in the Lindbergh Conference Room of the Metropolitan Airports Commission's General Offices. Chair Wilcox called the meeting to order at 1:30pm. The following were in attendance:

Representatives: T. Valento, U. Duggan, K. Erazo, S. Holmes, D. Miller, V. Wilcox, M. Loeffelholz, T. Perillo, M. Otto, T. Fitzhenry, J. Bergman

Staff: C. Leqve, A. Nyren, J. Felger, D. Probst

Others: J. Larsen – Minnesota Environmental Quality Board; D. McKnight – City of Mendota Heights; A. Yeske – MSP FAA; C. Costello – City of Richfield; L. Petschel – Mendota Heights; J. Sedlacek – Mendota Heights; D. Rosemark – City of St. Paul; M. Summers – City of St. Paul; R. Friskney – South Metro Airport Action Council; C. Rydeen – MSP FAA

1. Review and Approval of the 11 November 2009 NOC Meeting Minutes

Representative Otto, Minneapolis, noted that his name should have been included in the list of "others" present at the 11 November 2009 meeting.

Representative Bergmann, At-large Representative, noted that his name should have been included in the list of "representatives" present at the 11 November 2009 meeting.

IT WAS MOVED BY REPRESENTATIVE DUGGAN AND SECONDED BY REPRESENTATIVE OTTO TO APPROVE THE 19 NOVEMBER 2009 MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED WITH THE ADDITION OF REPRESENTATIVES OTTO AND BERGMAN TO THE LIST OF MEETING ATTENDEES.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.

2. Nighttime Runway Use: FAA Response to Nighttime Parallel Runway Usage

Chad Leqve, Technical Advisor, reminded Committee members that the distribution of nighttime operations on the parallel runways at Minneapolis-St Paul International Airport (MSP) was an issue of concern raised by the City of Mendota Heights at a previous Committee meeting. He noted that the Committee sent a list of questions to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regarding the nighttime runway use at MSP. **Leqve** noted that the FAA responded in writing to those questions, and that the City of Mendota Heights raised additional questions regarding the FAA's response. The Committee agreed that the City of Mendota Heights should put those questions in writing and that the Committee

would forward them to the FAA for further response. **Leqve** noted that Carl Rydeen, FAA MSP Tower Manager, would address those questions at today's meeting.

Carl Rydeen, FAA MSP Tower Manager, noted that three factors play a part in runway usage for nighttime operations: an aircraft's origination gate; the number of operations taking place; and the number of aircraft in play and their destinations.

Rydeen addressed the City of Mendota Heights' questions as follows:

1. In 2002, 42 gates were added to the north concourse; 12R/30L remained the favored runway in 2003. No shift in runway use occurred at the time, why is it occurring now?

Rydeen stated that the nighttime traffic fleet mix was different at that time. He noted that there are more regional jets in the fleet mix at this time and that there are more regional jets located at gates closer to the north parallel runway; as a result, there is a higher number of departures off of the north parallel runway. He pointed out that use of CRJs specifically began increasing in June 2001, peaking at approximately 9000 operations in June 2008. He noted that use of A320 and A319 aircraft peaked in June 2005 and has been declining since.

2. Between 2001 and 2009 there have been many ups and downs in the number of airport operations. Despite that, there was a very good balance in nighttime operations prior to 17/35. Why has that changed?

Rydeen stated that he did not have specific nighttime data available for the time period prior to 2005. However, he recalled that, in approximately 2003-2004, there was a heavy departure bank of traffic scheduled between 10:30 and 11:15pm, mainly by main-line carriers. He pointed out that such a departure bank does not occur these days. **Rydeen** noted that the 2003-2004 departures did not typically originate out of the A and/or B concourses at the airport, which may have had an impact on the balance of departure operations.

3. In 2004, when the airport saw in excess of 540,000 operations, the use of the south parallel was still greater than the north parallel. Why in light of a 17% decrease in operations, including nighttime operations, would the FAA not have greater flexibility to achieve a better balance in the nighttime use of the parallels?

Rydeen stated that reduced traffic levels give tower personnel more opportunities to expedite the flow of traffic. He said that an aircraft's destination airport and its proximity to a runway from its departure gate can result in a higher number of departures off of the north parallel. He said this is obvious in the example of operations off of Runway 30R; a CRJ parked at Gate B13 would have a very long taxi to Runway 30L and a much shorter taxi to Runway 30R.

4. If not change is going to occur until the airport: 1) expands the gates at Humphrey and on the south concourse; 2) reaches 575,000 operations annually; 3) constructs the crossover taxiway, does that mean that the communities at the end of 12L and 30R have to wait 6-20 years to get relief from the current distribution of nighttime noise?

Rydeen pointed out that the FAA does not dictate which aircraft are parked at which gates at either of the terminals. He noted that such decisions are made by the airlines and by whoever owns the gates. He also pointed out that the FAA does not dictate which specific flights/destinations will operate during the nighttime. He noted that traffic volume and the destination airport of any given aircraft will have an impact on runway selection. He said that if, for example, an airline on the south side of the airport began a nighttime departure rush it would have an impact on the departure percentages.

5. Is the greater use of the north parallel more related to reduced taxi distance to/from gates, and therefore fuel savings, than it is to numbers of operations?

Rydeen said that the use of the north parallel is related to where an aircraft originates from, the aircraft's destination and the number of operations at that time of night. **Rydeen** noted that, of the 44 operations proposed to take place between 9:45-10:15pm on Tuesday, 12 January 2010, 31 had destinations that would have taken them to the north parallel runway for departure and 13 had destinations that would have taken them to the south parallel runway for departure. However, there were only 10 departures between 9:35 and 10:33pm on Runway 12R and there were 34 departures between 9:42 and 10:35pm off of Runway 12L. He noted that one operation, NWA2330 was parked at Gate F13, closer to Runway 12R, but went to Runway 12L based on its destination. **Rydeen** noted that there were good weather conditions on 12 January 2010 and that poor weather conditions likely would have pushed back the bank of operations into later hours. **Rydeen** pointed out that aircraft departing Runway 12R make a right turn when in the air, and aircraft departing Runway 12L make a left turn in the air; directing aircraft to specific runways allows them to "cross" each other on the ground, rather than in the air, which is preferable from a safety perspective.

6. Why does the number of operations matter in relation to takeoffs/landings in light of the statement: "With reduced levels of traffic, controllers have more opportunities to expedite the traffic flow"? Wouldn't this give them greater flexibility to assign the crossover runway?

Rydeen stated that one of Air Traffic Control's primary duties, after preventing collisions, is to organize and expedite the flow of traffic. He said that lower traffic levels allow controllers to safely direct an aircraft to the closest runway associated with its parking location, which is consistent with expediting the flow of traffic.

7. If, according to RUS policy, there is to be no difference shown for the use of either parallel over the other, why is a clear preference being shown for using the north parallel for departures and the south parallel for landings?

If the FEIS and the RUS are not adhered to, what assurance do we have that today's standard procedure does not become standard operating procedure in perpetuity?

Rydeen said that, from an Air Traffic Control perspective, other than adhering to the RUS there is no percentage preference for one runway over another. He did say there are operationally-based preferences, based on where an aircraft is going. He said the ATC complies with the RUS. **Rydeen** stated that runway selections are a factor of traffic volume, an aircraft's destination and an aircraft's parking location. He said that runway selections would change as traffic volume and parking locations change.

8. How do the current runway use percentages match-up with those estimated under the FEIS for Runway 17-35? What relief is or will be provided now that 17-35 is fully operational and its impact on the airport is more fully understood?

Rydeen noted that Table A-6 of the 2003 Environmental Assessment for Runway 17-35 showed a revised forecast of 12.5% nighttime departure operations off of Runway 12L and 18.6% nighttime operations departures off of Runway 12R. He pointed out that the 2009 nighttime operations data show 18.7% departure operations for Runway 12L and 19.4% for departure operations on Runway 12R. He noted the percentages are skewed because of Runway 12L having been closed for reconstruction for two months. **Rydeen** pointed out that the 2008 nighttime operations data show 24.9% departure operations for Runway 12L and 20.1% for Runway 12R.

9. Flights were routinely being taxied to Runway 17 at night in 2007. Why couldn't they be taxied the much shorter distance to Runway 12R?

Rydeen noted that Air Traffic Control Tower staff conducted a review of nighttime Runway 17 departures in 2007. The review revealed that traffic volume at that time normally did not justify the use of Runway 17. In conjunction with the RUS, tower personnel re-directed aircraft that normally would have departed off of Runway 17 to Runway 12L.

10. Please provide a comparison of the nighttime RUS today vs. nighttime RUS in the 1990s and early 2000s (compared to opening Runway 17-35).

Rydeen said he did not have data for the 1990s. He provided a graphic showing the pre-Runway 17-35 RUS and the existing (post-Runway 17-35) RUS. They are:

Pre-Runway 17-35:

Departures

1. Runways 12L and 12R
2. Balanced Use of Runway 4-22
3. Runways 30L and 30R

Arrivals

1. Runways 30L and 30R
2. Balanced Use of Runway 4-22
3. Runways 12L and 12R

Existing (Post-Runway 17-35):

Departures

1. Runways 12L and 12R
2. Runway 17
3. Balanced Use of Runway 4-22
4. Runways 30L and 30R

Arrivals

1. Runways 30L and 30R
2. Runway 35
3. Balanced Use of Runway 4-22
4. Runways 12L and 12R

Rydeen said he is confident Air Traffic Control is complying with the existing RUS.

11. How often at nighttime is the Crossing-in-the-Corridor used vs. the number of hours that it could potentially be used (with a single controller)?

Rydeen noted that this topic has been briefed to the Committee in the past, and that it was briefed by his predecessor to the MASAC group also. He noted that the Crossing-in-the-Corridor procedure can be conducted only when one tower controller (i.e., one local controller) is in operation. He said that use of the procedure should be expected during nighttime hours when traffic volumes permit. **Rydeen** noted that tower supervisors are briefed – and were most recently briefed on 7 January 2010 – regarding the need to use the Crossing-in-the-Corridor procedure when traffic conditions allow. He pointed out that tower supervisors will continue to monitor use of the procedure and make appropriate corrections when they observe discrepancies.

Rydeen noted that, in November 2009, 16.2% of nighttime departures were off of Runway 12L and 39.3% were off of Runway 12R. He pointed out, however, that the total number of departures was 191, which was very low compared to October 2009 when there were 803 total nighttime departure operations. There were 445 total nighttime departure operations in December 2009. **Rydeen** said that the average nighttime traffic was 26.7/night in October 2009; 6.36/night in November 2009; and 14.83/night in December 2009. He said there were 34 total nighttime departures by CRJ aircraft in November, and 79 total CRJ nighttime departures in December. He also pointed out that in November 2009 Runway 12L was closed for six nights for maintenance, and Runway 12R was closed for three nights for maintenance.

Representative Duggan, Mendota Heights, thanked Rydeen for the information provided at today's meeting. He asked that copies of the information provided be made available to all Committee members. **Leqve** said that he would obtain a copy of Rydeen's presentation and distribute it to Committee members. **Representative Valento, MBAA**, pointed out that a lot of General Aviation (GA) aircraft are similar CRJs, and he asked how the data Rydeen presented would change GA data were included in the numbers Rydeen presented. **Rydeen** stated that GA data are included in the information he presented; he noted that almost all GA aircraft operating at that time depart off of the south parallel runway. Duggan said he would convey the information provided today to the Mendota Heights Airport Relations Commission for its review and response, if any.

3. Minneapolis-St Paul International Airport (MSP) Pilot Guide

Chad Leqve, Technical Advisor, noted that the Minneapolis-St Paul International Airport (MSP) Pilot Guide, developed by MAC staff, summarizes- for pilots - noise abatement procedures in place at MSP and includes facility and communication information. He pointed out that the guide has been designed and formatted to fit into a pilot's Jeppesen Charts binder for easy access and reference. **Leqve** noted that, if approved by the Committee, MAC staff would work with the Committee's pilot representatives for distribution to the pilot community.

IT WAS MOVED BY REPRESENTATIVE VALENTO AND SECONDED BY REPRESENTATIVE DUGGAN TO ENDORSE THE MSP PILOT GUIDE FOR PRESENTATION TO THE FD&E COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL, AND TO DIRECT STAFF TO DISTRIBUTE THE GUIDE IN COORDINATION WITH AIRPORT USERS.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.

4. Minneapolis-St Paul International Airport (MSP) Long-term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) Update

Dennis Probst, MAC Deputy Executive Director, noted that the MAC began work on an update to the Minneapolis-St Paul International Airport (MSP) Long-term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) in 2008 but put those efforts on hold until the Delta Air Lines – Northwest merger was completed. He noted that the MAC has met several times with the Committee-represented cities about the update. **Probst** noted that the 2020 Conceptual Plan for MSP called for construction of a new terminal, re-construction of the existing Lindbergh Terminal, demolition of existing parking ramps, the addition of an underground people-mover between terminals, and re-construction of Cedar Avenue and Highway 62 to improve airport access. He pointed out that this plan was driven, in large part, by the existence of Northwest's Building B complex at MSP. He noted that Northwest no longer exists and that the Building B complex has been mostly demolished, creating the opportunity for a new long-term plan.

Probst noted that the new 20-year plan focuses, with the exception of one significant taxiway improvement, on terminal improvements at Terminal 1-Lindbergh and Terminal 2-Humphrey. He said the focus on improvements to passenger facilities is driven by the forecast increase from 32 million passengers in 2009 to 56+ million passengers in 2030. He noted that those forecast numbers will be inaccurate at any one specific moment in time, but he stated that the passenger and operations data are tracked closely by the MAC. He said that the peak in operations was 540,000+ operations in 2005, and that there were, approximately, just under 430,000 operations at MSP in 2009. **Probst** said those numbers indicate that the airfield will continue to function in its current configuration through the 2030 planning timeline. He said that if the forecasts are correct, the MAC anticipates approximately 630,000 operations by 2030. He noted that the MAC had been implementing the previous improvement plan based on a 65% load factor on aircrafts. He pointed out that carriers are routinely achieving over 80% load factor on aircrafts, meaning more passengers at an airport.

Probst noted that Phase 1 (2010-2015) of the LTCP will focus on improvements at Terminal 2-Humphrey, based on the forecasts that show all non-SkyTeam members at MSP migrating to that terminal from Terminal 1-Lindbergh. He said such a migration will require 17 additional gates at Terminal 2-Humphrey – seven to the north and 10 to the south – and one additional international arrival-capable gate. He noted there are two auto rental facility areas proposed in the LTCP for Terminal 2-Humphrey in order to balance passenger service facilities between that terminal and Terminal 1-Lindbergh. This approach would be less costly than a consolidated auto rental facility and would provide greater customer service. **Chair Wilcox** asked if the MAC has met with the Metropolitan Council and MN Department of Transportation regarding the LTCP. **Probst** said the MAC has been before the Metropolitan Council and that the MN Department of Transportation is aware of the proposed changes in the LTCP, but that neither entity has airport-related highway/road improvements included in its long-term planning at this time. **Probst** said he anticipates receiving comments on the issue during the public comment period for the LTCP, which begins today. **Wilcox** noted that the proposed LTCP changes and the City of Bloomington's plans for the area to the south of MSP will have an impact on the 34th Avenue area, and he suggested it would not be out of place for the MAC and the City of Bloomington to encourage the MN Department of Transportation to consider those impacts now. **Probst** said that the MAC is examining the possibility of using Post Road as the primary access to Terminal 2-Humphrey, which could relieve some of the traffic load on 34th Avenue.

Probst noted that Phase 1 (2015-2020) of the LTCP will focus on improvement at Terminal 1-Lindbergh. He said that in June 2015 improvements to the E Concourse would begin, as well as

improvements to the ticketing lobby. Phase 2 would also see improvements to the baggage claim area. **Probst** said that an expansion of the terminal, which would include the addition of a people-mover to the G Concourse, and an addition to the Terminal 1-Lindbergh parking complex would be completed by the end of 2020. Also during Phase 2, deicing pads would be re-located to maintain deicing capabilities.

Probst said that during Phase 3 (2020-2025), improvements would occur at both Terminal 1-Lindbergh and Terminal 2-Humphrey, with nine gates and additional parking being added at Terminal 2-Humphrey. He noted that changes at Terminal 1-Lindbergh, including terminal expansion on the G Concourse, will have an impact on some Delta facilities, including the run-up pad which may need to be moved. If it is approved, an airport hotel would be built during Phase 3, and changes to the Inbound/Outbound roadway would begin. **Probst** noted the roadway changes would be necessary due to the proposed building of a new A Concourse to the south of the existing concourse to accommodate larger aircraft. The roadway changes would also be necessary to accommodate a new cross-over taxiway, which would be built during Phase 4.

Probst said the estimated total cost for the 20-year plan is between \$2-2.4bn.

Probst noted the 30-day public comment period for the LTCP began today and will run through 19 February 2010. He said there will be two public meetings on the LTCP in February 2010.

Chad Leqve, Technical Advisor, noted that the forecast 2030 noise contours are larger than the 2008 base-case noise contours. He noted there were 449,972 total operations at MSP in 2008, and that the forecast total number of operations for 2030 is 630,837, a 40% increase in total operations. He noted that the total INM nighttime (10:00pm – 7:00am) operations increase from 128.5 average daily operations to 176.3 average daily operations. Given the 10 decibel penalty assigned in INM to nighttime operations, the equivalent daily operations number then is an increase of 478 operations. **Leqve** said the 2030 forecasted runway use calls for an increase in the use of Runway 17 for departure operations to 30%. In addition, the 2030 forecast calls for growth in the use of A320/319 and B737-800-sized aircraft at MSP, along with larger regional jet aircraft such as the Embraer 170 & 190 and the Canadair 900, which are 70- to 100-seat jets. He said the forecast 2030 65 DNL contour is 49.4% larger than the 2008 65 DNL contour, and the forecast 2030 60 DNL contour is 55.6% larger than the 2008 60 DNL contour.

Leqve said that the forecast 2030 runway use percentages are consistent with what was shown in the forecast 2015 environmental assessment. He noted the forecast 2030 runway use percentage for Runway 17 is 30.3%.

Leqve noted that the forecast 2030 60 DNL contour does, in some areas, extend beyond the 2007 mitigated 60 DNL contour. He noted that the 2007 forecast, which lays out the mitigation eligibility area for the Consent Decree, was for 582,366 total operations and he reminded Committee members that the 2030 forecast is for 630,837 total operations – an 8% increase in operations. He noted that the total INM nighttime operation forecast for 2030 is 176.3 average daily operations, up from 123.3 daily operations in 2007. Given the 10 decibel penalty assigned in INM to nighttime operations, the equivalent daily operations total is 530 operations. He said the total acreage of the forecast 2030 65 DNL contour is 18.1% larger than the 2007 65 DNL contour acreage, and the acreage of the forecast 2030 60 DNL contour is 28.5% larger than the 2007 60 DNL contour. **Leqve** noted that 2 single-family homes and 54 multi-family homes would be added to the 65+ DNL contours in the 2030 forecast (across Bloomington, Burnsville, Eagan, Mendota, Mendota Heights, Minneapolis, and Richfield), and that 5620 single-family and 3162 multi-family homes would be added to the 60-64 DNL contour in the

2030 forecast. **Leqve** noted that the 2030 forecasted contours are larger than the 2007 mitigated contours, but he said that information should be tempered with the fact that the contours are in the context of a 20-year forecast. He said it will be important to see how the assumptions built in to the 2010 LTCP bear out when an update to the LTCP is conducted in 2015.

Representative Otto, Minneapolis, noted that the forecast 2030 contour assumes the existence of a cross-over taxiway at MSP, and he asked if forecast contours had been generated without the existence of such a taxiway. He said that the use of a cross-over taxiway allows for a fairly balanced use of the parallel runways. **Leqve** reiterated that the forecast 2030 runway use percentages are consistent with the 2015 forecast percentages, and he noted that market demand will have an impact on runway use, as it does now, as Carl Rydeen noted in his earlier presentation today. **Otto** noted that the largest growth of the forecast 2030 noise contour occurs in residentially-developed areas, and he asked if anything can be done regarding mitigating those areas and if any money is being budgeted for noise mitigation in the 20-year improvement planning. **Leqve** noted that the MAC is bound by the court-ordered Consent Decree in terms of noise mitigation efforts. He pointed out that airports typically use a 5-year planning span when looking at noise issues, and that the 20-year improvement plan is obviously beyond that. He said that discussions about noise and noise mitigation will be better served when 5-year operations data are available in 2015 when the next update to the LTCP is conducted. **Probst** added that progression with the LTCP will take place in response to demonstrated need and/or requests by the carriers. He noted that the aviation industry is still volatile and that, while the MAC is reasonably hopeful that its forecasts are accurate, changes could take place in the industry that would change the forecast outlook.

Representative Duggan, Mendota Heights, said it appears there is a discrepancy between a forecasted increase of 75% of passenger use of facilities, a 40% increase in operations and a 27% in aircraft capacity. **Probst** said that the numbers indicate more passengers per aircraft, which means more passengers utilizing the airport facilities even if fewer aircraft are operating into and out of the airport.

Representative Miller, Eagan, asked if the relatively small increase in the forecast 2030 noise contour – as compared to the 2008 actual contour - over the corridor area is a function of the parallel runways already being near or at capacity, while the larger increase in the 2030 contour to the north of the airport is a function of Runway 17 not being at capacity at this time. **Leqve** said that it is because, in a southeast operation flow and high-demand time period, Runway 17 can be used to absorb some of the departure operations to increase airport efficiency. He noted that adherence to the RUS is promoted when safety and operational considerations allow.

Probst noted that if any of the NOC-represented communities would like, the MAC would be happy to meet with them again regarding the LTCP.

5. Public Comment Period

Chair Wilcox noted that requests for public comments must be forwarded to the appropriate Committee member prior to the beginning of a meeting and approved by the Committee. He noted that no requests for public comments were received.

The next meeting of the NOC is scheduled for Wednesday, 17 March 2010.

The meeting adjourned at 2:43pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Christene Sirois Kron, Recording Secretary
612.725.6455
christene.siroskron@mspmac.org