

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Response to Comments**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

## COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

### ANOKA COUNTY-BLAINE AIRPORT LONG TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

On Thursday, July 10, 1997, a public hearing was held at the Blaine City Hall regarding the Long-Term Comprehensive Plan Update for Anoka County-Blaine Airport. An open forum public information meeting preceded the hearing. This public hearing was held in conformance with the Commission action of June 16, 1997. MAC Commissioners, Edward Fiore and Georgiann Stenerson served as hearing officers.

Following a brief presentation on the findings of the plan by The Airport Technology and Planning Group, Inc. (AirTech), the hearing was opened for public comment. Seventeen persons made statements for the public record. Written comments were accepted through July 25, 1997. Ten written comments were received. A transcript of the entire public hearing, and copies of the written comments, are appended with this report.

The following paragraphs present the response to the written and oral comments. The number associated with each response corresponds to the appropriate comment.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Response to Letter 1 (J. Rusch)** - Mr. Rusch's opposition to the proposed east-west runway extension and Airport expansion is noted. The FAA sets forth noise standards for airports in the "Airport Environmental Handbook, Order 5050.4A." In addition to the FAA's requirements, the Metropolitan Council Guidelines suggest additional analysis, based on the FAA's standards, for airports within its seven-county jurisdiction. As discussed in Chapter 4 of the LTCP, all noise impacts associated with FAA required contours are located on the Airport property. Metropolitan Council Noise Exposure Zone's A through C are contained on Airport property. Since 1992, there have been seven aircraft accidents at or near the Anoka County-Blaine Airport. The four on-Airport accidents occurred on the runways and resulted in no injuries.

**Response to Letter 2 (T. & D. Field)** - Their concerns are noted. Since Anoka County-Blaine Airport is a public airport, it is open to all general aviation aircraft. Acrobatic maneuvers are not allowed at the Airport. If these activities are observed, the air traffic control tower (ATCT) should be notified. MAC has not "kicked out" the pilot in question. MAC invited this operator to move to Anoka County-Blaine Airport based on the requirements of his aircraft. Anoka County Blaine Airport is more suitable for this specific aircraft. There are no scheduled service airlines located at the Airport. There are several companies that provide air charter and/or air cargo services (flying passengers and materials on demand). This type of activity is compatible with the Airport's Minor airport status.

#### **Response to Letter 3 (Sue Weber)**

1. In 1995, there were 900 jet operations per year at the Airport. Jet operations accounted for approximately 0.5 percent of all the operations. By 2015, number of jet operations is projected to increase to 3,300 or 1.2 percent of total operations. It is likely that the number of jet operations will continue to increase, even without lengthening the east-west runway. According to air traffic control personnel; almost all jet traffic uses the north-south runway since its length increases the margin of safety. Therefore, without extending the east-west runway, all future jet traffic will continue to use the north-south runway.
2. Comment is noted.

3. Comment is noted.
4. Comment is noted. PFC funding, which is collected from passengers using MSP, is not used for MAC reliever airports.
5. Anoka County-Blaine is a Minor use facility and will continue to be developed according to the Metropolitan Council's Aviation Guide..
6. Comment is noted.

**Response to Letter 4 (J. Cargill)** - The comprehensive plan recommends the installation of a precision approach on the east-west runway. MAC is committed to providing the safest airport facility possible. Mr. Cargill's other comments are noted.

**Response to Letter 5 (R. Monahan, AMJET)** - AMJET's support of the recommended development is noted.

**Response to Letter 6 (City of Mounds View)** A general comment is that the City is using an out-of-date draft LTCP Update (July 1996 rather than the most up-to-date May 1997 version). The May 1997 draft was the one released for public review prior to the hearing.

1. Page 1-5 of the May 1997 draft LTCP Update contains a history and description of the Stipulation Agreement (a.k.a. Order) as referenced. A copy of the Stipulation Agreement/Order will be added to the final document.
2. The May 1997 draft LTCP Update contains a copy of the August 1996 Draft Noise Abatement Plan for the Airport. The plan is summarized on pages 4-7 and 4-8. Prior to the draft noise abatement plan, a Field Order was in place that outlined acceptable airport operation procedures. The City's position is noted.
3. Anoka County-Blaine Airport is a Minor Airport and ARC B-II standards are consistent with a Minor Airport. The City of Mounds View alleges that the LTCP "improperly uses" the FAA's Airport Reference Code (ARC), Approach Category B, Design Group II standard (ARC B-II) for defining design standards for capital improvements at the Anoka County-Blaine Airport. The City contends that an out-of-date method describing the types of aircraft using the Airport, i.e. Class D and E, is more appropriate. MAC's position is that the Anoka County-Blaine Airport, like other Minor Airports, such as Flying Cloud, Airlake, and Lake Elmo, is designed in accordance with FAA's current ARC B-II standards.

In the way of background it must be noted that in 1978, the Metropolitan Council developed its first Aviation Systems Plan. That plan attempted to describe various types of airports needed to support aviation demand within the Metropolitan area. In an effort to describe the typical characteristics of various airports, the Council categorized aircraft as type "E" to reflect the single engine propeller aircraft and type "D" to denote twin engine aircraft. Type "C" aircraft represent large corporate jets. The AA, A, and B categories reflect larger commercial airliners. By the Council's definition, MSP was the Region's Major Airport, St. Paul Downtown was the Intermediate Airport, and the remaining MAC airports are Minor Airports.

At that time, circa 1977-1978, the FAA classified airports as Basic and General Utility, Basic Transport, General Transport, and Air Carrier. The FAA category for the Anoka County-Blaine Airport was General Utility.

In 1989, the FAA completed a major revision of its planning and design guidelines and established the "ARC" system to define airports by using a combination of aircraft operating

characteristics (approach speed) and aircraft dimensions (wingspan). For the Anoka County-Blaine Airport, the design aircraft characteristics included aircraft having approach speeds up to 121 knots and wingspans up to 79 feet. Within the regional system, all Minor airports, except Crystal Airport, are classified as ARC B-II. The ARC B-II design category does not set any maximum aircraft weight limits. For MAC airports, however, all Minor Airports, except Crystal Airport, have a single-wheel design strength of 30,000 pounds.

In summary, the Anoka County-Blaine Airport is a Minor Airport as defined by the Metropolitan Development Guide. By FAA definition, the Airport is a reference category B-II airport. The Airport should be designed to safely accommodate single and twin engine propeller aircraft, as well as some business and small corporate jet aircraft. Exhibit 3-1 correctly depicts examples of "typical" and "design" aircraft.

4. In May 1986, the Metropolitan Council updated its Aviation Chapter of the Metropolitan Development Guide. This update changed the categorization of a Minor Airport to include runway lengths between 2,500 and 5,000 feet. The Order, dated July 1986, specifically states that ... "MAC agrees to develop the Anoka County-Blaine Airport, consistent with the requirements of state law and the Metropolitan Development Guide, as of the date of this Agreement, as a "Minor use" airport. The Order was signed at least two months after the Guide was amended to allow Minor Airports to have 5,000 foot long runways.

Page 3-11 and 3-12 of the May 1997 LTCP Update have detailed runway length data justifying a 5,000 foot long runway.

5. As discussed above, ARC B-II design standard are warranted and not in conflict with the Master Plan and Order. ARC A-I design standards are not appropriate. The 1983 Master Plan recommends that Runway 8R/26L be widened to 100 feet. As previously noted, a 100 foot runway width is appropriate for B category runways with a precision approach having visibility minimums below 3/4 statute mile,
6. The May 1997 draft LTCP Update recommends that Runway 17R/35L be developed to a length of 4,855 feet. The LTCP no longer contains the referenced statement.
7. As discussed above, ARC B-II design standards are considered appropriate. The taxiway width recommended in the May 1997 LTCP Update has been revised since the July 1996 draft. The recommended width is now 40 feet, not 35 feet. MAC typically constructs taxiways to width of 40 feet to facilitate snow removal. The FAA allows design parameters to be exceeded as long as Federal funding is not requested for the additional portion of the project. MAC typically does not request Federal funding for such projects. The 1983 Master Plan states that taxiways parallel to a non-precision runway should be separated by at least 200 feet. A maximum distance is not stipulated. A 300-foot taxiway separation improves the safety and operational flexibility of the runway/taxiway system with little additional cost or impact to the land envelope.
8. Operational demand, as projected in Chapter 2, indicates that the number of operations is expected to increase to 272,300 by 2015. Without the addition of a parallel runway(s), the Airport cannot accommodate projected demand. Table 2-8 presents the projected fleet mix for the planning period. Approximately 232,500 operations by single engine aircraft and 35,400 operations by multi-engine aircraft are anticipated by 2015. As indicated in the capacity section, the theoretical number of operations the Airport can accommodate without capacity enhancing improvements is 230,000. FAA planning guidelines suggest initiating planning for improvements when an airport reaches 60 percent of available capacity and to construct them when operations surpass 80 percent of available capacity. The 1983 Master Plan identified the need for parallel runways.

9. The May 1997 draft LTCP Update does not recommend a GPS precision approach to Runway 17R. A non-precision GPS approach is recommended. Runway 17L currently has a non-precision approach. When Runway 17R/35L is constructed it will replace the current north-south runway (Runway 17L/35R) as the primary north-south runway. Therefore, a non-precision approach is warranted. PAPIs are not indicative of a precision approach; they are primarily used during VFR approaches. PAPIs are a replacement for the older VASI system. VASIs were recommended for all runways in the 1983 Master Plan.
10. The future storage requirements are not based on ARC design standards. The future storage requirements are based on maintaining the existing aircraft to hangar storage ratio. As additional aircraft base at the Airport, additional storage facilities will be needed. Table 2-4 presents the existing and projected based aircraft fleet mix. While the percentage of single-engine aircraft is projected to decline slightly (90 percent to 88 percent), the total number of single-engine based aircraft is projected to increase from approximately 387 to 482. Multi-engine aircraft are expected to increase from 35 to 55 during the planning period. To accommodate this demand additional hangars will be required.
11. The majority of the existing "historic" aircraft based at Anoka County-Blaine Airport meet ARC B-II design standards. As previously stated, an ARC B-II design standard is appropriate for Anoka County-Blaine Airport and its role as a Minor Airport. There are several historic aircraft based at the Airport that have a wingspan greater than 79 feet. These aircraft reportedly make less than 150 operations per year, and are therefore not considered the overall design aircraft for the Airport. Historic and unique aircraft, in general, cannot be prohibited from using a public airport. Such a policy would be discriminatory and in conflict with Federal mandates.
12. As previously stated, an ARC B-II design standard is appropriate for Anoka County-Blaine Airport.
13. Following revisions based on the response to comments, the LTCP Update will be presented to MAC for approval. Following MAC approval, the LTCP Update will be submitted to the Metropolitan Council for a determination of consistency with the Metropolitan Development Guide.

#### **Response to Letter 7 (City of Circle Pines)**

1. The City of Circle Pines' opposition to the recommendations contained in the LTCP Update are noted. The FAA and the MnDOT have established distinct safety areas located off runway ends to protect area residents. These safety areas are contained on Airport property and do not have residential or public gathering places located in them. Chapter 4 contains a full description of the various required safety zones and Anoka County-Blaine's compliance. Taxes do not support development at MAC reliever airports. Development projects are funded through revenues generated from concession, parking, and land leases.
2. The LTCP Update evaluated future development based on projected activity. These projections follow accepted planning guidelines are consistent with projections contained in the FAA Terminal Area Forecast. While planning for future projects is based on projected activity, projects will not be constructed until there is a demonstrated demand.
3. While the Airport would continue to function as a reliever without improvements, its ability to accommodate the growing number of aircraft in the Metropolitan Area would be compromised. There are no other reliever facilities that can be expanded in the northern section of the Metropolitan Area. A map of the Metropolitan system is provided in Chapter 1. There are no private fields that have the land and airside capacity and or facilities to accommodate the projected demand. The Minneapolis-St. Paul area has experienced a

fairly significant increase in based aircraft. For the nation as a whole, many reliever systems have experienced declining activity. The Metropolitan Council prepared a system wide reliever study in the late 1980's. This study indicated that the projected demand for aviation facilities could surpass the capacity of the existing system of airports, including the MAC relievers by 2010.

4. The recommendation to lengthen the east-west runway is not solely based on the projection that the number of projected future aircraft. As is discussed in Chapter 4, the extension of the runway would allow the ATCT to evenly distribute the jet aircraft between north-south and east-west arrivals and departures. Extending the runway will increase the safety margins for aircraft operating in instrument conditions (periods of reduced visibility). The expenditure of funds is not geared solely toward the projected increase in aircraft. All existing based and transient aircraft would benefit from the Airport improvements. In addition, the efficiency of the entire system would be improved.
5. The regression analysis was not used as the preferred methodology to project based aircraft at the Airport. While this method was studied, a linear growth trend was selected as the preferred methodology. A regression analysis was used to project aircraft in the Metropolitan Area. While this information is useful to show how the number of aircraft in the region is expected to increase, this data was not directly used in the forecast of based aircraft. The methodology used is detailed in Chapter 2.
6. There is no plan to redistribute the existing Metropolitan fleet of based aircraft. It is assumed that Airports that are constrained by limited land envelopes (i.e. Crystal Airport) will not be able to add significant numbers of based aircraft in the future.
7. Justification of the runway extension is not solely based on the additional aircraft projected to operate at the Airport. As discussed in Chapter 3, a runway extension will increase the efficiency of the Airport and allow the Airport to shift between east-west and north south operations at the ATCT's discretion. In addition, safety is enhanced by providing a longer runway for use with the planned precision approach. Aircraft using the precision approach, which is planned for the east-west runway, will benefit from a 5,000-foot long runway due to the fact that the precision approach aids aircraft landing during periods of reduced visibility.
8. This comment is noted.
9. The Airport is currently finalizing development of the western building area. This area will allow the Airport to store additional aircraft. In addition, the Airport has the land envelope to accommodate additional aircraft storage areas. Regional demand for additional aircraft storage is evident in that the number of registered aircraft in the Metropolitan Area has historically increased. As additional aircraft base at the Airport, it is logical to assume that the number of operations will increase.
10. A more precise evaluation of potential environmental impacts is addressed in a Federal EA/State EIS. A Federal EA/State EIS may be required prior to developing the proposed building area. In addition, Federal and State permitting will be required if wetland fill is required. As is discussed in Chapter 3, a minimum impact scenario has been developed that can accommodate approximately 60 hangars with minimum wetland impact. This scenario was developed to avoid wetlands and should be more than adequate to accommodate demand for aircraft storage during the planning period. The 50 acres of wetlands is a "worst case" scenario that assumes the entire northwestern quadrant would be developed. Again, extensive environmental analysis, permitting, and mitigation would be required prior to the development shown in Exhibit 3-9.

11. A Federal EA/State EIS would be required prior to development of any major project, i.e. runway extension, new runway, major new building area, etc. The Federal EA/State EIS will contain an analysis of the "no-build" alternative.
12. When wind conditions permit, the ATCT could operate the Airport in a balanced manner. This operational pattern is not currently part of the ATCT's standard procedure. It should be noted that light, slow single-engine aircraft are more adversely impacted by crosswinds. The Airport currently has an established standard pattern. A standard pattern is flexible, however, in that it varies based on the number of aircraft operating at one time, pilot skill, wind conditions, etc.
13. As is shown on Exhibit 3-5, extending the runway to the west will cause the MnDOT Zones A and B to extend further outside the Airport's land envelope. MAC will update the airport layout plan (ALP) following the approval of the LTCP Update. The ALP will contain a more detailed design of the Airport. Prior to the construction of a major runway project, a Federal EA/State EIS may be required to further identify development alternatives.
14. As previously discussed, a runway extension is justified. The projection methodology is explained in previous paragraphs. As noted in Chapter 3, LTCP Update, a runway width of 100 feet is required to support an instrument approach with visibility minimums lower than 3/4 statute mile. The proposed ILS approach would provide approach minimums lower than 3/4 statute mile.
15. Recommendations regarding parallel runways and additional hangar space have been discussed previously.
16. All capital projects are justified. Phasing may change based on future demand levels.

#### **Response to Letter 8 - (City of Lexington)**

1. Chapter 2, LTCP Update, contains a detailed discussion of the methodology used to prepare the projections of aviation demand. The City of Lexington's opposition is noted.
2. In 1996, MAC records indicate that the Airport accommodated 192,000 operations.
3. The decrease in operations between 1990 and 1995 is noted. This decline is discussed on page 2-7 of the LTCP Update.
4. The Airport is not currently operating at full capacity. As indicated in the capacity section, the theoretical number of operations the Airport can accommodate without capacity enhancing improvements is 230,000. It is considered sound planning to identify improvements when an airport reaches 60 percent of available capacity and to construct them when operations surpass 80 percent of available capacity. Even with the addition of the ATCT, the Airport is currently operating in excess of 60 percent of its available operational capacity. Planning for capacity enhancing projects is warranted and prudent. As discussed in the LTCP Update, the construction of parallel runways will be a function of demand and funding.
5. Anoka County-Blaine Airport is defined as a Minor Airport in the Metropolitan Guide. The plan does not change nor violate that definition.
6. The change in the definition of a Minor Airport was completed in May 1986, when the Metropolitan Council updated its Aviation Chapter of the Metropolitan Development Guide. This update changed the categorization of a Minor Airport to include runway lengths

between 2,500 and 5,000 feet. The Order, dated July 1986, specifically states that ... "MAC agrees to develop the Anoka County-Blaine Airport, consistent with the requirements of state law and the Metropolitan Development Guide, as of the date of this Agreement, as a "Minor use" airport. The Order was signed at least two months after the Guide was amended to allow Minor Airports to have 5,000 foot long runways.

7. The City's concerns are noted. The FAA and MnDOT have established standards for safety zones off airport runway ends. Anoka County-Blaine Airport exceeds these standards. These standards are discussed in detail in Chapter 3. Future noise contours for the Airport, as required by the FAA and the Metropolitan Council, are contained on Airport property. A detailed discussion of noise is contained in Chapter 4.
8. The ATCT became operational on October 1, 1996 and the majority of the aircraft operations will favor the north-south flight pattern. Implementation of the extended east-west runway will allow an opportunity to more equitably distribute the operations. Aircraft operating altitudes are prescribed to maximize safety to both the Airport users and the people on the ground.
9. Air cargo activity is permitted at the Airport as well as all other MAC public airports. Scheduled airline cargo flights do not operate at any of MAC's Minor airports. The air cargo activity at these airports are normally small package shipments using general aviation aircraft. Wetland impacts have been discussed in Response to Letter 6.
10. The City of Lexington's comments are noted.

#### **Response to Letter 9 - (City of Blaine)**

1. Runway Protection Zone - The City's comment is noted. Once the LTCP Update is approved, MAC and the communities adjacent to the Airport, will work towards implementing MnDOT zoning guidelines.
2. Hangar Use - The City's comment is noted.
3. Utilities - MAC is currently investigating how best to serve the Anoka County-Blaine Airport with sewer and water services. Among the alternatives being considered is the possibility of limiting service to only commercially leased properties, such as the FBOs.
4. Noise - The City's comment is noted.
5. East Building Area Expansion - The final phasing of the future building areas has not been finalized. The phasing presented in the CIP could be modified following additional review of construction impacts, i.e., noise, land use, wetlands, etc. MAC will continue to work with the City to minimize impacts from on-Airport construction. The section on the eastern building area will be modified to indicate that adequate buffers will be constructed when this area is developed.
6. Airport Property Land Use - The City's comments regarding land use are noted. Locating a golf course adjacent to the Airport is currently under study.

#### **Response to Letter 10 - (Coon Creek Watershed District)**

1. The area under consideration is very limited (approximately five acres) and , therefore, economical alternatives are limited. The proposed annex contains only 11 hangars. The final LTCP will reflect that the area south of the south access road was deleted from the

project. Alternative concepts for the eastern building area will not be prepared until such a time that development is anticipated.

2. This exhibit was prepared prior to the completion of the access road. MAC is currently delineating wetlands in this area. The purpose of Exhibit 3-7 is to depict typical hangar layouts. The hangars shown south of the east-west road will be removed from the plan to avoid wetlands.
3. Page 3-30 will be revised.
4. The pavement rehabilitated appears to be the same as reviewed by Board of Managers.
5. The issuance date for the NPDES general permit was November 1, 1997.
6. Page 4-11 will be amended to indicate that there are Federal, State, and local requirements for pre-treating storm water prior to discharge into wetlands.
7. The filling of jurisdictional wetlands will be noted on page 4-13.
8. The need to pre-treat storm water will be noted on page 4-14.
9. It will be noted on page 4-14 that the northwestern building area will require review and permitting by the Watershed District.
10. Page 4-17 will include the suggested revisions.
11. Page 4-18 will be revised as suggested.
12. Development scenarios have not yet been prepared for the east building area. Completing development of the western building area will continue prior to developing the eastern area. There is no supportive infrastructure available for the eastern building area yet.
13. The Watershed is correct that they should try to maintain their 50 percent status to keep their privileges they have now. This does not conflict with MAC goals.
14. The LTCP Update is to serve as the framework for future development activity at the Airport. This statement is located on page 5-1.
15. It is anticipated that a comprehensive stormwater plan will be completed following the final approval of the LTCP Update. MAC has directed their engineering consultants, SEH, to move forward on delineating the remaining wetlands on the Airport. A stormwater management plan and a on-site wetland delineation will address local, State, and Federal regulatory requirements.

## **RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS**

**Response to Comment 1** - (R. Hendrickson, Director of Community Development, City of Blaine)

(Page 29, line 6, through page 3, line 15) - Comments are noted. See previous "Response to written Comment 9 - City of Blaine."

**Response to Comment 2** - (D. McCarty, Mayor of Mounds View)

(Page 32, lines 5 through 17) - Air cargo activity is permitted at the Airport as well as all MAC public airports. Scheduled airline cargo flights do not operate at any of MAC's Minor airports. The air cargo activity at the Minor airports, including Anoka County-Blaine, are normally small package shipments using general aviation aircraft.

Page 32, line 18 through page 34, line 1) - The weight of aircraft or the percentage of use for business and/or pleasure was not completed as part of the LTCP Update. One can typically assume that multiengine aircraft are primarily used for business purposes due to the relative cost of ownership and operation. This statement is supported by economic impact studies for other regions that have reported more than 65 percent of all multiengine operations are for business purposes. Minor airports are allowed to accommodate the following types of general aviation activity: business, flight training, personal/recreation, military, and air taxi.

(Page 33, line 2 through Page 34, line 3) - No on site noise measurements were conducted. All noise contours were developed using the FAA's INM computer program.

(Page 34, line 15 through page 37, line 13) - Under Metropolitan Council's Aviation Guide, Anoka County-Blaine Airport is classified a Minor Airport. The State of Minnesota classifies all airports with paved, lighted runways of 5,000 feet or less as an Intermediate Airport. The fact that these are separate categories is stated in Chapter 1. The LTCP Update is based on the Airport remaining classified as a Minor Airport in the Metropolitan system.

**Response to Comment 3** - (B. Long, Attorney, City of Mounds View)

(Page 39, line 12 through line 16) - Written comments from the City of Mounds View are addressed in Response to Letter 6.

(Page 39, line 22 through page 41, line 10) - The LTCP Update is procedurally correct. The Metropolitan Development Guide, Aviation Chapter, reports the recommendations from the most recent approved LTCP. The 1983 Master Plan is the most recent plan approved by Metropolitan Council. Following MAC approval of the draft document, the LTCP Update will be submitted to the Metropolitan Council for a finding of consistency. The next version of the Aviation Guide will then be changed to reflect the most recent LTCP Update.

(Page 41, line 11 through line 25) - This comment has been addressed in Response to Letter 6, #4.

(Page 42, line 1 through line 18) - The Airport is classified as by The Metropolitan Council Aviation Guide as a Minor Airport. The Airport plan meets all requirements for a Minor Airport. Regional/commuter airline operations are not planned for in the LTCP Update.

(Page 42, line 19 through page 43, line 8) - Single and multi-engine aircraft (referred to by Mr. Long as D and E aircraft) are projected to make up approximately 98 percent of the operating fleet.

(Page 42, line 9 through page 45, line 20) - The Airport will remain a Minor Airport. B-II design standards are appropriate for a Minor Airport. Airport design standards are further discussed in Response to Letter 6, #3 and in Chapter 3, LTCP Update.

(Page 46, line 1 through line 20) - The recommended development projections are not solely to accommodate 1.2 percent of the operating fleet. Many of the improvements will improve safety for the existing and projected aircraft fleet. Justification for the Airport expansion is further discussed in Response to Letter 6, #8 and in Chapter 3, LTCP Update.

(Page 46, line 21 through page 47, line 4) - Runway width standards are further discussed in Response to Letter 4, #3 and in Chapter 3, LTCP Update.

(Page 47, line 5 through line 13) - Comment regarding political feasibility and the City's position on the legality of Airport expansion is noted.

(Page 47, line 14 through line 17) - MAC typically designs all reliever airport taxiways to a 40-foot width to facilitate snow removal.

(Page 47, line 18 through page 48, line 12) - As the owner of a public airport, MAC cannot exclude aircraft from operating or basing at the Airport. As previously stated, the Aviation Guide is based on the most recent, approved LTCP. The Guide would be revised following MAC and Metropolitan Council approval of the LTCP Update.

(Page 48, line 13 through Page 49, line 9) - The capital improvements discussed in Table 3-3 will not be initiated until such a time when demand warrants construction. Phasing is based on five, ten, and 20-year time lines for planning purposes only. All planning recommendations are based on the appropriate design aircraft.

(Page 49, line 11 through page 51, line 17) - Comments are noted.

**Response to Comment 4 - (D. Anderson, Council member, City of Lexington)**

(Page 51, line 22 through page 54, line 19) - The City's opposition to the recommended plan is noted. As previously discussed, the LTCP Update recommendations are consistent with Metropolitan Council Guidelines for a Minor Airport.

**Response to Comment 5 - (P. Korst, Council member, City of Circle Pines)**

(Page 55, line 2 through page 56, line 4) - Mr. Korst's comments regarding the City's opposition to the proposed expansion projects are noted. Safety issues are addressed in Response to Written Comment 8, #7 and Chapter 3. Since 1992, there have been seven aircraft accidents at or near the Anoka County-Blaine Airport. The four on-Airport accidents occurred on the runways and resulted in no injuries. With the opening of the ATCT, aircraft operational safety is enhanced even further since the ATCT will provide support to aircraft operations in the area.

**Response to Comment 6 - (J. Trude, Council member, City of Mounds View)**

(Page 57, line 3 through page 61, line 16) - Air traffic control is handled based in accordance with FAA rules and regulations. In addition, all aircraft operators have been asked to fly arrival and departure procedures that minimize impacts to residential areas. MAC is committed to continuing to work with the ATCT and Airport users groups to promote a safe operating environment.

(Page 61, line 22 through page 64, line 19) - While individual aircraft can be annoying, the DNL contours are the recognized standards for the FAA and the Metropolitan Council. These noise contours take into account all noise from aircraft in a 24-hour period. A 10 times penalty is given to aircraft operating at night to account for the more disruptive nature of this noise. A detailed narrative on the noise contours and the method used to generate them is contained in Chapter 4, LTCP Update.

(Page 64, line 15 through page 65, line 4) - There has been no assessment on the impact of the recommended projects to area property values near the Anoka County-Blaine Airport.

**Response to Comment 7 - (J. Rusch)**

(Page 65, line 14 through page 66, line 10) - Opposition of the proposed development is noted.

**Response to Comment 8 - (A. Gibas)**

(Page 66, line 17 through page 68, line 4) - Mr. Gibas's comments are noted. Air quality review may be required as part of a Federal EA/State EIS. Coordination with the MPCA would be required to determine their air quality review policies.

**Response to Comment 9 - (P. Godine)**

(Page 68, line 12 through line 24) The 1983 master plan (LTCP) contained a recommendation for the development of parallel runways. While these runways have been in the plan, there has been no move to implement them. As discussed in the Chapter 3 of the LTCP, the final phasing of the parallel runway development has yet to be determined. Future demand and further environmental analysis will be required.

(Page 69, line 1) - Yes, there is an annual financial report for the airports. A copy can be obtained from MAC.

(Page 69, line 2 through line 17) - MAC operating funds for the reliever airports primarily come from concession revenues at MSP and from ground leases at the reliever airports. An airport, like other public facilities (i.e. highways, sewer/water plants, parks, etc.), contributes to the overall economic well being of the community and region it serves. Metropolitan Council is preparing to conduct a study that quantifies the overall economic impact the Metropolitan system of general aviation airports provides.

(Page 69, line 18 through line 21) - In 1995, there were and estimated 900 operations by jet aircraft. By 2015, this number is projected to increase to 3,300 operations annually. It should be noted that an operation is an arrival or a departure. A take-off and landing constitute two operations.

(Page 69, line 22 through page 71, line 3) - Mr. Godine's concerns regarding the FAA accepted method for measuring noise is noted. A detailed discussion of the noise modeling assumptions is contained in Chapter 4, LTCP Update.

(Page 71, line 4 through line 18) - All aircraft operations are conducted under flight rules as defined by the FAA. The pilot in command is responsible for adhering to these rules. A pilot can have his/her licence suspended or revoked for operating in an unsafe manor. MAC has no jurisdictional authority as to how aircraft operate once leaving the Airport. MAC is committed to working with

airport users through established forums, to continue to educate pilots, promote safety, and improve relations with surrounding communities.

**Response to Comment 10 - (G. Specketer)**

(Page 72, line 2 through 13) - Mr. Specketer's support of the plan is noted.

(Page 72, line 10 through 17) - The recommendation for the ultimate shortening of Runway 17L/35R is contingent upon the construction of Runway 17R/35L. Runway 17L/35R would remain at its current length until a major maintenance project was required. At that point, the runway would be maintained at a length of 3,500 feet, thus minimizing the expenditure of funds for a parallel runway. Recommended runway lengths are discussed in Chapter 3, LTCP Update.

(Page 72, line 18 through page 74, line 9) - Mr. Specketer's comments are noted.

**Response to Comment 11 - (N. Zeck)**

(Page 74, line 17 through page 75, line 11) - Ms. Zeck's comments are noted. The hearing notice was published according MAC guidelines. Notice of the availability of the draft LTCP Update was advertized and copies for review were placed at local libraries. Meeting notices were placed in area newspapers and a message was placed on the billboard in front of Blaine's City Hall.

**Response to Comment 12 - (D. Erickson)**

(Page 75, line 20 through page 76, line 25) - Mr. Erickson's comments are noted.

**Response to Comment 13 - (R. Barrows)**

Page 77, line 9 through page 78, line 3) - Mr. Barrows comments are noted.

**Response to Comment 14 - (R. Markfelt)**

(Page 79, line 7 through page 84, line 12) - Information requested by Mr. Markfelt was supplied directly to the City of Mounds View for distribution to Mr. Markfelt at the time of his initial request. Chapter 2, LTCP Update, presented the historical number of operations at the Airport through 1995. MAC's current operational counts are based on ATCT records.

**Response to Comment 15 - (M. Cook)**

(Page 84, line 3, through line 12) - Ms. Cooks comments are noted.

**Response to Comment 16 - (J. Krack)**

(Page 84, line 17, through page 87, line 5) - Mr. Krack's comments are noted.

**Response to Comment 17 - (C. Kampff)**

(Page 89, line 2 through line 12) - Safety is a primary concern for all recommended runway and taxiway projects.

(Page 89, line 13 through line 25) - The Airport's land envelope (approximately 1,900 acres) is more than adequate to accommodate all the recommended projects. The land envelope can also accommodate growth beyond the 20-year planning period.

(Page 90, line 1 through line 6) - The Metropolitan Council Regional System Plan included a search area for a new general aviation airport northwest of the Twin Cities. Development costs, environmental factors, locational issues, market conditions, and political factors would require extensive analysis prior to locating a new system airport. The existing system of reliever airports appears to have the ability to be expanded to accommodate demand in the Metropolitan Area. Therefore, a new system airport does not appear warranted.

(Page 90, line 7 through line 18) - Major projects, including runway extensions and parallel runways would require a Federal EA/State EIS. The LTCP addresses the need for follow on Federal EA/State EIS analysis prior to the construction of these facilities.

(Page 90, line 19 through page 91, line 6) - The theoretical capacity of the Airport, if parallel runways were constructed, is approximately 355,000 annual operations. As discussed in Chapter 3, the maximum number of operations is contingent on the number of runways, types of aircraft operating, weather, and the amount of training that takes place. There is no indication that demand will approach this level of activity during the planning period.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100