

APPENDIX 3

Public Hearing Transcript

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

1 METROPOLITAN AIRPORTS COMMISSION
2 ANOKA COUNTY - BLAINE AIRPORT
3 LONG-TERM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
4 PUBLIC MEETING/HEARING
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 Transcript of hearing, held on
13 Thursday, July 10, 1997, commencing at
14 approximately 7:00 p.m., at Blaine City Hall,
15 9150 Central Avenue Northeast, in the City of
16 Blaine, Minnesota.
17

18 * * *

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 MAC Commissioners Present:

2

3 1. Edward Fiore

4 2. Georgiann Stenerson

5

6

7 MAC Staff Present at Front Table:

8

9 1. Mark Ryan

10

11

12 * * *

13 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were duly had:

14 * * *

15

16 MR. FIORE: Good evening, ladies and
17 gentlemen. The public hearing will now come to
18 order.

19 My name is Ed Fiore, and I'm a member of
20 the Metropolitan Airports Commission. I represent
21 District E, which includes the Anoka County-Blaine
22 Airport.

23 I, as well as Georgiann Stenerson, who is
24 sitting on my left-hand side, have been designated
25 as Commission representatives on this panel of

1 hearing officers pursuant to the action taken at
2 the Commission at the meeting of June 16th, 1997.

3 The purpose of the public hearing is to
4 receive testimony on the Commission's long-term
5 development plan for the Anoka County-Blaine
6 Airport.

7 The plan concludes that the future
8 activity of the airport will continue moderate
9 growth in the future.

10 The plan further recommends extending the
11 east-west runway an additional 1,000 feet to the
12 east to more equally distribute air traffic.

13 This report has been available for public
14 view at the city halls of Blaine, Mounds View,
15 Circle Pines, Lexington and Spring Lake Park.

16 Public notice of this hearing, as well as
17 the availability of documents, has been published
18 in a variety of newspapers in Minneapolis and
19 St. Paul, as well as adjacent communities to the
20 airport.

21 At this time I'd like to take an
22 opportunity to introduce the mayor of the City of
23 Blaine, Mayor Tom Ryan.

24

25 MAYOR RYAN: Good evening and

1 welcome. I'd like to welcome all of the members
2 from the Metropolitan Airports Commission and
3 staff, welcome to everybody in the audience.

4 We're here tonight for the comprehensive
5 plan review process public hearing for the airport,
6 Blaine-Anoka County Airport.

7 I'd ask that as you make your comments,
8 that you come up to the podium, and we'll get ready
9 and we'll proceed.

10 If you would rather have written
11 comments, you can leave those out in the back or
12 you can make public comments, whichever you
13 prefer.

14 Welcome everyone and we can get going
15 here.

16
17 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

18 Following these introductory remarks, the
19 format of the public hearing will be as follows:
20 We will have a brief presentation by Ms. Barbara
21 Fritsche representing the Airport Technology and
22 Planning Group, AirTech, consultants for this
23 project.

24 Following Ms. Fritsche's presentation, we
25 will take comments from the City of Blaine, the

1 meeting's host community, and from elected
2 officials and from the public.

3 We ask that you please provide your name
4 and address on the attendance sheet. In addition,
5 there are cards for you to note if you wish to
6 speak about the plan.

7 I would ask those who wish to make
8 statements to please keep them brief and to avoid
9 excessive repetition so that all that wish to speak
10 will have an opportunity to do so.

11 At the conclusion of this meeting, the
12 record will remain open until the close of business
13 on July 25th, 1997, so that anyone who wishes to
14 submit additional statements in writing may do so.
15 The statements should be addressed to Mark Ryan,
16 R-y-a-n, Metropolitan Airports Commission, 6040 -
17 28th Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55450.

18 Following the conclusion of the meeting
19 and the receipt and review of all comments, the
20 hearing officers' report and the findings and
21 conclusions based on the testimony of the public
22 meeting will be prepared for presentation to the
23 Commission's Planning and Environmental Committee
24 and then to the full commission.

25 We will collect any cards from people who

1 wish to speak, and I think most of you have
2 probably turned them in as you came in and
3 registered.

4 We will now proceed with the
5 presentation.

6 Before we do, I'd like to introduce
7 Mr. Mark Ryan, who is planning for the MAC, and he
8 will introduce the MAC staff that is here for the
9 meeting.

10

11 MR. RYAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 I'd like to introduce Gary Schmidt, who's
13 the manager for our reliever airports, and also Roy
14 Fuhrmann from the Reliever Airport System. They're
15 in the back there. And I think that's all I can
16 see right now.

17 We have the staff people that were
18 assisting us outside, two of the secretaries from
19 the Airport Development and Regional Airport System
20 secretaries.

21

22 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Mark.

23 We'll now turn the meeting over to
24 Ms. Fritsche for her presentation.

25

1 MS. FRITSCHER: Thank you.

2 We have a short presentation to go
3 through the plan. I think the -- how do we get
4 this so these show up on the monitor? Next
5 question, technical one.

6
7 A MALE VOICE: Just place it on
8 the -- it will automatically pick it up.

9
10 MS. FRITSCHER: It is on my screen
11 but -- oh, there we go. The magic of whatever
12 century we're in.

13 We have for those of you that had the
14 opportunity to come to the workshop that we had
15 prior to this meeting, we did have some boards that
16 had some of this additional information on it.

17 If there are things that you can't see
18 that you have interest in seeing a little bit
19 closer, when the meeting is finished, we'll be
20 happy to get the boards out so that you can look at
21 some of this information on a closer basis rather
22 than on the TV monitor.

23 As we pointed out when we started the
24 presentation tonight, this is an update of a
25 previous comprehensive plan that was done for the

1 Anoka County-Blaine Airport.

2 This plan -- the previous plan was
3 actually completed in 1983, and for those of you
4 that were familiar or living in the area at that
5 point in time, you'll see that really many of the
6 key recommendations that are contained in this
7 update are very similar to recommendations that
8 were developed in that prior planning process.

9 This particular graphic just summarizes
10 basically where we are in the planning process.
11 Again, this is an update of the 1983 plan.

12 We have had an advisory committee that
13 has worked with us during the planning process.

14 We have gone through a number of
15 technical steps that are somewhat independent but
16 also related to one another.

17 In terms of, first of all, inventory and
18 collecting information on the airport, looking at
19 historic activity levels, what the traffic has done
20 over the last 10, 20 years at the airport in terms
21 of based aircraft, those aircraft that are
22 permanently stored at the airport, and also in
23 terms of annual operations.

24 When we talk about an operation, that's
25 either a landing or a takeoff. So one aircraft

1 movement counts as an operation. That's sometimes
2 something that's important to understand as we go
3 through this process.

4 Once we developed activity projections,
5 then we looked at the facilities, both in terms of
6 the landside facilities -- those would be things
7 like hangars, and then airside facilities. Those
8 would be things like runways, taxiways, lighting,
9 precision type approach equipment that might be
10 necessary to accommodate that demand.

11 And then finally looked at some of the
12 environmental issues at the airport that might
13 either impede the development of the projects as we
14 identified them, or on the other hand, make sure
15 that the airport is in compliance with all the
16 current environmental regulations that are in
17 effect not only locally, regionally, statewide, but
18 also in terms of Federal guidelines.

19 The plan has been reviewed by the MAC.
20 They have given us permission at this point in time
21 to go forward. We're in this square right now,
22 public hearing to get your comments on the plan
23 related to the airport's proposed long-term
24 development.

25 Once those comments are received, and I

1 believe Mark mentioned the cutoff date for that
2 will be July 25th, we will respond to those
3 comments. Those comments will go back to MAC and
4 they will decide whether or not to take further
5 action on the plan's recommendation.

6 One thing that I think is important to
7 understand when we start talking about -- and I
8 realize this is a little difficult to see -- is
9 that scale -- start talking about Anoka
10 County-Blaine Airport is the fact that it is an
11 airport that is part of the metropolitan airport
12 system.

13 MAC actually owns and operates, in
14 addition to Minneapolis-St. Paul International
15 Airport, several different airports, general
16 aviation airports that are really classified
17 -- excuse me -- as reliever airports. And that's
18 a definition that comes from the Federal Aviation
19 Administration, the FAA.

20 The purpose of a reliever airport is
21 really to provide -- in one of the roles is to
22 provide an alternative landing site for aircraft
23 that would otherwise be destined to a congested
24 commercial service airport.

25 Now, we're not talking about commercial

1 aircraft, whether they would be large DC-9s or
2 aircraft like that, or even commuter aircraft.

3 We're talking about privately owned
4 general aviation aircraft, and that's the segment
5 of demand, that these airports are available to
6 serve in the metropolitan area.

7 And I think now, especially since the
8 dual-track process has been defined and the
9 decision has been made to maximize the state of the
10 existing facility, the role that needs to be played
11 by these airports in the metropolitan system is
12 even more important in terms of what they'll need
13 to do long-term.

14 In addition to dealing with a variety of
15 Federal criteria and classifications, within the
16 Twin Cities, the Metropolitan Council also has a
17 development guideline which defines airports and
18 really dictates the kind of development, the kind
19 of activity that can be accommodated at various
20 airports within the system.

21 They classify airports, the Metropolitan
22 Council does, as major, intermediate, minor and
23 then special purpose.

24 Within the metropolitan system, only
25 Minneapolis-St. Paul is classified as a major

1 airport and only Downtown St. Paul is classified as
2 an intermediate airport.

3 The remainder of the airports and
4 including the Anoka-Blaine are classified as minor
5 facilities.

6 And in this role, the runway link at the
7 minor airports cannot exceed 5,000 feet. That's
8 the longest runway that can be developed at an
9 airport in a minor classification.

10 This is something that's important to us
11 as we go through the planning process and
12 understanding what kind of aircraft can be
13 accommodated at the various airports in the
14 system.

15 When we look at based aircraft, and this
16 is one of the parameters that we look at to try to
17 determine what kinds of facilities will be needed
18 in the long-term, an aircraft, and we refer to it
19 as a based aircraft, this is just an airplane that
20 is permanently stored. It has a hangar, it's tied
21 down or it's in some way, shape or form permanently
22 located at a particular airport. That's its home,
23 its location.

24 If we go back to a period back to 1985
25 and we look at what's happened, you can see that

1 really there's been a little bit of growth in based
2 aircraft at the airport, but it's hovered at around
3 400 up to about 450 over the last several years,
4 last 15 years or so.

5 We see that by the end of the planning
6 period, and the final planning horizon that we
7 looked at in this plan was 2015, that based
8 aircraft could grow to about 550 planes. And the
9 kinds of planes that would be based at the airport,
10 as we'll talk about in just a minute, would be very
11 similar to the kinds of planes that are there
12 today.

13 We're not talking about a dramatic change
14 in terms of the kinds of aircraft that would
15 operate at the airport, but we do say that the
16 potential for increased numbers of planes to be
17 stored at the airport.

18 The metropolitan area of the Twin Cities
19 is somewhat unique in terms of its general aviation
20 environment, because when we look at some
21 metropolitan areas around the United States, we
22 don't see this kind of growth in general aviation
23 activity. Things are relatively flat and in some
24 cases even declining, but because the Twin Cities
25 has such a healthy economy, we have a number of

1 Fortune 500 companies that are based in the area,
2 there's a large and a fairly affluent population
3 that lives in the Twin Cities area, you have
4 continued, and we think you're going to continue to
5 have some modest growth in general aviation.

6 The other demand component that we look
7 at when we try to determine what kind of facilities
8 would be needed in the future are annual aircraft
9 operations, movements, and, again, this is either a
10 landing or a takeoff.

11 If we go back as far as 1980, the airport
12 in that timeframe was accommodating about 200,000
13 annual operations. Through the '80s, that activity
14 level actually declined and then has started to
15 rebound slightly in recent years.

16 By the end of our planning period, 2015,
17 the airport could be accommodating as many as
18 270,000, 272,000 annual operations.

19 So, really, if we go back to 1980, and it
20 was almost 200,000 operations at that point in
21 time, we're saying that by the year 2015, we're
22 only going to be seeing about a 70,000 increase in
23 terms of annual operations from what it was back in
24 the early '80s, so really this is a fairly modest
25 amount of growth over the timeframe.

1 The other thing that's of concern that we
2 look at when we try to determine what activity is
3 going to take place in the future is what we call
4 fleet mix or the kinds of planes that will actually
5 be operating at the airport.

6 Again, I think it's important to
7 reiterate that we're not looking at any kind of
8 cargo activity or commercial aircraft in terms of
9 scheduled passenger aircraft that would be coming
10 into this airport. It's going to remain strictly a
11 general aviation facility. And by far the majority
12 of the planes that will continue to operate at the
13 airport are small single engine aircraft. Over 85
14 percent of the planes will continue to be in that
15 category of aircraft.

16 We have about 13 percent multi-engine
17 aircraft, the Beech Bonanzas, King Airs, Queen
18 Airs, aircraft like that, and then some aircraft,
19 about .4 percent, and then some aircraft that would
20 fall into a corporate or business jet
21 classification, but they would be about 1.2 percent
22 of all annual operations at the airport.

23 So if you would divide this out annually,
24 some days you wouldn't even have a jet operation,
25 but they would be fairly minimal in terms of their

1 frequency; one to two a day at most, and this is by
2 the end of the forecast period that we're talking
3 about.

4 So these are the kinds of things that we
5 looked at when we started to identify what
6 facilities would be needed.

7 Just to summarize real quickly where we
8 see the traffic headed, you see based aircraft
9 increasing from their current level of about 444 up
10 to maybe as many as 550, and this again is over a
11 20-year timeframe, so we're talking about adding a
12 few aircraft each year in terms of additional
13 planes that would be at the airport.

14 Annual operations increasing from a
15 current level of about 181,000 up to about 272,000
16 over the next 20 years; a fleet mix or operating
17 types of aircraft that would remain fairly
18 consistent with what they are today; and about 60
19 percent of all the activity would remain local or
20 training nature.

21 The rest of the activity, the other 40
22 percent, would be what we call transient or
23 itinerant, and that would actually be people that
24 are based at the airport flying away to another
25 airport for the day or people who are coming to the

1 Twin Cities from another airport to visit. That
2 would be their activities.

3 So it would still -- the character of the
4 airport we don't see changing dramatically over
5 time and these are important considerations as we
6 start to identify what kinds of facilities we think
7 will be needed.

8 I'm going to ask Scott Sanders, who is
9 also with AirTech, who has worked extensively on
10 the plan to talk a little bit about the actual
11 facility requirements that we've identified, and
12 then we'll open it up for your comments.

13.

14 MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Barb.

15 One thing that's important to remember
16 about the facility requirements or the actual
17 projected new facilities on the airport is all of
18 the facility requirements are driven by demand. If
19 the number of based aircraft do not increase at the
20 airport or the number of operations do not continue
21 to exhibit growth at the airport, there's nothing
22 to require that these facilities be implemented at
23 any certain point in time.

24 As Barb indicated, the plan looks at a
25 20-year period, so all the facilities that we're

1 talking about would or could be required in that
2 next 20-year time period up to 2015.

3 The first thing we looked at in the
4 facility requirements section was what is the
5 capacity of the airport or how many aircraft
6 operations can the facility accommodate.

7 As was indicated previously, you know,
8 there has been, really, no more than 200,000
9 operations over the last 20 odd years or so, and
10 really that was the maximum number of operations
11 that physical plan at the airport could actually
12 handle.

13 Now that the air traffic control tower
14 has been put in place, you know, that number -- the
15 airport may be able to handle somewhere in the
16 neighborhood of 230,000 operations, again because
17 that tower is there to help things operate more
18 efficiently, run smoother, and they're able to, you
19 know, help the airport operate in a more efficient
20 manner.

21 As we've indicated, demand or the
22 potential for the area indicates that somewhere in
23 the neighborhood of 270,000 operations could be
24 accommodated in the future.

25 Again to accommodate that future demand,

1 the parallel runways that have been recommended
2 since the earlier plan in 1983 would come into
3 play.

4 We've looked at the existing runway
5 system and the future runway system to accommodate
6 this demand, and we're looking at some changes to
7 all of the existing runways.

8 The east-west runway would be extended
9 out to 5,000 feet. That, again, is the maximum
10 extension that could be allowed at the airport,
11 again because of its designation as a minor
12 airport.

13 An extension to 5,000 feet would allow
14 the airport to operate in what's called a balanced
15 field situation.

16 As some of you know, the north-south
17 runway is currently just shy of 5,000 feet at 4,855
18 feet.

19 Most of the business jets and, you know,
20 the large more demanding aircraft that operate at
21 the airport, they need the longer runway to be able
22 to take off safely.

23 By having an east-west runway that's the
24 same approximate length, they would be -- the tower
25 would be able to then switch back and forth which

1 runway is being used by those more demanding
2 aircraft. And, again, 5,000 feet is the maximum
3 length that the airport is by the Legislature
4 allowed to have.

5 The existing north-south runway would
6 ultimately be developed just to 3,500 feet, and
7 that would be shortened from its current length of
8 4,855 feet. That would only be in conjunction with
9 the construction of a new north-south runway that
10 would be a little bit closer to the existing
11 building area on the western side of the airport.

12 By having two runways, the airport is
13 able to -- let me get an exhibit up here to make
14 this a little --

15 By having two runways, the airport is
16 able to operate two runways in the same direction,
17 the airport is able to operate in a more efficient
18 manner, especially with the tower there to control
19 what's going on.

20 As Barb indicated, about 60 percent of
21 all the activity that takes place at the airport is
22 somehow involved with training activity or local
23 activity, where they're flying -- aircraft are
24 flying in a pattern.

25 And then by having a shorter runway, the

1 tower is able to operate -- or by having two
2 runways, the tower is able to operate the training
3 activity on one of the runways, and then the other
4 runway is able to be open to accommodate the
5 transient and the aircraft that are taking off for
6 parts other than just on the airport.

7 The plan recommends having two of those
8 parallel runway systems. Two runways going
9 north-south and two runways going east-west.

10 Ultimately, though, an environmental
11 assessment would have to be prepared to decide
12 which of those parallel runways would be
13 constructed first.

14 As those of you who are familiar with the
15 area, there's a number of wetlands in the area in
16 the northern -- northeastern -- or the northwestern
17 quadrant of the airport, so you'd have to have a
18 little bit more detailed look at the area to see if
19 that parallel runway would ultimately be feasible.

20 Some other facility recommendations that
21 we made were looking at taxiway improvements on the
22 airport. A number of the taxiways are currently 35
23 feet in width. MAC typically has their taxiways
24 developed to a 40 foot width to accommodate snow
25 removal.

1 Other things we looked at when we were
2 deciding what facilities were needed at the airport
3 is looking at FAA design criteria.

4 The FAA has a very extensive cookbook
5 that's required to -- that an airport is required
6 to meet.

7 There's a number of safety areas that
8 have to be set back from runways, areas that have
9 to be cleared, distances that runways and taxiways
10 have to be from each other, and we wanted to make
11 sure that Anoka meets all those criteria, and the
12 current facilities do meet all the FAA criteria,
13 and all the proposed facilities would continue to
14 meet all the FAA designed criteria.

15 The Minnesota Department of
16 Transportation also has some additional criteria
17 with regard to protection zones off the ends of the
18 runways, and the airport currently meets those
19 criteria as well.

20 Other areas that were looked at include
21 navigational aids to the airport, the ways for
22 aircraft to come into the airport when visibility
23 conditions are not perfect.

24 One of the recommendations is a precision
25 approach on the extended runway. A precision:

1 approach then would be from the eastern side of the
2 airport.

3 Also aircraft storage areas. An area on
4 the east side of the airport is available for
5 additional storage facilities, as well as the
6 northwest quadrant of the airport could also be
7 developed with additional storage facilities again
8 to accommodate those 550 based aircraft we see
9 there being a demand for over the next 20 years.

10 So the airport has plenty of available
11 space to be able to accommodate the demand that's
12 projected. There wouldn't be any need for any land
13 acquisition projects to accommodate any of these
14 recommendations.

15 Then following the facility requirements
16 section, we did an environmental overview where we
17 looked at a number of issues on the airport; some
18 of them in a cursory way, others in a more detailed
19 way to look at the environmental impacts of these
20 particular projects that have been recommended.

21 This primarily hooks on two areas. Water
22 quality issues where drainage on the airport
23 impacts the wetlands, storm water runoff and ground
24 water would need to be addressed.

25 All those are required by the

1 Metropolitan Council to be addressed as part of the
2 Comprehensive Plan. And MAC is currently in the
3 process of undergoing extensive environmental
4 planning on the airport.

5 There's an environmental audit being done
6 at the airport to determine what the impacts would
7 be over the next -- this project will be done in
8 the next year or so to determine all the impacts to
9 the wetlands and water quality areas on the
10 airport.

11 There doesn't appear to be any
12 significant issues related to this development with
13 regard to those issues.

14 The other area that's probably of concern
15 to a lot more of you is noise issues. Some
16 extensive noise analysis was done looking at what
17 would be the impacts from the proposed increase in
18 activity at the airport, as well as what would it
19 mean with regard to the activity in combination
20 with the proposed facilities.

21 I don't know if that shows up very well,
22 but we have some boards that highlight this.

23 The FAA has a system or some definitions
24 that look at how airports and noise should be
25 discussed. It's called a day-night noise level

1 where it averages all the noise that takes place at
2 an airport over a 24-hour period.

3 They have some -- as part of that, there
4 are noise contours that could be generated to find
5 out what areas are incompatible with residential
6 activity.

7 All the areas that fall within the FAA
8 criteria are located on the airport property.
9 That's called the 65 DNL area. I don't know if it
10 shows up very well, but those all fall along the
11 airport property.

12 The Metropolitan Council requires that
13 airports within the MUSA line look at noise
14 activity out to what's called a 55 DNL.

15 Most of those areas are also contained on
16 airport property, but there's a few areas that do
17 fall off airport property, primarily to the north
18 and a little bit to the west.

19 Again, the 55 DNL is a fairly quiet area,
20 though. When you look at the ambient noise that's
21 associated with that when you've got car activity
22 and residential activity, lawn mowers, etcetera,
23 55 DNL is a very quiet area, but Metropolitan
24 Council wants those areas designated just for a
25 planning standpoint, but there is no

1 incompatibility with residential use.

2 MAC has also recently completed a noise
3 abatement program for the airport that now that the
4 tower is in place will be more likely to be able to
5 be implemented in the future.

6 There's a number of requirements
7 associated with that noise abatement program that
8 help maintain all the -- the arrivals and
9 departures and training activity within a boundary
10 bordered by 65 on the west and the highways on the
11 eastern side of the airport to the south and the
12 north. So most of those training activities would
13 take place over an area that's pretty much under
14 airport control.

15 Just to quickly summarize all the
16 components of the comprehensive plan, based
17 aircraft expected to go up to 550 by the end of the
18 planning period, about 272,000 operations. The
19 east-west runway would be extended to 5,000 feet,
20 and a precision approach would be associated with
21 that extension.

22 A new north-south runway would be
23 constructed to 4,855 feet, and then the existing
24 north-south runway would ultimately only be
25 maintained at a length of 3,500 feet, again on the

1 outside of the airport to accommodate training.
2 And then ultimately a new -- an additional
3 north-south -- sorry -- an additional east-west
4 runway would be constructed to a length of 3,500
5 feet to accommodate training as well.

6 There was a couple of building areas that
7 are available for future development to accommodate
8 based aircraft and then a number of taxiway
9 improvements on the airport.

10 With that, we'd like to turn it back over
11 to the chairman.

12

13 MR. FIORE: Okay. Thank you.

14 We'll now proceed with the public
15 statements.

16 Many of you when you came in, we had
17 these cards available to fill out. If you care to
18 speak and you haven't filled out a card, please
19 raise your hand and we'll get a card to you, or if
20 you filled one out and I don't have it, also raise
21 your hand and we'll get the cards up here and we'll
22 recognize you in order.

23 The proceedings tonight are being
24 transcribed and recorded by a court reporter so
25 that a complete and accurate record will be

1 compiled of the presentations, public statements
2 and other information that is presented here
3 tonight.

4 Incorporated into the record will be any
5 written comments that are received from anybody
6 that's at this particular public hearing or you can
7 submit them, as previously stated, directly to the
8 MAC.

9 We ask that anybody making a statement
10 will please state your name, your address, the
11 organization you represent, if any.

12 At this time we'd like to recognize the
13 public officials first for comments and then we'll
14 recognize the general public.

15 So the Chair at this time will recognize
16 Ron Henrickson.

17

18 MR. RYAN: Yes, that's correct.

19 Mr. Chairman, may I just introduce Chad
20 Lecqueve from our noise abatement staff. He's in
21 the back of the room. I want to make sure that
22 he's recognized.

23

24 MR. FIORE: Chad, raise your hand so
25 we know who you are.

1 Thank you, Chad.

2 The Chair will now recognize Ron
3 Henrickson, Director of Community Development for
4 the City of Blaine.

5
6 MR. HENRICKSON: Good evening.

7 The Anoka County-Blaine Airport is an
8 integral part of our city and a valuable asset to
9 our community, and we appreciate the opportunity
10 tonight to host your public hearing, and we trust
11 that the dialog that ensues tonight will be both
12 positive and constructive.

13 We are most appreciative of the series of
14 meetings that we have had with MAC staff that have
15 been going on for more than a year.

16 Although our interest in constituencies
17 are not always identical, we have found common
18 grounds on many issues and believe strongly that we
19 have established an ongoing working framework to
20 address unusual concerns.

21 With respect to the long-term
22 comprehensive plan, I want to briefly summarize the
23 comments that we've submitted in writing tonight.

24 The City of Blaine has an interest in the
25 future construction of roadways which fall within

1 the runway protection zone, and we desire to work
2 closely with MAC to obtain the necessary approvals
3 in the future for these roads.

4 The City also has an ongoing concern that
5 the use of airport hangars be limited to airport
6 related uses and that the City and MAC will work
7 cooperatively together to adopt and implement an
8 effective comprehensive fire inspection program.

9 We endorse the extension of utilities on
10 the airport and pledge to work cooperatively with
11 MAC in that regard. The City, however, does expect
12 that the water availability charge and trunk
13 sanitary sewer charges will be paid by airport
14 users as they are by all property owners in the
15 City of Blaine.

16 We further urge MAC to optimize the use
17 of nonairport needed property by sale or lease
18 consistent with good land use and zoning policy.

19 With regard to future hangar area
20 development, we urge MAC to make full use of the
21 area northwest first, and expand only as necessary
22 beyond that.

23 We would also anticipate that the
24 expansion of the east areas would be adequately
25 buffered from adjacent residential areas.

1 Lastly, I would like to address the issue
2 of noise which we share with our neighboring
3 cities.

4 An airport by its very nature creates
5 noises, a by-product of its operation. In Blaine
6 we have mandated noise construction standards to
7 alleviate some of the impact, and we recognize and
8 support MAC's effort at noise abatement.

9 Perhaps we will never reach our goal or
10 the goal which will be acceptable to all interests,
11 but we urge MAC to continue to work with us and our
12 neighboring cities to identify issues and solutions
13 which will make the Anoka County-Blaine Airport a
14 better neighbor for all of our residents.

15 Thank you this evening.

16
17 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Ron.

18 The Chair will now recognize Duane
19 McCarty, mayor of Mounds View, and Bob Long, who is
20 the city attorney for Mounds View.

21
22 MAYOR McCARTY: Mr. Chairman,
23 members of the committee, my name is Duane
24 McCarty. I'm the mayor of the City of Mounds
25 View.

1 I have just a couple of questions -- I
2 don't expect them to be answered this evening
3 -- for clarification of the staff, Mr. Chairman,
4 if I may.

5 First, the statement was made that the
6 study did not consider nor were we looking at or
7 was the commission looking at cargo activity as a
8 use at the Anoka County Airport.

9 We have evidence from actual anecdotal
10 experience that there is a cargo operation up there
11 at this time that came in recently, and I'm
12 wondering if that is going to remain or if that's
13 just something that came in during the flooding of
14 Holman Field?

15 There is a company up there, a cargo
16 company, that is operating at this time. So I'd
17 like to have clarification on that statement.

18 The studies tell us that we will have 85
19 percent of the aircraft usage in the future of
20 Anoka County Airport over the next 20 years will be
21 small single engine aircraft.

22 I'd like to have a more definitive
23 description of those aircraft in terms of weight,
24 ownership, are they private pilots, pleasure craft
25 or are they heavier aircraft being used by

1 corporates or otherwise?

2 Secondly, on the issue of the
3 environmental studies, the LDN study that was done,
4 the LDN method that was used and you arrived, I
5 believe, you said at a 55 DDA DNL for the off
6 airport site noise levels, I believe is what you
7 said.

8 I would like to know where you placed
9 your equipment and for what length of time the
10 equipment was in the area to arrive at those noise
11 levels. I'm assuming that was done on the A meter,
12 is that correct?

13

14 MR. SANDERS: Actually it was all
15 done with the INM, noise modeling.

16

17 MAYOR McCARTY: Okay.

18

19 MR. SANDERS: So there was

20 no --

21

22 MAYOR McCARTY: So there was no
23 physical measurement off site?

24

25 MR. SANDERS: No.

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

MAYOR McCARTY: That's an important clarification. Thank you.

This airport has been an issue for Mounds View for many, many years. I expect that I perhaps know as many of Mr. Ryan's staff as Mr. Ryan knows.

Mark and I have become very good friends, not necessarily in agreement on issues, but, however, nonetheless we've worked together for a very long period of time, and I appreciate their efforts to get information to us, but as I pointed out, sometimes the information isn't as clear as we would like to see it.

For example, in the long-term comprehensive plan update, we have a statement that the Anoka County Airport was again classified as an intermediate airport in reference to the 1983 master plan.

Mark, in my memory over the last 30-some years, Anoka County Airport has never been classified an intermediate classed airport.

I think what's important on that issue is what are we dealing with? Are we dealing with an airport of a minor classification or intermediate?

1 Where are we going, from where to where, I think is
2 important.

3

4 MS. FRITSCHER: Can I just straighten
5 something out on that?

6 One thing that's rather confusing is that
7 all the different agencies that we deal with, the
8 State of Minnesota actually has three
9 classifications that they use.

10 An intermediate is one of the terms that
11 they use, also, and, in fact, all general aviation
12 airports according to State classification are
13 called intermediate airports under MnDOT. So that
14 could be where that reference relates to and where
15 the confusion comes in. Because under the MnDOT
16 system, it is classified as an intermediate. But
17 Met Council uses a different classification.

18

19 MAYOR McCARTY: Barbara, I can
20 understand being from the East Coast how that would
21 have confused your firm.

22 The classifications of our airport system
23 in the metropolitan area come under the
24 Metropolitan Council, Aviation Chapter of the
25 Metropolitan Development Guide, not the MnDOT .

1 classifications.

2

3 MS. FRITSCHE: But the MnDOT
4 classifications --

5

6 MAYOR McCARTY: They are different.
7 The MnDOT classifications are different. However,
8 our metropolitan airport system --

9

10 MS. FRITSCHE: That's right. I
11 understand that, but --

12

13 MAYOR McCARTY: -- is regulated
14 otherwise.

15

16 MS. FRITSCHE: But the MnDOT
17 classifications were also listed in the report and --
18 maybe that was where the confusion was. I mean, if
19 it was classified as an intermediate, it was
20 according to their standards, not Met Council.

21

22 MAYOR McCARTY: Well, then I guess I
23 would ask the question why did you use the MnDOT
24 classifications when the airport system is under
25 the Metropolitan Development classification?

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

MS. FRITSCHÉ: We did not use them.
We just noted them.

MAYOR FRITSCHÉ: Okay. Then I guess
I'll ask why did you note them? What was the
importance of that issue?

MS. FRITSCHÉ: It's still part of
the State system. It's a part of the state. It's
in the State of Minnesota.

MAYOR McCARTY: Okay.

MS. FRITSCHÉ: Unless we secede. I
think you're still part --

MAYOR McCARTY: I think I'm perhaps
coming from a long time of involvement at the local
level and we use different terminology, and the
terminology is important in the ideas that you
impart, so that's simply why I brought that up.

I won't go into a lengthy period of
time. I think I've probably spent more time in
testimony on this airport than anybody else I can

1 think of, and I believe that we will be submitting,
2 or I know we will be submitting written comments in
3 the very near term to further state our case.

4 The City of Mounds View has a court
5 ordered stipulation and agreement with the
6 Metropolitan Airports Commission regarding the
7 Anoka County Airport.

8 Our experiences over the last several
9 months have escalated dramatically in terms of the
10 noise complaints that we have received at City
11 Hall, and being one who lives directly under the
12 final approach flight path for Runway 35, I'm very
13 much aware of the increased noise activity or
14 noisier aircraft that we are seeing at the Anoka
15 County Airport especially since the construction of
16 the tower, the air traffic control tower.

17 We are at this time trying to work with
18 cities around the airport.

19 We recently met with Blaine, Circle
20 Pines, Lexington and Mounds View, the four of us,
21 and of the four cities, three of us were in
22 agreement of opposition to this upgrade.

23 At this time I'd like to turn my portion
24 of this testimony over to our City Attorney,
25 Mr. Bob Long, so that he can read into the record

1 our legal position on this facility.

2 Mr. Long will close our testimony.

3 Thank you.

4

5 MR. LONG: Thank you, Mayor.

6 Mr. Chairman, Commission, my name is Bob
7 Long and I'm City Attorney for the City of Mounds
8 View.

9 I was asked by the council actually back
10 in November of '96 to prepare some written comments
11 which we submitted at that time.

12 We also have some additional and revised
13 comments that we'd like to submit tonight. I have
14 copies for everybody here. I'll make sure those
15 get into the record. We'd like to make them part
16 of the official record.

17 I won't read them verbatim. I just want
18 to summarize them because I think it's important
19 that at least some of it get into the public record
20 verbally and that some of the commissioners who may
21 not have heard this directly hear it.

22 Procedurally what our concern is right
23 now is the comprehensive plan that's being
24 considered we think conflicts currently in its
25 current wording, conflicts with several Minnesota

1 Statutes and the Court Order that was written in
2 July of 1986.

3 And specifically we believe that the
4 proposed plan conflicts with Minnesota Statute
5 473.611, Subdivision 5, 473.641, Subdivision 4,
6 473.655, and ultimately the Court Order.

7 Let me just in detail tell you where I
8 think that conflicts.

9 473.611, Subdivision 5, I think, as the
10 staff knows, is the requirement of Minnesota
11 Statutes that says that a comprehensive plan
12 prepared by MAC must be in compliance with and be
13 consistent with the Metropolitan Airport Guide,
14 Aviation Chapter.

15 And according to the most recent Aviation
16 Guide that at least I was able to get, the December
17 1996 guide, there is no mention, no consideration,
18 no word mentioning an extension of a runway to
19 5,000 feet.

20 In fact, in the chart that talks about
21 the proposed runways, and I believe it's page 52 of
22 the document, it lists a primary runway length
23 existing in proposed, and there is nothing proposed
24 for extending the runway at the airport.

25 So procedurally we believe that the plan

1 that you're considering tonight is going a little
2 bit in backwards form in that this document we
3 believe has to be amended first before you can
4 consider comprehensive plan amendments that would
5 be -- that would have to be consistent with this.

6 So that's one procedural thing we think
7 you should consider and, of course, our position is
8 that the runway extension proposal should be
9 deleted, not only because it would conflict right
10 now with the guide, but it also conflicts with the
11 Court Order which at the time, and, you know, it
12 was a long history long before I got to Mounds
13 View, but it was a stipulation, and the agreement
14 was that they would extend the east-west runway
15 from 3,200 feet to 4,000 feet and no more. And
16 that the Court Order says that the -- and the MAC
17 agrees to develop the airport consistent with the
18 1983 Master Plan, which, of course, had only a
19 4,000 foot runway contemplated.

20 So we believe on its face proposing a
21 5,000 foot extension conflicts with both the
22 statute, the order, and I guess the point that was
23 raised by intermediate airport I think is very
24 important, because that's overriding here, a major
25 concern.

1 Minnesota Statute 473.641, Subdivision 4,
2 is the so-called McCarron's Law. Former
3 Representative McCarron states in part that MAC
4 shall not use revenue from any source for
5 construction of air facilities to expand or upgrade
6 the use of an existing metropolitan airport from
7 minor use status to intermediate status as defined
8 by the Metropolitan Development Guide, Aviation
9 Chapter.

10 And it's the City's feeling and position
11 that by proposing all of the capital improvements
12 that are contained in this document, even though
13 you would not go beyond the 5,000 foot mark, which
14 is one factor in how you define intermediate
15 airport, if you look at the functional analysis
16 which is set forth in the Aviation Guide for how
17 you define intermediate airports and you look at
18 regional and commuter air traffic, you look at
19 influence of area, you look at the -- and the
20 differences, of course, are in the type of design
21 aircraft which this plan calls for.

22 The typical operating aircraft at this
23 airport right now according to the plan proposal is
24 a Cessna 172 with a wingspan of 35.5 feet or a
25 Beechcraft Barron with a wingspan of 37.8 feet.

1 Maximum takeoff weight 2,500 pounds in
2 the Cessna. The maximum takeoff weight of 6,200
3 pounds on the Beechcraft Barron, well below the
4 12,500 pound limit which is referenced in the
5 Master Plan which used to be referred to as DNE
6 type aircraft, the small operating aircraft which
7 the planners believe will be 85 percent of the
8 operating fleet at this airport.

9 The plan, proposed plan, Exhibit 3.1,
10 very clearly shows a major departure from that
11 design. It says, "The design aircraft for this
12 airport now will be for a Citation 2 of a wingspan
13 of 51.7 feet, maximum takeoff weight of 13,300
14 pounds, and an approach speed of 108 knots, by the
15 way, versus 64 knots on the Cessna.

16 It also plans for a design aircraft of a
17 Beech King Air of a wingspan 50.2 feet, maximum
18 takeoff weight of 9,650 pounds, 100 knots, versus
19 the 6,200 pound Beechcraft Barron.

20 And it very clearly, I think, from
21 talking to experts in the field, and I'm certainly
22 not the expert, but the expert in the field tells
23 me that when you begin to design an airport with
24 this type of aircraft, this is no longer the small
25 user DNE aircraft for which this airport is

1 classified as a minor use.

2 This is clearly the commuter regional
3 type and business and corporate aviation traffic,
4 and even though it may only comprise at the time a
5 small percentage, we are proposing to drastically
6 change the airport and design it completely
7 different to handle much larger aircraft, thus
8 kicking in under the Aviation Guide we believe in a
9 functional analysis an intermediate use airport
10 status, thus being in conflict with the statute,
11 the McCarron's Law, and we think that's very
12 serious.

13 So in other words, what we think is
14 happening with the plan currently as written, it's
15 as if we are creating an intermediate airport
16 without calling it that. And the distinction thus
17 far has been whether we go at 5,000 feet on the
18 airport runway or 5,001, and everybody, of course,
19 knows if you go to 5,001, that's a very clear
20 issue, but I think it's very clear when you look at
21 the overall functional analysis that by upgrading
22 it to change the design aircraft that significantly
23 for corporate aviation and regional commuter
24 traffic, which, by the way, are not uses listed in
25 the minor use definition in the Aviation Guide. It

1 clearly takes it into intermediate use category.

2 So those are some very serious concerns,
3 so we would ask, of course, at this point that the
4 plan be amended drastically to remove all of the
5 references in the proposal to extend the runway and
6 to drop the references for capital improvements and
7 actually overall change the plan, because what you
8 really have said here is you are now going to
9 design this airport, and I'm going to get a little
10 technical here, but the Airport Reference Code
11 A-R-C, ARC, and right now we're currently dealing
12 with an ARC A-I type airport, and you are designing
13 it for an ARC B-II type airport, which is a
14 completely different type of airport, completely
15 different than the minor use, and so even if we
16 would say that technically by not going over the
17 5,000 feet, you could claim at least on paper that
18 it's not an intermediate airport, I think all the
19 functional analysis would say it clearly is an
20 intermediate airport.

21 I think that raises some really serious
22 concerns because of the State law and because of
23 the impact environmentally, of course, on the
24 surrounding area when you start talking about the
25 larger aircraft with the greater speeds, etcetera.

1 Specifically, and I won't take very long
2 on this, the other areas that we believe should be
3 amended in addition to dropping the design aircraft
4 and going back to an ARC B-I, we think -- or A-I,
5 excuse me, and dropping the proposal for the
6 extension of the runway, there's some other areas
7 that we think are very important, many of which are
8 completely inconsistent with the assumptions.

9 In other words, if the statement is
10 correct that demand will drive the need for the
11 facility, I think that was the consultant's quote,
12 then there would be no rational reason to build an
13 airport and to have all these expansions to
14 accommodate essentially 1.2 percent of the
15 aircraft. It doesn't make any sense financially.
16 Doesn't make any sense from a planning standpoint
17 to design an airport to serve only one percent of
18 the aircraft, if those numbers are correct. And
19 that's what the plan does. It completely changes
20 it.

21 So the other issues, of course, are the
22 parallel runways, the issue of -- the issue of
23 -- excuse me, I have to look at my notes here.
24 -- on recommendation that the east-west runway
25 should be widened from 75 feet to 100 feet should

1 be deleted. It should remain at 75 foot width.
2 This hundred foot width is only needed if you go
3 with the new design aircraft, and we don't believe
4 that's necessary.

5 The recommendation for a proposed
6 parallel runway to be developed to a length of
7 5,000 feet, and the report says "if it is
8 politically feasible," unquote. Well, we're here
9 to say it's not politically feasible, we hope you
10 won't do it, but we don't think it's legally
11 possible given the arguments we made, and I believe
12 it would clearly, again, be following this design
13 aircraft.

14 The taxiways also would be changed
15 according to meet the design aircraft, which we
16 suggest should be changed, and, therefore, the
17 taxiway proposal should be deleted.

18 And, finally, I think one of the biggest
19 concerns that is coming up in Mounds View as it
20 relates to noise is with regard to the older
21 military aircraft. And one of the very big
22 concerns we have about the particular plan is it
23 specifically calls for increasing the hangar
24 storage for, quote, historic and unique aircraft at
25 the airport, and thus would encourage a larger

1 based fleet of the older noisier aircraft. We
2 think that's the wrong direction. Again, that's
3 not called for in the Aviation Guide of '96. We
4 think the plan is inconsistent with that and by
5 statute you can't plan for something that's
6 inconsistent with the guide, and we think it's the
7 wrong direction to be going in, so we would suggest
8 and hope that the hangar space would not be
9 increased for the older airport -- older birds,
10 the warbirds as they call them, I guess. It's not
11 my term but that's what's been used in the
12 community.

13 And so, finally, the capital improvement
14 plan that's shown on Table 3.3 we believe can be
15 drastically reduced in size and in dollars, and
16 we're talking taxpayer dollars here, because if we
17 truly are maintaining an airport to serve the
18 smaller aircraft, which is what we believe the law
19 requires, there's no need to spend the money on
20 designing the airport to handle much larger
21 aircraft.

22 Not only do we think that's in conflict
23 with the order and the law but we think it's also a
24 waste of dollars given the fact that the demand
25 isn't there for it.

1 So those are our concerns in a summary
2 fashion, Mr. Chairman. I'd be happy to answer any
3 questions. I will submit all of this to the
4 Commission. What you have is our comments dated
5 July 10th. Exhibit A is the resolution of the
6 Mounds View City Council adopted on November 25th,
7 1996, and Exhibit B is the Court Order that I was
8 referring to entered into in July of 1986.

9 Thank you very much.

10
11 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Mr. Long.

12 Obviously those questions will be
13 addressed by the MAC, but I do want to correct one
14 thing, Mr. Long.

15 The MAC does not use taxpayers' money, so
16 that is not a valid statement. MAC revenue is
17 generated from the traveling public, and we do not
18 use one penny of taxpayers' money.

19
20 MR. LONG: I think if you look at
21 the State definition, the funds that MAC receives
22 are legally public funds.

23
24 MR. FIORE: No, they are not.

25

1 MR. LONG: Well, I think your staff
2 will tell you they're public funds.

3

4 MR. RYAN: They're airport.

5

6 MR. FIORE: They are airport.

7

8 MR. LONG: Well, they're public
9 funds in a public facility.

10

11 MR. FIORE: No, they are not public
12 funds. That is a misstatement.

13 Thank you very much.

14

15 MAYOR McCARTY: Ed, may I respond to
16 that just very briefly? I think we've had this
17 conversation recently at the Capitol, and the way I
18 put it, and I'm going to support Mr. Long on this,
19 if we charge our residents a fee for a recreational
20 activity or if we charge them a service charge for
21 something that we do in the building code
22 enforcement division, that is not a tax dollar per
23 se. However, it is public money and we do consider
24 it the same -- the same as a tax dollar in our
25 fiduciary responsibility to the taxpayers.

1 Whether it comes from the tax dollars off
2 the property tax or whether it comes from some
3 other form such as your fees at the airport that
4 all of our taxpayers pay when they go through to
5 take a flight, those are still public dollars. We
6 are still public agencies, and we are responsible
7 to them the same as if they were tax dollars.

8
9 MR. FIORE: The connotation,
10 Mr. Mayor, was that we are using tax dollars,
11 dollars coming from State revenue sources. We are
12 not. And that's that I wanted to correct.

13 Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

14
15 MAYOR McCARTY: Well, you can deal
16 with the technicalities. I'll deal with the ethics
17 of it. Okay?

18
19 MR. FIORE: The Chair will now
20 recognize Don Anderson from the City of Lexington.

21
22 MR. ANDERSON: I'm Don Anderson.
23 I'm a councilmember in the City of Lexington.

24 I'm on assignment representing my mayor,
25 Mayor Dot Heifort and the councilmembers of the

1 City of Lexington.

2 Many residents have also asked that I
3 speak in their behalf.

4 I'd like to thank The Chair for the
5 opportunity to make comment at this time.

6 A couple of years ago, actually, Mark
7 Ryan came out and visited with our council and
8 discussed the operation of a proposed tower at the
9 airport. And many of the points of the tower were
10 pointed out that it would increase safety at the
11 airport, and it would also train badly needed air
12 traffic controllers. This tower would also
13 eliminate low overflights from our neighboring
14 communities and reduce noise by tightening the
15 traffic pattern around the airport.

16 My council has sent me to represent their
17 view that this has not been so.

18 They to the person on the council express
19 that they have not seen reduced low overflights or
20 reduced noise from the airport in the past ten
21 months that the tower has been in operation.

22 This long-term development plan for the
23 airport shows no advantage for the City of
24 Lexington and potentially extreme disadvantage to
25 our community.

1 This plan includes everything to make
2 this an intermediate airport except one foot.

3 There is no way to limit the air traffic
4 coming into this airport from using it as an
5 intermediate airport if we build it like an
6 intermediate airport except one foot.

7 It will be used for what it's designed
8 for.

9 I once heard that you can tell how things
10 are by putting them to a test.

11 An animal that might smell like a duck,
12 that might have features like a duck, that might
13 fly like a duck and make the noise of a duck most
14 likely is a duck.

15 This plan is for an intermediate
16 airport.

17 This could violate both State law and
18 court orders.

19 The City of Lexington would like to be on
20 record as being opposed to the runway extension.
21 The City of Lexington would like to be on record as
22 being opposed to the creation of additional
23 runways, and the City of Lexington would like to be
24 on record as being opposed to the precision
25 approach system which would bring commercial and

1 private air traffic directly over Lexington and low
2 landing approaches in the worst of weather
3 conditions.

4 There are no residents in the City of
5 Lexington or any of the surrounding communities
6 that have bought property or built houses near an
7 intermediate airport, but that may change depending
8 on the Metropolitan Airport Commission's decision.

9 It's not similar to other airports where
10 you can see what they are and you move there and
11 you accept those circumstances.

12 This airport has not been designed or
13 designated for these uses that it's being built
14 for.

15 The City of Lexington would join the
16 other communities and extend efforts to oppose this
17 expansion.

18 I'd like to thank the Chair for the
19 opportunity to speak.

20

21 MR. FIORE: Thank you,
22 Mr. Anderson.

23 The Chair will now recognize Phil Korst,
24 city councilmember of Circle Pines.

25 I hope I pronounced that right.

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

MR. KORST: Yes, you did. Thank you.

Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Commission. My name is Phil Korst, councilmember for Circle Pines.

I'm here to express Circle Pines' opposition to any new expansion to the Anoka County Airport.

We believe it is poor public policy to expend public dollars to provide for the growth of private recreational aircraft at this site.

These aircraft are what the city most commonly receives complaints about. These noise complaints relate to aircraft flying at inappropriate levels, and from a safety standpoint, the growth in the number of these aircraft increase the likelihood that there are and will be an accident that does injure the residents or to the students in the number of schools surrounding the airport area. These schools are located in the flight path.

Every week now we get some news report -- we see it weekly, if not monthly, that a small plane goes down, single engine. This is the type

1 of aircraft we're talking about, and we're very,
2 very concerned about this.

3 We will be submitting written comments in
4 the near future.

5 Thank you.

6
7 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Mr. Korst.

8 That is all that I have for public
9 officials. Are there any other public officials?

10 Okay. Could I -- do I have a card for
11 you?

12
13 MS. TRUDE: Yes, I have a card.
14 Julie Trude.

15
16 MR. FIORE: I'm sorry, Julie.

17
18 MS. TRUDE: I started to write City
19 of Mounds View and you collected my card before I
20 finished it.

21
22 MR. FIORE: I apologize.

23 The Chair recognizes Julie Trude from the
24 City of Mounds View.

25

1 MS. TRUDE: Right. I'm a
2 councilmember in the City of Mounds View.

3 And I also will agree with the comments
4 from the speakers of Lexington and Circle Pines
5 that my phone has been ringing more since the
6 control tower went up than before. And that causes
7 me great concern, because I've really truly wanted
8 to believe the bill of goods that we were sold at
9 our city hall about a year ago that this would
10 improve the safety and improve the quality of life
11 to the residents in Mounds View who saw many
12 aircraft flying low over their homes. And we felt
13 after this went in that we would get some
14 cooperation.

15 Just as recently as a week ago from
16 Sunday, approximately ten days ago, there was some
17 kind of a 10:00 a.m. breakfast at Crystal Airport.
18 I had calls or contact from two of my neighbors who
19 were very alarmed to see two large Army type or old
20 retired World War II aircraft take off from the
21 Anoka County Airport in an apparent formation over
22 our homes in our neighborhoods, and when these
23 aircraft are viewed from your backyard and you look
24 up and they're about the length of one of the trees
25 that it's flying over and there's two of them

1 within 150 feet wingspan, and they're older
2 aircraft, approximately 40-some years old, it is
3 alarming to people raising children in their
4 homes.

5 I called immediately the air traffic
6 control tower and talked to the control officer,
7 and he told me -- and then a short time after
8 another aircraft took off flying extremely low over
9 the homes in Mounds View.

10 My visual guess, and my neighbor, who's a
11 Minneapolis police officer, guessed that they were
12 below the 300 foot zone.

13 Supposedly we have about a 500 foot
14 safety zone over our homes, but that is not what we
15 witness on a daily basis.

16 This was intimidating or frightening,
17 because I called the air traffic tower, as an
18 elected official, expect a cooperative,
19 professional response. We were told they were
20 going to be staffed with FAA controllers, and this
21 man said, "Well, once they take off, I have nothing
22 -- there's nothing I can do." I hope that is not
23 MAC's position. I hope that's not how the
24 controllers are trained.

25 I hope -- I see Mr. Fuhrmann is in the

1 audience. I hope that the airport reliever manager
2 can investigate that incident and find out why it
3 is that the formation flights occur over our
4 homes.

5 And then I can also vouch personally that
6 it was about three weeks ago on Monday, I sat at
7 the city hall ball field with my seven year old and
8 about 50 parents and 30 seven year olds as we saw
9 again two aircraft approach from the east. They
10 flew over the city hall ball field directly next to
11 our water tower, approximately parallel to our
12 water tower, two of them formation flight.

13 There was also an adult baseball game
14 going on in that recreational field.

15 I've had complaints of this from the
16 playground superintendent at Pinewood Elementary
17 School located at 35W and County Road I of similar
18 observations.

19 If this is the kind of advantage we're
20 offered with control tower, I can't imagine that it
21 can get continually any better if you keep adding
22 more runways and lengthen them.

23 The residents in my city are calling me,
24 and they're mothers, and they're mothers who are
25 alarmed and concerned.

1 I know you have personally heard from Sue
2 Weber. She told me of the incident that happened
3 this spring when a jet was arriving for a low
4 approach. It was south of County Road J, had
5 descended significantly, and her little girl came
6 running in the house screaming and crying, "Mommy,
7 it's going to crash." It didn't happen, but that's
8 how us mothers feel in our community. That's what
9 we're concerned about.

10 I personally a year ago was in a driveway
11 on Groveland Road with a and our children, and we
12 hit the pavement because a low flying jet almost
13 tipped her cottonwood tree in the yard.

14 I'm very concerned that these issues are
15 not being addressed as a mother, as an elected
16 official, as a parent who has children in public
17 schools, children who are using our parks.

18 I implore any of the pilots in the
19 audience to encourage your fellow pilots to abide
20 by the flight standards which require you to
21 approach north of County Road J, to not make a
22 direct flight, zip around the water tower in Mounds
23 View or zip around the tower in Spring Lake Park to
24 come in for an overpass to view people in their
25 backyard swimming pools or whatever it is they're

1 trying to do. It interrupts their life so much,
2 and I think the air traffic control tower isn't
3 capable of handling that.

4 The morning that I called with my
5 problem, he had many takeoffs and landings to
6 handle. He put me on hold several times and had to
7 clear people for takeoff and landings.

8 These safety issues are going to only
9 increase with more aircraft and larger aircraft and
10 noisier aircraft, so the comments I'm putting in
11 the record I would say speak specifically for what
12 I would call the social environmental impacts by
13 the proposed plan. I think these social impacts
14 will increase.

15 So my community safety is threatened, and
16 also I'm concerned about the noise.

17 I think the assumptions that were made in
18 the standards that state the noise level, I think
19 there's an assumption that these aircraft are
20 maintained at altitudes greater than they presently
21 are.

22 I had a call from a resident, Mr. Obert,
23 on Greenwood one day because he was awakened at
24 2:00 a.m. in the morning by the jet that flies
25 checks in and out. It usually comes in around

1 11:00 o'clock at night. He was awakened. His
2 windows were rattling, and that's not within the
3 noise standards that are in your models.

4 The personal testimony of the people that
5 call me include people who live on Edgewood Drive
6 close to our city's city hall. I've had many calls
7 from people on Long Lake Road. I've had calls from
8 people who live on Sunnyside Road. I've had people
9 on Greenwood who have called me, people who live on
10 Redwood Drive who call me, people on Knollwood
11 Drive where I reside.

12 It's a frequent topic of conversation
13 when I go down the street for a walk. Pleasant
14 View Drive, Sherwood Drive, Ardan Road, Groveland
15 Road, Saint Stephen's Street, St. Michael's
16 Street. And I could provide names of families that
17 live on all these places that have called me within
18 the last year about their concerns about low flying
19 aircraft, concerned about their safety with the
20 older aircraft.

21 One of our councilmembers said he's very
22 concerned about the stress test that occur over his
23 house and yard, and I guess that's how some people
24 view a 50 year old aircraft when it has to do the
25 touch and goes.

1 One of my neighbors on Knollwood called
2 and talked to Mr. Fiore within the past month about
3 the touch and go operation of one of these older
4 aircraft, and he landed and took off five times
5 within about a 40 minute period, and it was very
6 disruptive to his activities and in his home, and I
7 can assure you that if the noise levels are such
8 they disrupt our activities in our home, they're
9 exceeding those decibel levels that your model is
10 projecting.

11 So the personal comments to people who
12 are trying to raise families and live in their
13 homes and enjoy some solitude are being disrupted
14 by perhaps some people who do not respect the rules
15 and I don't see that there's an effort to find
16 compliance. I really urge pilots in the audience
17 that if you don't want to see continuing dissension
18 from the general public who can't afford to fly or
19 is not able to enjoy that privilege, that you would
20 try and respect the neighborhoods and respect the
21 quiet and solitude.

22 People who bought their homes in the area
23 anticipated the minor use. They didn't anticipate
24 the larger jets. Most of the complaints are about
25 the older larger aircraft and people who are

1 disobeying the rules.

2 The recreational pilots, I seldom hear a
3 complaint about a recreational pilot if they're
4 abiding by the rules, coming in north of County
5 Road J and then making their landing and approach
6 from within the -- within the configuration that is
7 recommended.

8 So I think that these concerns need to be
9 addressed. I want these considered as impacts on
10 the social environmental statement, and I think any
11 expansion of the runway and additional runways will
12 only make this zone in my community larger where
13 the complaints will be generated from, impacting
14 more homes and values.

15 I can even speak to the market value of
16 homes. I will be leaving the City of Mounds View
17 in the near future, but I feel this is my
18 obligation to represent the families that I care so
19 much about.

20 A realtor told me after he read about the
21 proposal you have is, "Julie, if you sell your home
22 next summer, it's going to sell for less because of
23 this plan. If this goes through, the market value
24 of your home would be less."

25 My whole community's economic property

1 values will also be impacted, and that would be a
2 negative on the Environmental Impact Statement.

3 That concludes my comments. Thank you
4 for recognizing me.

5

6 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Ms. Trude.

7 Are there any more public officials to
8 address the hearing?

9 If not, the Chair will ask from here on
10 out will you please give in addition to your name,
11 will you please give your address as well?

12 Joseph Rusch.

13

14 MR. RUSCH: Good evening. My name
15 is Joe Rusch. I live at 419 Pleasure Creek Drive.
16 I live on the west side of the airport.

17 I oppose the expansion of the east-west
18 runway. That would allow larger planes, noisier
19 planes, more fuel, heavier loaded, to fly over the
20 east-west neighborhood.

21 Right now I get planes coming in low
22 morning, noon and night. I can't sleep at night
23 without having a plane come over, wake me up in the
24 middle of the night.

25 I talk to my neighbors. There's some

1 airplane there, especially these World War II
2 planes and some of the older planes. You can't
3 talk to your neighbors without having the
4 interference of an airplane drowning out the
5 conversation. So I oppose any expansion of the
6 airport.

7 I moved in here, the airport was the way
8 it is, and I don't like it, but I have to live with
9 it. I don't want to have any expansion of the
10 airport.

11 Thank you.

12

13 MR. FIORE: Thank you, sir.

14 The Chair will now recognize Andrew
15 Gibas.

16

17 MR. GIBAS: My name is Andrew
18 Gibas. I live in Circle Pines, and I go back a few
19 years, because we moved into this area in 1948, at
20 which time the airport was in Ramsey County, across
21 what is now the freeway.

22 When I listen to these statistics about
23 how there's going to be no noise and there's going
24 to be no problem at all, no growth, all you have to
25 do is drive down, I think it's 91st Street where

1 the airport storage units are located, and you'll
2 find that there's -- you know, two years ago or
3 before the tar road was put in, there were about
4 five or six units at that time, hangars.

5 If you drive by now and also drive past
6 the airport, you will find that there are not five
7 or six or ten but there are over 150 of those
8 units.

9 Now, you have to be stupid to not realize
10 that if you have that many more storage units, that
11 you're going to have a lot more planes flying, and
12 this is true.

13 Now, I've heard some of the other people
14 talk about noise at night. I used to be able to
15 sleep at nighttime, but I get awakened up in the
16 middle of the night repeatedly because this
17 particular factor is ignored.

18 I'd like to go into discussion on the
19 environmental. You know, as these planes fly over,
20 what do you think they're -- when you're driving
21 your automobile, you're kicking out impurities.
22 And when you're driving an airplane, the same thing
23 is true.

24 So I'd like to see some figures on
25 exactly how much more pollution we're getting than

1 we have been getting in the past.

2 And I could go on, but I would want to
3 cover all of those points in a written testimony
4 that I will submit before the 25th of this month.

5

6 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Mr. Gibas,
7 and I apologize for mispronouncing your name.

8 The Chair will now recognize Peter
9 Godine.

10

11 MR. GODINE: Thank you.

12 My name is Peter Godine. I live at 11498
13 Knollwood Court Northeast.

14 I agree wholeheartedly with all the
15 speakers previous to this who have objected to this
16 expansion.

17 I came to the hearing about the tower
18 here in this room a year and a half ago or so. At
19 that time I asked the specific question, I believe,
20 about the dual runways, and the comment was there's
21 no plans to expand the runways at this time.

22 I don't know how long it took to put this
23 plan together, but I'm suspicious of the reply I
24 got back then.

25 I guess I have a question. Is there a

1 financial report on the operation of the airport?
2 I've heard the chairman repeatedly say that no
3 taxpayer dollars are used, and I heard the
4 discussion about taxpayer versus public dollars. I
5 agree, I think they're public dollars, whether you
6 call them tax dollars or not. The public is paying
7 for the private use aircraft to have a place to
8 play and do business.

9 I'm not sure when you say no taxpayer
10 dollars are used, if you take 3,400 acres out of
11 the tax base of this area, I'm sure you could build
12 3,400 homes there, at least a 100,000 each, that's
13 about 3.4 billion you're taking out of the tax
14 base.

15 So when you say no taxpayer dollars are
16 used, I believe that's not true. We are losing a
17 lot of tax dollars because of that facility there.

18 I believe the comment that was made by
19 the consulting group who prepared the plan was that
20 we could expect maybe one to two jets a day at
21 most. I think we've already exceeded that.

22 I have comment about the FAA DNL measure
23 as well.

24 I learned of the DNL at the last time I
25 came to this hearing, and I believe this is a very

1 convenient way to measure noise so that it sounds
2 like no impact.

3 As I understand it, you average the noise
4 out over 24 hours.

5 Using a DNL, I bet an atomic bomb could
6 fall under 65 DNL out in the middle of the ocean,
7 one big spike, and then it would be quiet for the
8 rest of the time, and your average would probably
9 be less than 65 DNL. I think that's a ridiculous
10 way to measure noise.

11 The noise that's the objection is not the
12 quiet spaces in between. It's the maximum noise at
13 the time of the interference, which happens over
14 500 times a day according to your figures, because
15 you're having over 500 operations a day here.

16 That averages out to me to be about 23
17 operations per hour. It would seem to me you could
18 easily go up to 30 or 40 or 45 operations per hour
19 with the current facility. That could get you well
20 over your projected increase over the next 20 years
21 or whatever your flight -- your planning horizon
22 is.

23 Now, yeah, they may not occur at the
24 times you want them to occur, but they don't occur
25 for us, the public, on the freeway either.

1 The average traffic on the freeway is
2 probably pretty good, but when we have to go to
3 work, it's terrible.

4 The comments about flying dual formations
5 I believe was also made at the last hearing here,
6 and I think the airport manager at that time made a
7 comment, "Yeah, we're going to need to do something
8 about forbidding that." I don't remember exactly,
9 but I think he did respond to that. I don't know
10 why nothing has happened on that.

11 Anyway, I get very irritated about this
12 whole thing, because I think they keep sneaking it
13 up on us in small increments, hoping that we will
14 ignore it and go away, because a year and a half
15 ago, I'm sure the reply was there's no current plan
16 to expand the airport runways, and here we are a
17 year and a half later and we've got a plan.

18 Thank you for your attention.

19

20 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Mr. Godine.

21 The Chair will now recognize Gary
22 Specketer.

23

24 MR. SPECKETER: Good evening. My
25 name is Gary Specketer. I'm an aircraft -- oh, the

1 address is 12009 Jefferson Street Northeast.

2 I'm an aircraft owner and a pilot at
3 Anoka County Airport, and I would like to speak in
4 support of the plan.

5 By in large the plan does what needs to
6 be done for the viability of the airport.

7 There are issues that need to be
8 addressed. The long range plan takes a look at
9 doing those.

10 The one objection I would have is that if
11 we go to a dual runway on north-south, it would
12 shorten the existing runway back considerably from
13 what it is now.

14 I do not feel it's good use of public
15 assets to tear up existing infrastructure. As long
16 as it's there, let's maintain it and let's continue
17 it.

18 The objections that have been voiced
19 according to noise, I do not fully understand as a
20 pilot. I try to be responsible. I have neighbors
21 that live below the flight path. I live somewhat
22 outside the flight path, but I am aware of the
23 noise too.

24 By extending and having a balanced
25 airport, in effect it shifts the operations between

1 two runways. There are options available. You
2 don't if you have a bad wind day have all of the
3 airplanes coming over your house. There are
4 options for the airport to use.

5 If accidents and safety are the criteria
6 that we judge a long range plan by, I think this is
7 the thing that supports the plan more than anything
8 else. Without planning, without infrastructure,
9 safety goes downhill.

10 I can speak as a pilot. I do not fly
11 over the residential areas near as often now that
12 we have a control tower as I did before. I was
13 mandated to because of the traffic flow before
14 that.

15 Planning and organization leads to better
16 safety and leads to quieter municipalities.

17 A lot of what you're going to be hearing
18 tonight and you've already heard comes under the
19 category "Not in my backyard." It happens with
20 every public hearing with everything that's going
21 on in any community.

22 One of the things I would like to point
23 out, that while they are not here, there are many,
24 many people who like this airport and support this
25 airport.

1 We have an Aviation Days out there
2 annually, and this year we had 30,000 people who
3 thought the airport was a great place to come to
4 for a weekend, to bring their kids, to look at
5 airplanes, and thought it was great. They're
6 obviously not all here. But the public opinion is
7 not as unbalanced as tonight's hearing would
8 indicate.

9 Thank you.

10

11 MR. FIORE: Thank you,
12 Mr. Specketer.

13 The Chair will now recognize Nancy Zeck.

14

15 MS. ZECK: Hi. My name is Nancy
16 Zeck. I live at 9539 Griggs Avenue.

17 Basically I feel like I'm right in the
18 flight pattern of these airplanes.

19 When you say not in my backyard, that's
20 exactly what I mean.

21 Six years ago I moved into Lexington. I
22 hardly knew there was an airport in this area until
23 the last year and a half when the larger planes are
24 flying over.

25 At times I thought they were literally

1 crashing into our homes.

2 So my concern is that more larger planes
3 will be flying over and the noise level will
4 accelerate.

5 I also want to let you know that I'm
6 disappointed as to the publicizing of this
7 meeting. By accident I stumbled across the notice
8 in the Minneapolis paper. I ran up and down my
9 neighborhood tonight and asked my neighbors if they
10 were aware of this public hearing, and the answer
11 was no.

12 Thank you.

13

14 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Ms. Zeck.

15 The Chair will now recognize Dennis
16 Erickson.

17

18 MR. ERICKSON: I'm Dennis Erickson.
19 I live at 99th and Jackson.

20 And I, too, kind of stumbled across the
21 ad in the Minneapolis paper, and that's the only
22 indication I saw of this meeting, was a small ad at
23 the bottom of a section of paper.

24 As mentioned that it would be a modest
25 increase in traffic, I think going from 180,000

1 currently to 272,000 is a 50 percent increase.
2 That's a great deal more than a modest increase.

3 I agree with three of the city officials,
4 everything they've had to say. I applaud their
5 effort, the time they put in in looking this up.

6 I kind of wish the official from Blaine
7 had spoken up against the airport, also, because I
8 see, excuse me, no advantage to the citizens of
9 Blaine in enlarging this airport.

10 My eyes have been opened a great deal on
11 what's going on here. I see another indication, as
12 has been mentioned, step by step slowly slip things
13 in here and pretty soon you've got a larger
14 airport, which if you tried to come in initially,
15 you know you wouldn't get.

16 If the gentleman who just spoke, the
17 pilot, is indicative, I think the councilperson
18 that spoke here, his actions when people were
19 speaking against the airport I think were rather
20 childish. When she said she was planning on
21 moving, he was applauding.

22 If these are the pilots that are supposed
23 to be flying safely in our neighborhoods, I don't
24 think it's a good representation.

25 Thank you.

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

MR. FIORE: Thank you, sir.

The Chair has a maybe from Ron Barrows.
Does Mr. Barrows wish to address the --

MR. BARROWS: My name is Ron
Barrows, and I reside at 1672 Kristin Court in
Fridley.

I am a lifelong Anoka resident, Blaine
business owner, airplane owner and airport user.

Not too long ago I had the opportunity --
strike that -- a nail biting experience to fly to
and land at Pelwaukee (reporter's spelling),
Illinois. Until you fly into a community like
that, you don't realize what we've got here, I
don't think.

That's a community that has two major
airports and three or four deteriorating satellites
compared to our community with one major and five
to six satellites.

I feel that we're safe, we're quiet and
we're controlled.

I enjoy flying here. I feel safe here.
And if we don't address expansion and safety, I
think we've got our head in our sand -- head in the

1 sand.

2 I appreciate the opportunity to view my
3 comments.

4

5 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Mr. Barrows.

6 That is the end of those in the audience
7 that have submitted cards to speak. Is there
8 anyone else that cares to address the hearing?

9

10

11 A MALE VOICE: I'd like to address
12 the hearing, if I can.

13

14 MR. FIORE: Can you fill out a card,
15 please?

16

17 A MALE VOICE: I don't have one.

18

19 MR. FIORE: We'll get you one.

20 Is there anybody else that would like to
21 address the hearing?

22

23 A MALE VOICE: Do you want the card
24 up there?

25

1 MR. FIORE: Please.

2

3 MR. MARKFELT: My name is Ryan
4 Markfelt, and I live at 2564 Ardan Avenue in
5 Mounds View, directly in line with the north-south
6 runway.

7 I've spoke to this council before, and
8 Mark, he's well aware of what I'm probably going to
9 say, but one of the things that bothers me more
10 than anything else is the numbers that you people
11 are using. The basic numbers when I first started
12 hearing about this two or three years ago was that
13 we had 230,000 operations at this airport every
14 year.

15 I did some quick math on it, and I wish
16 that the rest of this crew would take some math on
17 this thing and figure out how many planes that puts
18 in the air on a daily basis around here.

19 I challenge those numbers, and I think
20 the numbers have dropped down considerably a number
21 of times. And I think on one of the reports that I
22 read somewhere had 190 some thousand operations in
23 '83, '84 was a hundred and something else, and it
24 just kept going downhill.

25 Today I called the tower and I asked

1 them, I says, "Can I have the numbers for since you
2 guys have been in operation, since October?" He
3 says, "Well I'm not at liberty to give you those
4 numbers," he said, "but MAC will give them to you,
5 because I fill them out and give them to them every
6 month." And I said, "Well, I've had enough
7 dealings with MAC to know that I'm not going to get
8 those numbers." So he says, "Well, try the FAA."
9 And he gave me Bruce Wagner's number, and a very
10 nice gentleman I talked to, and it's real
11 interesting. He told me, he says, "I do not have
12 the numbers right now because the gal that I'm
13 -- that does this or whoever the person is that's
14 in charge of those is on vacation." And he says,
15 "If you'll write me a letter," he says, "I will
16 furnish this information to you." I says, "Well,
17 that's not going to do me any good. I'm a day late
18 and a dollar short for tonight's meeting." He
19 says, "Well, I can help you out there a little
20 bit." He says, "If you want to know," he says,
21 "from October of '96 when you opened this tower
22 through June, they've had 102,929 operations."
23 Okay, to date, for that period of time. He says,
24 "The June level was 16,252 operations," and he
25 says, "If you took July, August and September and

1 threw those numbers into it based on the June
2 traffic, because it's a busy time of the year," he
3 says "you would come up with a total of 151,685
4 operations a year at this airport."

5 That's a far cry from the 230,000 that I
6 heard a little while ago, and it's a far cry from
7 the 180 or the 270,000 that you're talking about
8 now.

9 In reality, if the numbers were true or
10 were valid and could be substantiated, you would
11 find that the traffic at this airport has actually
12 gone down over this period of time. It has not
13 gone up, if their numbers are correct.

14 I don't know how to address this. I feel
15 in my own mind, and I have no way of proving this,
16 but I feel that the numbers that were used by MAC
17 and the planning people was basically used to
18 justify the tower. The tower was the key issue to
19 this whole operation.

20 Without the tower, they could not build
21 double runways in either direction. They couldn't
22 put in the guidance systems. They wouldn't need
23 them, but they got the tower. The next step is the
24 runways. And the direct -- this whole thing is
25 headed right toward an intermediate airport and

1 there's no way around it.

2 You can call it what you want, but in
3 reality, it's being designed for more traffic of
4 bigger planes than what we are accustomed to.

5 Thank you.

6
7 MR. FIORE: Thank you, sir.

8 I'd just like to -- there were 186,000
9 operations at this airport last year as a published
10 number. And that's from the counts, and the count
11 for the control tower was an FAA count. That was
12 done by an FAA survey in June of two years ago, so
13 that was not a MAC count.

14
15 MR. MARKFELT: If you want to stick
16 with that number, that's okay. You can go ahead
17 and do that.

18
19 MR. FIORE: That's the published
20 number.

21
22 MR. MARKFELT: Well, that's the
23 published number, but I can publish a number also,
24 okay? And what I'm saying is, is I tried very hard
25 to find out how that number was arrived at, and

1 there was nobody, and I mean nobody could tell me
2 the exact way it was done, and it came out as an
3 answer, okay? And this may sound a little
4 ridiculous because it sure did to me, but it's
5 through some formula that is in Washington, D.C.
6 that nobody happens to know how it really works.
7 Okay. But this is how we get our numbers, and it's
8 supposedly based on the number of aircraft based at
9 a place, the overflies or whatever you call it
10 where planes are going through, plus the touch and
11 goes or operations, meaning a takeoff and a
12 landing.

13 Incidentally, that's another interesting
14 thing if you want to talk about numbers. I asked
15 today about these numbers, do they include the
16 traffic that passes through the zone of this
17 airport, and the answer was, "Well, some of it is,
18 yeah, but it's insignificant. Those numbers don't
19 mean anything." Okay. Well, I don't know. It all
20 depends on how you look at it. If you want to make
21 a number big, you can make it big. Okay. If you
22 want to make it small, you can make it small also.
23 So all depends on how you do it.

24

25

MR. FIORE: Thank you, sir.

1 Marylee Cook.

2

3 MS. COOK: My name is Marylee Cook.

4 I live at 2194 Lakebrook Drive in New Brighton.

5 A few months ago we made a down payment
6 on a lot just east of this east-west runway to
7 build our retirement home. Tomorrow we cancel it,
8 after what I've heard from these residents, and
9 it's a very, very difficult decision to make. But
10 why do we want to buy this can of worms and bring
11 it into our lives during our retirement years? No
12 thank you.

13

14 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Ms. Cook.

15 The Chair will recognize John Krack.

16

17 MR. KRACK: My name is John Krack.

18 I live at 7629 Lakeside Road in Fridley.

19 I'm speaking tonight on my own behalf,
20 but I am very active in the Anoka County Aviation
21 Association, which is an organization that was
22 formed approximately seven years ago to try to
23 promote -- to actually promote safe operation of
24 the airport and as well as community relations.
25 And we have supported community relations through

1 our sponsorship of the Blaine Aviation Days which
2 was mentioned earlier and other programs.

3 I'm here to speak in support of the MAC
4 proposal. I've been a pilot for approximately 30
5 years. I've flown out of Anoka County since 1983
6 when I had the opportunity to build a hangar.

7 For the first few years, having flown out
8 of that airport, I was actually quite frightened
9 because of the traffic situation. I had flown out
10 of Crystal prior to that, which had a control
11 tower, was very comfortable flying in a controlled
12 environment, and I was actually quite frightened to
13 fly out of Anoka.

14 Over time I got used to the pattern, but
15 I was still never comfortable with them.

16 The advent of the tower to me was a great
17 advance, a great step forward in the safety of the
18 operation of that airport.

19 I believe also, although I am quite
20 surprised, dismayed and actually disappointed by
21 some of the comments I've heard regarding low
22 flying aircraft over populated areas, and I guess
23 I'd like to see some of that myself, but I haven't
24 had the opportunity to.

25 I keep my patterns above County Road J,

1 north of County Road J, and I really believe that
2 the tower has been a great asset.

3 I believe also that airports on balance
4 are an asset to a community. Airports attract
5 businesses, which are the lifebloods of the
6 communities.

7 I had one individual call me several
8 years ago who is a pilot for a manufacturing
9 company in this area, and he was asking me -- at
10 the time I was the president of the Anoka County
11 Aviation Association -- to support the tower
12 activity. He wanted to move -- they wanted to move
13 their aircraft into this area from Crystal because
14 it was closer to their facility.

15 And the presence of a viable airport does
16 bring in businesses who would not otherwise settle
17 here because of the convenience.

18 The airport system that the Twin Cities
19 has is pretty unique within the United States. We
20 have a well balanced system.

21 We have aircraft spread around the area.
22 We're not all using the same airport. We have a
23 very safe system, and I believe that it's an
24 infrastructure which needs to be preserved, it
25 needs to be nurtured, and it needs to grow in a

1 controlled way, balancing as much as feasible and
2 as much as possible the concerns of the community
3 residents as well as the safety and the needs of
4 the aviation community.

5 Thank you.

6

7 MR. FIORE: Thank you, Mr. Krack.

8 Are there any further members of the
9 hearing who wish to address -- fill out a card,
10 please.

11

12

13 A FEMALE VOICE: I did. Carol
14 Kampff.

15

16 MR. FIORE: Oh, I'm sorry. You've
17 already addressed us.

18

19 MS. KAMPPFF: No, I haven't. That
20 was Marylee Cook.

21

22 MR. FIORE: Oh, I'm sorry. I
23 apologize. Excuse me.

24 I thank you for addressing us then.

25

1 MS. KAMPFF: You probably already
2 have my name, carol Kampff, 8330 Redwood Street
3 Northwest, Coon Rapids Minnesota.

4 I'm a resident of Anoka County, the
5 southern area.

6 And my concerns aren't as specific as the
7 neighbors who live very close to the airport.

8 My concern is based on a comment by the
9 lady presenter. I didn't catch her name. I was a
10 few minutes late. But I came in just as she was
11 saying -- speaking about the entire metropolitan
12 airport system and that these auxiliary airports or
13 minor airports are used also to over -- to take
14 additional traffic from other airports.

15 I'm beginning to get the feeling if you
16 look at the growth pattern for the north metro
17 area, Anoka County, it's exploding in growth right
18 now, and it's going to continue because it's the
19 best and cheapest way for the metropolitan area to
20 expand.

21 And I think the main metropolitan
22 airport, the Minneapolis-St. Paul International, is
23 getting so much traffic that they're going to
24 divert as much smaller craft as they possibly can
25 to your intermediate and minor airports because of

1 a safety factor.

2 I also think from what I've heard here
3 tonight that the residents here might possibly not
4 have so much opposition if this proposal were to
5 expand the runway purely for safety reasons but not
6 to increase traffic.

7 They had this airport for basically
8 pleasure craft when they moved here, and they knew
9 it, they're dealing with it. They already have
10 plenty of problems as a result of that. I think
11 they'd be in favor of expansion for safety reasons
12 only to help control what they have here now.

13 Another big point was made about no land
14 acquisition being necessary for this.

15 It seems almost that the MAC is trying to
16 cram as much as they can into this and get the most
17 bang for their buck, so to speak, in this airport
18 instead of being more long-term thinking to an
19 airport on the northern end of the Twin Cities but
20 further out.

21 You're starting to create here with talk
22 of possible noise abatement being necessary, with
23 the housing, you're creating in a much more minor
24 proportion many of the same problems that you have
25 with Minneapolis-St. Paul International.

1 You're crammed in the middle of the
2 city.

3 Why not look to the future and go out,
4 and it would promote development for the northern
5 areas of Minnesota, not just the metropolitan
6 area.

7 And additionally, all the environmental
8 concerns, I hope I won't some day read a notice in
9 the paper that all these things were deemed not
10 worthy of an Environmental Impact Statement, that
11 that will be waived. And this issue of the
12 wetlands, it's a big concern in Anoka County. We
13 do have a lot of wetlands.

14 God made the earth the way it is. I
15 don't think that you can recreate wetlands
16 absolutely accurately in other areas. Then I think
17 that's when you start to have problems with floods
18 and that sort of thing.

19 But if it were a safety issue and not a
20 grown issue, and there's nothing that's in the plan
21 from what I can tell from the presentations, since
22 I haven't had the plan to review, that states that
23 these projections are maximums. It's just a
24 projection. It could go far beyond that. There's
25 nothing to say, is there, and I'm asking you, that

1 there is a cap beyond which this airport cannot
2 go. You've only talked about projected increases
3 but you've never talked about maximums, and maybe
4 they're part of the FAA regulations that you talked
5 about, but I don't know that, and I'd like some
6 comment on that.

7 I thank you for your time.

8

9 MR. FIORE: You're welcome.

10 Are there any further members of the
11 public that care to address the hearing?

12 Any further comments?

13 If there are no further comments, let me
14 again remind you that any additional communications
15 received by the MAC prior to the end of the
16 business day on July 25th will be made part of this
17 hearing record.

18 If there is no further business to come
19 before this hearing, I thank you all for your
20 attendance.

21 This hearing is now concluded at 8:45.

22 Thank you very much.

23

24 (Hearing concluded at

25 approximately 8:45 p.m.)

