

Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

The Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on November 8, 2007. Mr. Jack Lanners, Chairman of the Metropolitan Airports Commission, was invited to this meeting to talk about the MAC system of airports which includes the Minneapolis-St. Paul International airport and six reliever airports, including Flying Cloud Airport, that surround the Twin Cities.

A number of questions were raised by the general public attending the meeting and the Mr. Lanners promised that responses to these questions would be prepared by MAC. The following pages are responses to the questions asked that evening.

Index	General Comment	General Response
GR1	General comments expressing concerns over the impact on property values due to the expansion of Flying Cloud Airport (FCM).	The relationship between cumulative noise levels and property values is complex. Several studies have been conducted with inconclusive results. The degree of effect is contingent on several factors including the level and frequency of the noise, the location of a property relative to overflights, the perceived amenities and quality of the affected neighborhood/community, the local supply and demand for housing, the local and regional economy and other market conditions that cannot be controlled or predicted. The assessment of property valuation cannot be isolated to one element, i.e., airport effects; therefore, such analysis would be speculative and hypothetical at best. As a general rule, real property values in areas with less than DNL 65 noise exposure are not affected by aircraft operations, which is the case at FCM.

Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

GR2	General comments regarding land that was acquired by the MAC for the FCM expansion; specifically, that the land could be better used to create more tax revenue and to keep property taxes down for Eden Prairie if it was developed for commercial or residential use.		The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the expansion of FCM identifies several specific projects to provide for the airport development plan that best satisfies the year 2010 aviation needs of the airport and the Metropolitan Airports System. The projects include acquiring sufficient land to protect the airport from incompatible development. The FEIS identifies the tax revenue that would have been lost in 1999 by the City from all of the land acquisition is \$75,131, which is less than 0.07% of the total tax revenue collected by the city in 1999.
GR3	General comments from residents stating that they are not happy with the airport expansion, the increase in jet traffic and the increase in noise from the airport.		The MAC and the City of Eden Prairie negotiated an agreement that outlines several actions on behalf of the MAC that are intended to protect residents around FCM from airport noise impacts associated with the operation and development of FCM. The agreement outlined preferential departure routes, a voluntary program to restrict the operation of Stage 2 aircraft, a voluntary restriction on nighttime aircraft and recommended procedures for nighttime operations.
GR4	General comments regarding the overall need for the airport expansion if the airport is not running at capacity or if the expansion does not directly benefit Eden Prairie residents.		Expansion of FCM is not based on economic need or on a positive benefit-cost ratio; rather, It is based on minimizing the use of MSP by general aviation traffic and providing hangars to meet existing and future demand. FCM is a reliever airport (of MSP) in the Metropolitan Council's Metropolitan Airports System. FCM currently does not have the facilities needed to function effectively in that role, as determined by the Metropolitan Council. The needed facilities are a 5,000 ft. runway and additional hangar space. The provision of a 5,000 ft. runway will also provide a greater margin of safety for all aircraft operating at the airport.
1.	Gary Demee — 9425 Shetland Rd, Eden Prairie	A There appears to be some misinformation coming from this Commission regarding the Flying Cloud Airport expansion. The information regarding the cost benefit of expanding Flying Cloud Airport is not accurate.	See GR4.

**Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the
Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting**

		B	Expansion would reduce property values.	See GR1.
		C	Expansion would reduce standard of living and cause a loss of millions of dollars per year in property tax, school funding and other revenues from land taken by MAC.	See GR2.
		D	Extending a runway will not necessarily generate more revenue for the airport. Ninety percent of the planes there now can continue to use the existing runway. Why spend additional money on a public encroachment project when the airport is running at 33% of capacity.	See GR4.
2.	Laura Neumann — 8903 Sylvan Rd, Eden Prairie	A	MAC Commissioners are not readily available and accessible to the general public.	MAC Commissioners spend a considerable amount of time each month attending meetings of the board and its committees. In preparation for those meetings, commissioners pore through agenda and background packets often totaling 100 pages or more in length. Many commissioners are involved in other MAC leadership roles such as with the Taxi Advisory Committee, Reliever Airports Advisory Council, community airport relations groups and special projects such as ordinance hearings, task force meetings, and legislative or public outreach activities. Public input is invited at every meeting of board committees and of the board as a whole. Commissioners regularly receive and respond to correspondence and phone calls from tenants, travelers and other members of the public. Many speak to local organizations such as Lions Club chapters, rotaries and chambers of commerce. All may be contacted directly or through the Commission secretary.

Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

		<p>B The MAC is looking to obtain private funding for the airport expansion. Has the MAC obtained private funding and, if so, how much and who was the contributor?</p>	<p>Historically, private capital has played a critical role in the development of facilities at the Commission's reliever airports, and it continues to fill that role today. Reliever airport tenant leasehold improvements, including hangars, pavement and fueling systems, have been constructed with private capital. The MAC is in the preliminary stages of identifying private capital to fund various portions of the FCM expansion project. Once finalized, this information will be made available to the public.</p>
		<p>C MAC has stated that the runway expansion is to accommodate newer, quieter aircraft. However, larger business jets are just as loud and even louder. Indications in the EIS are that bigger business jets are not quieter. Specifically, the Falcon 900B is not a quiet aircraft.</p>	<p>The purpose of the FCM expansion project is to provide for the airport development plan that best satisfies the year 2010 aviation needs of FCM and Metropolitan Airports System, as stated in the Aviation Chapter of the Metropolitan Development Guide of the Metropolitan Council. The existing primary runway (10R/28L) is 3,909 feet in length and is inadequate to provide efficient general-aviation air taxi and business aircraft access to the nation. The expansion of FCM will fulfill these development needs and allow full utilization of the airport for aircraft that are currently based at FCM. Due to inadequate runway length at FCM these aircraft have to stopover at Minneapolis-St. Paul International (MSP) for fuel or passengers, which, is inconsistent with the purpose of the reliever airport system.</p> <p>Quiet aircraft technology will continue to become more prevalent at FCM as operators continue to update their fleet of aircraft. These new aircraft are considerably quieter than their predecessors, perform better and are more fuel efficient. Based on Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 36 take-off noise levels it would take approximately 29 Cessna Citation 560 XL (newer technology stage 3 corporate jet) departure operations to equal the same noise energy as one Learjet 28/29 (older technology stage 2 corporate jet) departure operation. Specifically, the Falcon 900B has Part 36 certified noise levels similar to those of many aircraft currently operating at FCM (Cessna Citation 550, Cessna Citation 650).</p>

**Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the
Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting**

		<p>D The EIS document refers to 25 aircraft that cannot effectively use the airport prior to the expansion but can after the expansion.</p>	<p>As an example, the FEIS lists 16 out of 43 light-to-medium sized business jet aircraft that could effectively use FCM at 60% of load capacity. With a 5,000 ft. runway, 41 of the 43 jets listed in the FEIS could effectively operate at FCM. It is important to note that this does not mean that 25 new aircraft will be able to use the airport with a 5,000 ft. runway; rather, it represents aircraft that could effectively use the airport without having to takeoff with reduced fuel and/or passengers (requiring these aircraft to stopover at an airport with adequate runway length to pick up additional fuel and/or passengers). Furthermore, many of the aircraft listed as being able to effectively use the airport with a 5,000 ft. runway have used FCM with only the existing 3,909 ft. runway, just not at full load capacity. MAC ANOMS analysis shows only three aircraft listed in the FEIS as not being able to use FCM effectively with the 3,909 ft. runway (Rockwell Saberliner 40, Rockwell Saberliner 80 and Gulfstream IV) that have not operated at FCM since January 1, 2000. Of those three aircraft the Gulfstream IV would still not be able to use FCM with an expanded 5,000 ft. runway due to Ordinance #97 (aircraft weighing more than 60,000 lbs maximum gross takeoff weight prohibited from using the airport).</p> <p>As stated another way by Mr. Rick King, Chair of the Eden Prairie Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission, most of the aircraft listed in the FEIS use FCM today but sub-optimally, meaning less than full fuel load and passenger load. The extension will permit most of these aircraft to operate optimally. As a result of the extension, two additional aircraft were identified as being able to operate, where they couldn't before.</p>
--	--	---	---

Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

		<p>E Runway improvements appear to be for larger business jets; traffic congestion or delays do not appear to be an issue at Flying Cloud.</p>	<p>See GR4.</p>
		<p>F The growth in noise complaints is concerning.</p>	<p>In an effort to make the complaint reporting process as easy and convenient as possible the MAC has maintained a noise complaint and information hotline (612-726-9411) that residents can call to file noise complaints about specific operations for FCM or any other MAC airport. In response to community requests, the MAC expanded the internet complaint form to allow residents to file noise complaints online for FCM and the other five reliever airports. (This functionality did not exist for the reliever airports prior to 2005.) While noise complaints are used in conjunction with operational data to corroborate specific events or to identify possible trends the actual number of complaints filed at any given time may not be indicative of operational increases in traffic or an overall increase in aircraft noise at the airport.</p> <p>From January to October 2007 the MAC received a total of 653 noise complaints from 65 individual complainants. Of those 653 complaints 176 (26.9%) were filed in September and October and one individual complainant accounted for 82 (46%) of those complaints in September and October. Furthermore, 563 (86.2%) complaints were filed via the internet complaint form which was not available prior to 2005. The MAC will continue to investigate all complaints (both phone and internet) in accordance with the provisions outlined in the December 2002 Final Agreement and the September 2003 FCM Operational Implementation Plan.</p>

Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

		G	Homes will have to be insulated due to the airport expansion.	As part of the December 2002 Final Agreement and the September 2003 FCM Operational Implementation Plan, the MAC agreed to test residences on the east side of the airport within the 60 DNL noise contour to determine the existing exterior to interior noise reduction level. The MAC agreed to conduct the testing within two years from the date that the extended runways are made available for use. In the event that any of the identified residences has an exterior to interior noise reduction level of less than 20 dBA, the MAC agreed to provide sound insulation to achieve a noise reduction of at least 20 dBA.
3.	Vicki Pellar Price – 16893 Bainbridge DR, Eden Prairie	A	It is important to get community input on these issues. In past discussions with some MAC representatives, the representatives said that they don't get the information until the FAA notifies them.	<p>The MAC agrees that community input is an integral part of maintaining, operating and developing a system of airports including FCM. Involvement of the public and government agencies in preparation of the FEIS was extensive and dates back to 1997. Public input is invited at every meeting of MAC board committees and of the board as a whole. Commissioners regularly receive and respond to correspondence and phone calls from tenants, travelers and other members of the public. All may be contacted directly or through the Commission secretary.</p> <p>In addition, the MAC works closely with the local, regional and national FAA; a critical relationship for the furthering of aircraft noise reduction. This cooperative relationship with the FAA, the tenants operating at FCM, and the Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission has helped to foster cooperative solutions in noise reduction and the development of innovative procedures like the preferred noise abatement procedures recently developed for air ambulance helicopter operations based at FCM.</p>

**Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the
Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting**

	B	The Department of Homeland Security has new rules for private aircraft arriving in the U.S. from a foreign port. There will be additional risks to security as larger planes use Flying Cloud.	Security is a top priority at all MAC airports. The MAC has been diligent in working with local and national law enforcement agencies to provide information and to accommodate requests that enhance the security of the National Airspace System. Furthermore, the MAC worked with the City of Eden Prairie and the Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission (FCAAC) to review airport security and implement initiatives to increase security. These initiatives include updating the airport security guide, the addition of new security lights, the addition of high-intensity lights in high-traffic areas, and the replacement and/or addition of signage related to airport security.
	C	VLJ's may be dangerous.	The FAA has sole authority and responsibility for certifying and determining the airworthiness of all aircraft operating in the National Airspace System including Very-light Jets (VLJs).
	D	Noise is a problem and it has to be addressed.	See GR3.
	E	Expansion of the airport will negatively impact property values.	See GR1.

Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

		F	The FAA has allotted \$10 million for the study of environmental issues including airport noise. Community activists do not get any of this money.	<p>The FAA's mission is to provide the safest, most efficient aerospace system in the world, and its vision is to improve the safety and efficiency of aviation, while being responsive to their customers and accountable to the public. The FAA uses its allocated funding to accomplish these goals and to operate the National Airspace System. The FAA also provides funding for airports, certifies airplanes and completes numerous other tasks that may be assigned to the agency. Typically, the FAA does not provide funding for community activist groups.</p> <p>However, the Vision 100-Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act established the Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP). The ACRP is funded by the FAA and managed by the National Academics, acting through the Transportation Research Board (TRB). The ACRP undertakes research and other technical activities in response to various airport issues. The group does not "fight" communities, to the contrary, the ACRP is focused on finding solutions to environmental issues, including noise, in a manner that is suitable from all perspectives.</p>
4.	Jerry Pitzrick - 9322 Overlook Trail, Eden Prairie	A	Will the expansion of the runway lead to an expansion of the landing pattern? Will the whole pattern be expanded out and have a greater impact on the community?	The FCM expansion entails numerous projects including extending the north parallel runway (10L/28R) to 3,900 ft. and the south parallel runway (10R/28L) to 5,000 ft. The threshold for aircraft landing on Runways 10L/R will move west as the runways are extended. As a result, aircraft will be slightly lower on final approach to these runways (west of the airport). The landing pattern will not be expanded out for other runways as arriving aircraft follow FAA standard operating procedures on approach to the airport.
		B	The land to the north of Hennepin Village that was acquired by the MAC could have been used for a different purpose.	See GR2.

Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

		C	Why weren't other options considered for access to Hennepin Village, rather than extending prospect road? Why weren't options toward the north, across MAC property considered?	Decisions regarding road access to Hennepin Village are the responsibility of the developer and the City of Eden Prairie. The option of utilizing MAC property to the north of Hennepin Village is not possible due to runway safety zone and FAA aircraft navigation equipment considerations.
5.	Bill Ruff - 11798 Tanglewood Drive, Eden Prairie	A	Why expand the runways for an organization that fails to follow its own noise abatement program? Pilots are not abiding by the voluntary restrictions on nighttime operations.	<p>The MAC does not have the authority to enforce mandatory restrictions (i.e., nighttime curfew) at a public use facility like FCM. Although the MAC does not have the authority to prohibit nighttime/early morning aircraft operations, the MAC and the City of Eden Prairie negotiated an agreement (December 2002 Final Agreement and the September 2003 FCM Operational Implementation Plan) that places voluntary restrictions on operations between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. Specifically, users are asked not to operate at the airport between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m., and to use the south parallel runway (10R/28L) and execute turns to the south of the airport over the Minnesota River between 6 a.m. and 7 a.m.</p> <p>The MAC has also agreed to investigate any complaints received from Eden Prairie residents, airport users, Fixed Based Operators or any other source to determine if a violation or failure to comply with a voluntary measure has occurred. The MAC will use the Airport Noise and Operations Monitoring System (ANOMS) or observations made by MAC staff on duty or the FAA to investigate the complaint and verify if a violation has occurred. If verified, the MAC will send a letter to the owner/operator (in cases where contact information is accessible) notifying them that they have operated in a manner inconsistent with the voluntary restraints on nighttime aircraft operations, early morning departures and/or operations by Stage II aircraft. Furthermore, the letter will state that the MAC's policy is to voluntarily limit inconsistent operations and will request the owner/operator provide a detailed response describing the reason for the operation in question.</p>

**Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the
Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting**

		B	No response has been received from the MAC regarding several internet noise complaints that have been filed.	The Metropolitan Airports Commission maintains a noise complaint and information line 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Residents can call this number (612-726-9411) to file noise complaints about specific operations for FCM or any of the MAC Airports, as well as request a return call. The goal of MAC staff is to provide a return call, to all individuals who request one, within three working days. Residents may also log complaints using the online noise complaint form at www.macnoise.com . The online noise complaint form allows residents to file noise complaints via the internet which are summarized and reported the same way as complaints received through the noise complaint and information line. However, the MAC receives thousands of internet complaints each month (the majority of those do not contain contact information); due to available staff time and resources, those wishing to receive a return phone call or a response from MAC staff should call the noise complaint and information hotline.
		C	Was told that pilots can not turn to the south of the airport over the Minnesota River because they would disturb the eagles nests. Why do the eagles get priority over Eden Prairie residents?	The FEIS included an assessment of the proposed project on the bald eagle nest territory in the wildlife refuge south of FCM. The analysis, dated January 25, 2001, concluded that the proposed project was not likely to adversely affect bald eagles or their critical habitat.
		D	The airport will not go away but what is the logic of continuing an expansion of an airport that will continue to lose money for the City?	See GR4.
6.	Floyd Hagen – 15721 Cedar Ridge Road, Eden Prairie	A	In the early 1970's, MAC agreed never to expand again and now they are going to expand.	The Minnesota legislature, in its April 1996 decision to expand MSP instead of constructing a new replacement airport, mandated that the MAC divert the maximum feasible number of general aviation operations from MSP to the reliever airports because the runway capacity of MSP is constrained by the size of the site. The proposed action (5,000 ft. runway and additional hangar space) will allow FCM to function effectively in the role of a reliever airport to MSP.

Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

		B	It is inconceivable that people are being put at risk for increased noise levels and decreased property values for an expansion that is not necessary.	See GR1 and GR3.
		C	How can any resident of Eden Prairie benefit from the expansion?	See GR4.
		D	Major jets should not be allowed to come to the airport.	The Agreement between the City of Eden Prairie and the MAC (December 2002 Final Agreement and the September 2003 FCM Operational Implementation Plan) places guidelines on the present and future use of the airport relative to the specific nature of operations. These provisions focus on the exclusion of airport air carrier certification and major cargo operations/facilities. As part of the agreement, the MAC will not apply for Part 139 certification at FCM. This will ensure that FCM will not be considered to provide facilities for air carrier operations in the future. In addition, the MAC has committed that major cargo operations will not be conducted at FCM.
7.	Judy Gentry – 9766 Eden Prairie DR, Eden Prairie	A	Disapproves of the additional noise from jets and the additional air pollution.	See GR3. The MAC does not regulate or have jurisdiction over aircraft emission levels. The FAA and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) are the agencies responsible for this issue. Although the MAC is not a producer of aircraft emissions, we will continue to keep abreast of these discussions and of any resulting policy decisions. Furthermore, the evaluation of air quality impacts in the SDEIS and the FEIS conform to the USEPA and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) air quality requirements.

Metropolitan Airports Commission Staff Responses to Public Questions Addressed at the Nov. 8, 2007 Flying Cloud Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

		<p>B Did not know of the airport noise and the airport expansion when she moved in.</p>	<p>The MAC Noise Program maintains a detailed web site (www.macnoise.com) dedicated specifically to airport noise issues including operations at FCM. In addition, telephone and e-mail contact information is easily accessible on the site and MAC staff is more than willing to provide information for perspective home buyers regarding airport noise issues and proposed airport development plans. The involvement of the public and government agencies in preparation of the FEIS and the proposed airport development was extensive and dates back to 1997.</p>
		<p>C Was wondering if she is paying taxes that help finance the airport expansion.</p>	<p>The MAC is a public corporation of the state. Unlike typical state agencies, the MAC does not receive an appropriation from the state operating budget. Instead, the MAC operates like a business, paying its expenses from revenues it generates.</p> <p>MAC's Capital Improvement Program is funded from a variety of sources that include passenger facility charges (PFCs), federal grants (Airport Improvement Program – AIP), MnDOT grants, MAC generated funds and bond proceeds. No general, property or income taxes (city/state/federal) are used for the development of MAC airports.</p>