



MSP NOISE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2020 at 1:30 PM
By Teleconference Only



Call to Order

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP) Noise Oversight Committee, (NOC) having been duly called, was held Wednesday, September 16, 2020, by teleconference only. **Chair Hart** called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The following were on the teleconference:

Representatives: P. Borgstrom; M. Brindle, T. Cossalter; P. Dmytrenko; J. Falk; C. Finlayson; J. Hart; C. Jacobson; P. Martin; D. Miller; C. Koppen; L. Olson

Staff: P. Hogan; B. Juffer; K. Martin; D. Nelson; N. Pesky; B. Rief; M. Ross; B. Ryks

Others: R. Bassler – FAA; R. MacPherson – FAA; S. Fortier - FAA; H. Rand – Inver Grove Heights; L. Moore – Bloomington; L. Palmisano – Minneapolis; Scott Norling; Durre Cowen – FAA; J. Varian – FAA; and other members of the public

A quorum of four Community Representatives and four Industry Representatives was established by roll call attendance:

Community Representatives: M. Brindle; P. Dmytrenko; C. Jacobson; P. Martin; D. Miller; L. Olson

Industry Representatives: P. Borgstrom; T. Cossalter; J. Falk; C. Finlayson; J. Hart; C. Koppen

1. Consent

1.1. Review and Approval of July 15, 2020 Meeting Minutes

There were no questions or revisions to the July 15 meeting minutes.

1.2. Reports

1.2.1. Monthly Operations Reports: July and August 2020

Michele Ross, Assistant Technical Advisor provided July and August operations updates.

| July | August |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| • Total Operations: 17,870 | • Total Operations: 21,455 |
| • Nighttime Operations: 735 | • Nighttime Operations: 789 |
| • North/South/Mixed: 38/51/4 | • North/South/Mixed: 40/52/2 |
| • RUS (Priority 1/2/3/4): 50/1/0/48 | • RUS (Priority 1/2/3/4): 50/0/0/50 |
| • RJ/Narrow/Wide: 45/54/2 | • RJ/Narrow/Wide: 45/53/2 |
| • Complaints: 7,484 | • Complaints: 11,105 |

- Complaint locations: 235
 - Top 10 Households: 48%
 - Hours of events*: 217
 - Number of events*: 46,467
 - R17 procedure: 97.4%
 - EMH Corridor procedure: 96.6%
 - Crossing procedure day: 29.2%
 - Crossing procedure night: 63.8%
 - RUS: 51.5%
- Complaint locations: 296
 - Top 10 Households: 48%
 - Hours of events*: 271
 - Number of events*: 56,366
 - R17 procedure 100%
 - EMH Corridor procedure: 96.4%
 - Crossing procedure day: 21.1%
 - Crossing procedure night: 50.7%
 - RUS: 50.3%

* Aircraft sound events above 65dB.

Presentation materials are available on macnoise.com.

Chair Hart asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda items.

Member Dymtrenko moved, and Member Brindle seconded approval of the Consent Agenda items. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Eleven: Borgstrom, Brindle, Cossalter, Dymtrenko, Falk, Chair Hart, Jacobson, Martin, Co-Chair Miller, Koppen, Olson (Member Finlayson did not respond to the roll call vote)

Nays: None

Abstain: None

2. Public Comment Period

There were no parties in attendance who elected to make a public comment.

3. Business

3.1 Flight Procedure Change Request Guidelines

Brad Juffer, Technical Advisor, presented the draft Flight Procedure Change Request Guideline that documents the proposed flight procedure change request guidelines and clarifies the role of the MAC and the FAA. The Flight Procedure Request Details section will be completed by MAC staff in consultation with residents and resident groups. The document standardizes a process to provide a consistent expectation to requestors.

The action requested was to approve and adopt flight procedure change requests as amended and available on the website. **Juffer**, took questions from the NOC members:

Member Falk, Sun Country Airlines, thanked Mr. Juffer for listening to feedback and making changes to the document accordingly.

Member Olson, City of Minneapolis, suggested revising the NOC considerations section to strengthen the concept that these are considerations, not requirements. Suggested a revision to sentence 2 to state that the following areas have traditionally been considered by the NOC. **Olson** noted that should also look at community impacts, e.g. health, livability

and clarified that the form should let the public know what items are being sought. **Olson** stated that the formality of a form may be perceived as an unnecessary barrier to community members seeking to make a request.

Member Borgstrom, Delta, did not see this form as a barrier but more of an avenue to give community members a road map to get from A to B. Borgstrom noted appreciation for the way it was put together and acknowledged that a lot of time and effort went into creating it.

Chair Hart, Delta, said it provides a good guide to take it from an idea into something more concrete and liked the use of a form, further noting did not perceive it as a barrier. **Hart** added that listening to and incorporating user feedback will be essential.

Member Jacobson, City of Mendota Heights, appreciates MAC staffs willingness to take ownership of the completion of the form and did not see it as a barrier but rather it offers transparency to the process and a way to facilitate interaction for a concerned citizen or group.

Member Dymtrenko, City of Richfield, appreciated the changes made to the form and process. She stated that NOC should give it a try and then listen to user feedback moving forward.

Member Brindle, At Large Representative, appreciates the work that went into making the form less technical and recommends moving forward with the form and being open to feedback.

Co-chair Miller, City of Eagan, appreciates the last-minute work, stating that the changes were well done, and the form gives everyone a road map to work with. **Miller** suggested a change to, the last sentence of the NOC consideration section from “these criteria may be evaluated by the NOC” to “these considerations will be evaluated by the NOC” in order to soften the language. She noted appreciation for the changes made to the form and is supportive of moving forward with it.

Chair Hart asked for a motion to approve the document as amended.

Member Olson, City of Minneapolis, moved, and Member Martin, City of Bloomington, seconded approval of the Flight Procedure Change Request Guidelines acceptance with the following two changes to wording:

- Under the NOC considerations section:
 - Revise “For the request to be endorsed by the NOC, the following areas should be considered.” to read “For the request to be endorsed by the NOC, the following areas are typically considered.”

- Revise “These criteria may be evaluated by the NOC and some may be evaluated by the FAA.” to read “These considerations may be evaluated by the NOC and some may be evaluated by the FAA.”

The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Eleven: Borgstrom, Brindle, Cossalter, Dmytrenko, Falk, Finlayson, Chair Hart, Jacobson, Martin, Co-Chair Miller, Koppen
Nays: One: Olson
Abstain: None

4. Information:

4.1 FAA Report to Congress – Community involvement in FAA NextGen projects located in Metroplexes

Rebecca MacPherson, FAA Regional Administrator, Great Lakes Region, provided an overview of the report which is a mandate from Congress with a focus on Metroplexes. The information in the report details FAA community outreach actions. It is equally applicable for airports, outside of a metroplex project, where there are active community concerns about noise and the community has developed a roundtable that meets FAA criteria. Per FAA guidelines, an adequate round table must be comprised of elected officials or individuals appointed by elected officials, not simply community members with noise complaints. All communities around the airport must be equally represented. The MSP NOC and ONCC in Chicago were in many respects the model of an appropriate round table.

4.2. Eagan Flight Procedure Change Request Update

Rebecca MacPherson, FAA Regional Administrator, Great Lakes Region, noted that the FAA provided Commissioner Rick King a response letter dated September 2nd (provided in the NOC meeting packet). FAA tentatively determined that the suggested procedure change would be possible and could be done consistent with the existing crossing in the corridor noise abatement procedure. The request asks the FAA to consider directing departures from Runway 17 with an initial departure fix of COULT to Runways 12R and 12L, unless the departure would impede or be impeded by the arrival traffic to those runways, and provided that the departures could use the crossing in corridor noise abatement procedure.

FAA’s preliminary assessment of the procedure change request shows that under certain configurations there will be an adverse impact on either arrivals or departures depending on which are favored when the use of 12R is needed for arrivals. Some configurations ATC will need to use the longer runway for arrivals (dependent on aircraft type, weather, and aircraft weight). When that happens, ATC will use Runway 12R for departures and that will adversely impact efficiency in that configuration, because near in separation standards must be increased, otherwise known as the gap. FAA cannot say that under all circumstances, where this might be used, that there will be no impedance. At least one,

common, circumstance exists where that will be an adverse impact. FAA will continue to look at this.

As with all procedures associated with the Eagan proposal that have moved forward to this point, FAA is not able to do the detailed feasibility and safety analysis required to move forward with adopting the proposals as there is not currently enough traffic at the airport to give meaningful data. MacPherson estimated that traffic will need to return to about 80% of the pre mid-March 2020 numbers before FAA can do an adequate feasibility and safety assessment of the proposed procedure changes. FAA will continue to monitor the conditions and once the airport starts approaching appropriate levels, FAA will reach out to the MAC for their input. When the FAA collectively deems that there is enough traffic to allow for a meaningful analysis, FAA will start the analysis and will not require any additional action on the part of the MAC or the NOC to begin that analysis.

Chair Hart, Delta, asked if current operations at MSP are, de facto, doing this already with COULT departures - since those departures are not currently using Runway 17 and are departing on 12L or 12R – does this provide a proxy for low traffic conditions that can be extrapolated to higher traffic levels in order to provide some kind of analysis in the interim.

MacPherson replied that she thinks current conditions do provide good information on low traffic levels but a wholesale analysis will have to wait until traffic levels increase. Runway 17 has low use currently because there is not much need for it, but that is not a typical day at the airport. It may not be worthwhile to change a procedure if the benefit is minimal.

Co-Chair Miller, City of Eagan, thanked MacPherson for the work put into this and the clear communication and asked what would the threshold to make a change worthwhile.

MacPherson responded that the threshold would need to be more than a de minimis benefit to the change as there are costs and resources associated with changing procedures. There is also on the horizon the decommissioning of the VOR.

Co-Chair Miller mentioned that she can appreciate the role of the work and costs associated but wanted to keep in mind that Eagan started with 9 requests and are down to one request and nine operations a day. What is de minimis to the FAA is not de minimis to the community – this change is important to the community as it moves operations to noise compatible areas. We can wait until we get to the testing period but what may be considered de minimis to the FAA may not be the same to residents.

Juffer provided a quick history of the Eagan requests - there were 8 original requests and one question. The NOC recommended four of the requests be sent to the FAA for consideration. The FAA returned two of the requests back to the MAC and after further analysis the NOC recommended one of the requests be sent back to the FAA for a full evaluation.

4.3. FAA Great Lakes Region Noise Complaint Initiative

Rachel Bassler, FAA Community Engagement Officer, Great Lakes Region, provided an overview of the Noise Complaint Initiative and database that can be found at [FAA.gov/noise](https://www.faa.gov/noise). This is where the public can submit a noise complaint via webform to the FAA.

The purpose of the noise portal is to identify how the FAA can more efficiently and effectively respond to a noise complaint in a clear and repeatable manner by identifying and implementing improved and consistent agency workplans and procedures thru the FAA process to respond to noise complaints; and identify and evaluate potential action that the FAA might take to better address the underlying issue raised by the complaints.

The FAA Environmental Energy office oversees the noise portal process and maintains the database. The FAA Great Lakes regional office oversees Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas. FAA Administrative offices and Noise Ombudsman coordinates responses at the regional and staff level. Community engagement officer plans, implements, and manages community engagements related to noise issues. There are eight officers across the United States.

The public can view the FAA noise complaint policy and input their address to see where the nearest airport is and where noise originated, review information and send an inquiry. The agency receives the inquiry and coordinates a response through the portal back to the complainant. The agency may refer them back to the airport for any questions FAA was not able to provide an answer to.

The FAA is partnering with airports to minimize duplication of efforts, provide consistent responses, set up channels for communication and information sharing. Airports can opt out or update their preferences at any time.

The FAA will not respond to the same complaint twice; however, every submitted complaint is reviewed. The more details provided in the complaint, the more comprehensive the response can be. FAA seeks to respond to complaints within 15-30 days of receiving an inquiry or complaint. **Bassler** offered to take questions.

Chair Hart, Delta, thanked Ms. Bassler for the information and asked if a Minneapolis resident had a noise complaint, should they start with the FAA or the MAC.

Bassler replied that they should start with the MAC and if they feel they have not been responded to sufficiently or have an issue specific to the FAA then they should proceed to the FAA portal.

Member Falk, Sun Country, asked if the form is used for other types of noise complaints that are not around airports.

Bassler replied that if one is experiencing noise related to an aircraft, they can reach out to the airport or FAA. Occasionally, the FAA receives questions on helicopters, crop dusters or drones. The portal can be used for any noise related concerns.

Member Jacobson, City of Mendota Heights, asked what kind of responses people can expect to receive.

Bassler noted it is difficult to generalize as every complaint is different. Normally, FAA ends up referring the person to the appropriate airport with contact information for the airport manager. **Bassler** offered a recent example related to a complaint regarding a helicopter. It was related to police activity, so FAA provided contact information for the police department. Responses are tailored to each individual complaint.

Chair Hart questioned if Bassler's office would ever coordinate directly with air traffic and talk to them about the complaint and try to resolve it with them directly.

Bassler replied that she is not a technical expert and that most of these complaints are general or complainants need more information or they have never heard noise before and now they are. FAA explains as much as possible and if there is still an issue or concern, they share that with the appropriate office.

Chair Hart asked if there were any other questions and thanked Ms. Bassler for the information.

4.4. Runways 12L and 12R Nighttime Arrivals Operations Report

Michele Ross, Assistant Technical Advisor, provided an overview of the Runways 12L and 12R Nighttime Arrivals Operations Report. This report was prepared in fulfillment of the 2020 NOC workplan. The full report is available in the Agenda Packet and at macnoise.com.

Member Olson, City of Minneapolis, noted thanks for the report and asked if the origin of the plane or parking destination impacts runway use.

Ross remarked that the arrival route information is the primary consideration and on airport parking destination is a secondary consideration. To avoid potential conflicts, air traffic control typically does not cross aircraft traffic in the air.

Member Dymtrenko, City of Richfield, thanked MAC staff for putting this information together and said it is helpful to better understand the data and the reasons behind it. It is also helpful when explaining it to community members.

4.5. 2021 Draft NOC Work Plan

Brad Juffer, Technical Advisor, provided an overview of the draft NOC 2021 Work Plan. The draft includes items that are either found on the Work Plan every year or are items that will be carried over from 2020. Of note, staff have selected to add the MSP Annual Aircraft Noise Complaint Data Assessment as an annual report to provide that level of detail on an on-going basis.

Additionally, the NOC approved a request in 2019 for a noise monitoring study in Minnetonka after receiving a request from the Minnetonka City Council. Due to COVID-19, and a significant reduction in air traffic, a Minnetonka Mobile Monitoring Study in 2020 would not have been reflective of normal conditions and a decision was made to defer that study. Staff have added it to the 2021 Work Plan, to fulfill that commitment.

Input and suggestions are welcome. The Fall Listening Session is tailored to be a brainstorming session with airport neighbors to solicit input on the Work Plan. Recommendations from the session will be brought to the committee in November.

Juffer opened the floor to questions. Hearing none, **Chair Hart** moved on to agenda item 4.6

4.6. Review of Summer Listening Session

Brad Juffer, Technical Advisor, stated that the Community Relations Office staff held the first ever virtual NOC MSP Listening Session on July 22nd. While not the ideal forum to meet neighbors, staff were grateful to have the opportunity to meet with community members. MAC thanks Members Palmisano, Olson, Borgstrom, Moore and Chair Hart for their participation. During the session, staff answered questions regarding arrivals traffic on Runways 12L and 12R, Runway 17 departures, Eagan-Mendota Heights corridor compliance and frequency of use of Runway 4/22. Additionally, there were several questions regarding the Flying Cloud airport and flight activity in communities near that facility.

5. Announcements:

Brad Juffer, Technical Advisor, noted that the next Listening session will be held by teleconference, Wednesday, October 28 at 6pm. The next NOC meeting is November 18 at 6pm.

Chair Hart adjourned the meeting at 2:55pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kris Martin, Recording Secretary