



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



Wednesday, 19 March 2014, 1:30pm
MAC General Offices Building – Lindbergh Conference Room

Call to Order

A regularly-scheduled meeting of the MSP Noise Oversight Committee, having been duly called, was held Wednesday, 19 March 2014, in the Lindbergh Conference Room at the Metropolitan Airports Commission General Offices. Chair Hart called the meeting to order at 1:30pm. The following were in attendance:

Representatives: J. Hart, J. Carlson, K. Erazo, B. McQuillan, T. Christiansen, J. Oleson, D. Miller, E. Petschel, J. Quincy, T. Fitzhenry, J. Bergman, T. Fitzhenry

Staff: D. Nelson, J. Nelson, J. Giesen, J. Felger

Others: C. Costello – City of Richfield; B. Hoffman – City of St. Louis Park; A. Swenson – Edina; S. Nienhaus – City of Burnsville; L. Moore – Bloomington; J. Miller – City of Mendota Heights; M. Park – City of Sunfish Lake; L. Olson – City of Minneapolis; S. Neal – City of Edina; J. Bennett – City of Edina; P. Dmytrenko – City of Richfield; C. Wickstrom – Minneapolis; D. Langer – Federal Aviation Administration; M. Woodruff – Federal Aviation Administration; J. Childers – Edina; R. Owen – Metropolitan Council; D. Sloan – Mendota Heights Airport Relations Commission; L. Grotz – Edina; J. Teppen – City of Inver Grove Heights

1. Review and Approval of the 15 January 2014 Meeting and 6 March 2014 Special Meeting Minutes

IT WAS MOVED BY REPRESENTATIVE MILLER AND SECONDED BY REPRESENTATIVE QUINCY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE 15 JANUARY 2014 COMMITTEE MEETING.

The motion carried by unanimous vote.

IT WAS MOVED BY REPRESENTATIVE FITZHENRY AND SECONDED BY REPRESENTATIVE BERGMAN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE 6 MARCH 2014 SPECIAL COMMITTEE MEETING.

The motion carried by unanimous vote.

2. Operations Summary Report

Dana Nelson, MAC Environment – Noise Program Office, said complaints in January 2014 and February 2014 were up compared to January 2013 and February 2013. She said total aircraft operations in January 2014 were about 26% lower than in January 2013, and in February 2014 were about 3.9% lower than in February 2013. **Chair Hart, Delta Air Lines**, noted that Delta took a number of flights out in February 2013 due to weather conditions at MSP, and that the cold weather in January and February led Delta to cancel more flights than it had before.

D. Nelson said that air carrier jet operations were up 2.5% in January 2014 compared to January 2013, and were up 0.7% in February 2014 compared to February 2013. She said there was a decrease in the number of regional jets in the fleet composition in both January and February 2014 compared to January and February 2013. She said more manufactured Stage-3 aircraft were used in the fleet composition, and that modified Stage-3 aircraft levels were at 0% in both January and February 2014.

D. Nelson said there was a 19% increase in the total number of nighttime (10:30pm-6:00am) operations, and a 2.5% increase in carrier jet nighttime operations in January 2014 compared to January 2013, and similar increases in February 2014 compared to February 2013.

D. Nelson said Runway 30L had the majority of arrivals and departures during the nighttime hours (10:30pm-6:00am) in January and February 2014. She noted that Runway 17 had an increase in nighttime (10:30pm-6:00am) departures in February 2014 due to more days when the airport was operating in a mixed-flow configuration.

D. Nelson said 99.9% of the 1,898 Runway 17 carrier jet departures in January 2014 complied with the Runway 17 Carrier Jet Departure Procedure, and 99.4% of the 2,0756 Runway 17 carrier jet departures complied.

D. Nelson said there were 1,546 carrier jet departures off of Runways 12L and 12R in January 2014, and that 93.3% remained in the Egan-Mendota Heights Departure Corridor. She said there were 1,432 carrier jet departures off of Runways 12L and 12R in February 2014 and that 95.7% remained in the Egan-Mendota Heights Departure Corridor.

D. Nelson said that, in January 2014, 53% of departure operations used the Crossing-in-the-Corridor Procedure during the nighttime hours of 11:00pm-6:00am, and 50% of departure operations used the procedure during those hours in February 2014. She said that, in January 2014, 21% of departure operations used the Crossing-in-the-Corridor Procedure during the hours of 6:00am-11:00pm, and 29% of departure operations used the procedure during those hours in February 2014.

3. Presentation: Metropolitan Airports Commission Overview, MAC CEO Jeff Hamiel

Jeff Hamiel, MAC CEO/Executive Director, expressed the Metropolitan Airports Commission's (MAC) appreciation for the work the Noise Oversight Committee does as an advisory board to the Commission, and gave an overview presentation on the MAC. Highlights of the presentation included:

- The MAC is a public corporation created by the Minnesota Legislature in 1943 to own and operate airports within 35 miles of downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis.
- The MAC's narrow purpose and scope is to provide and promote safe, convenient, environmentally-sound and cost-competitive aviation services for its customers.
- The MAC is user-funded, not taxpayer-funded; has limited property taxing authority, which has not been exercised since the 1960s.
- There are 15 commissioners on the MAC's Board; 13 are appointed by the governor, and the mayors of St. Paul and Minneapolis each appoint one member. Members serve staggered, four-year terms.
- The MAC's projected 2014 operating expenses total approximately \$150 million, while its projected 2014 operating revenues total approximately \$290 million. Revenue is generated by charges to the airlines operating at MSP, concessions, rents and fees, and utilities and other revenues. **Chair Hart, Delta Air Lines**, asked for comment on concessions revenue being higher than airline rates revenue. **Hamiel** said the concessions figure includes parking concessions, which total approximately \$72-74 million.
- The MAC's net operating revenues are approximately \$140 million; minus payments to debt service, expenses for equipment and capital and other expenses, the MAC's net revenue is approximately \$42 million. The net revenue is invested in the next year's construction program. **Representative Quincy, Minneapolis**, asked what percentage of revenue and expenses are related to MSP, versus related to the MAC's reliever airports. **Hamiel** said the lion's share of revenues and expenses are related to MSP.
- In 2013 MSP was chosen the "Most Efficiently Managed Large Airport in North America", and it has one of the lowest airline cost per enplanements in the nation.
- The MAC's financial model is predicated on originating and destination passengers only, and the MAC uses conservative financial forecasting.
- The MAC has a AA- bond rating.
- MSP has the 17th busiest terminal facilities in North America, and the 13th busiest airfield. MSP was named "Best Airport in America" by *Travel & Leisure* in 2012.
- MSP had approximately 38 million total passengers in 2005; that number dropped to approximately 31 million in 2008 and grew slowly to approximately 33 million in 2013.
- MSP has seen a decline in total operations since 2004.
- As passenger traffic grows at MSP, it is forecasted that larger-capacity aircraft will be used to accommodate passenger loads.
- MSP contributes approximately \$10 billion toward the economic vitality of the community, and is the single largest economic generator.

- Approximately 76,000 people directly or indirectly generate employment through the MAC. Approximately 20,000 work at MSP.
- 6500 people who work at MSP live in Hennepin County; 4700 live in Ramsey County; 4000 live in Dakota County.
- Average compensation of MSP employee is highest of any county in Minnesota at \$66,000/year.
- MSP's tax revenue impacts are approximately \$360 million federal; \$243 million state; and \$10 million local.
- The 2030 Long-Term Plan for MSP forecasts 50 million passengers at MSP by 2030. To accommodate that number, MSP would need 20-30 more aircraft gates and another 18,000 parking spaces. No new runways would be needed. Expansion of MSP would be demand-driven.

Hart noted that Committee members are often asked by their constituents about the possibility of “downsizing” MSP and shifting some operations to airports such as St. Cloud, Duluth or Rochester, and asked for **Hamiel's** perspective on that idea. **Hamiel** said that the MAC has worked with the St. Cloud, Duluth and Rochester airports over the past 20 years and is not concerned about losing air traffic to them. He noted that “planes go where the people are” and that the vast majority of Minnesota's residents live in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. He said the MAC is supportive of the other airports, and would like to see them be successful in securing direct flights to their facilities but noted that they are challenged by a lack of population density in their metropolitan areas.

4. 2013 Annual Actual Contour Report

John Nelson, Technical Advisor, reminded Committee members that, per the Consent Decree, the MAC is required to prepare an Annual Noise Contour Analysis by 1 March. He noted that the Consent Decree was amended in October 2013 to extend the current mitigation program out to 2024, and to establish a three-successive year eligibility requirement (compared to the 2007 DNL forecast map), with the 2013 Actual Noise Contour used as the first year. The 2013 Actual Noise Contour Analysis was sent to Committee members with today's meeting packet. The 2013 Actual Noise Contour Analysis map shows 137 single-family and 89 multi-family homes in Minneapolis that have been identified as having first-year eligibility status.

J. Nelson noted there was an overall decrease in the size of the 2013 Actual Noise Contour compared to the 2007 Forecast Mitigated Contour, with the exception of an area where the 2013 contour is larger. He noted that this contour increase is associated with nighttime arrival operations on Runway 12R.

J. Nelson noted that a 25% reduction in total operations between what was forecasted in 2007 and what actually occurred in 2013 is one reason for the decrease in the contour size. He said the reduction in the use of manufactured Stage-3 aircraft at MSP and a 20% reduction in scheduled nighttime operations are also contributing factors to the reduced contour size.

Representative Quincy, Minneapolis, noted that the MAC used HNTB for the preparation of the Integrated Noise Model inputs to the report, and to run a quality check of the noise contours, and said that he appreciated the third-party validity. He asked how, if there's been a decrease in operations and changes to the fleet mix, part of the contour increased in 2013. **J.**

Nelson said that is primarily attributed to the increase over forecast in the number of nighttime arrival operations on Runway 12R, because nighttime operations carry a 10 dB penalty. He noted that a Runway Use analysis will be presented to the Committee at the May meeting.

5. Remote Monitoring Tower Monthly Technical Report Graphs

John Nelson, Technical Advisor, reminded Committee members that a table of the daily and monthly average DNL sound level reported at each Remote Monitoring Tower (RMT) is included in the Technical Advisor's Report published each month. He said that, beginning in March 2014, the Technical Advisor's Report will include graphs showing the RMT average monthly DNL. He noted that RMTs are located in residential areas located close to runway ends.

Representative Petschel, Mendota Heights, noted that RMT 23 is located in a Mendota Heights resident's backyard. She said the resident noticed the raw data on the RMT showed an increase in noise levels, and sent the data to the Noise Program Office for investigation. **Petschel** said the investigation determined the increased noise levels recorded were related to work being done by the City of Mendota Heights on the resident's street, and not related to aircraft overflights. She said that correlating the RMT data with aircraft events is important.

Representative Oleson, Bloomington, noted that RMT 30 is ranked #6 on the graph J. Nelson showed, and he asked what types of complaints the Noise Program Office has received related to aircraft noise events monitored by that RMT. **J. Nelson** said the Noise Program Office has not received a higher number of complaints from that area, but that an increased number of complainants is filing complaints i.e., fewer people are calling more frequently. **Oleson** noted there is increased development activity in Bloomington's South Loop area and said there should be conversations about the level of collaboration between the developers and the MAC with regard to construction and noise mitigation. **J. Nelson** agreed and said the MAC would be happy to meet with the developers to discuss the necessity of having noise insulation in the area being developed by Bloomington.

6. MACNOMS Validation Study Field Monitoring Scope and NOC Observation Team Appointments

John Nelson, Technical Advisor, reminded Committee members that an item on the Committee's 2014 Work Plan is to conduct a validation study of the MACNOMS equipment and processing used by the Noise Program Office. He said the study will examine and compare real-time and MACNOMS system data – flight operations counts, flight tracks and noise levels at RMTs. He noted that, due to staff and timing constraints, not all 39 Remote Monitoring Towers (RMT) can be validated during the study. He said the following criteria were used to establish the RMT sites to be used in the study:

- Must be one RMT for each community that has an RMT within its city limits

- RMT location must be easily accessible and have sufficient space to accommodate staff and observer team
- Where multiple RMTs are located in one city, selection should be based on the frequency of events, or the number and proximity of flight tracks over the prospective area, and be representative of departure and/or arrival operations or both.

J. Nelson noted that Committee member representative participation in the study is optional and voluntary. Staff recommends an appointed observer to the study be a sitting or alternate member of the Committee, or an employee of the represented city or air carrier-related group of the Committee. He said staff proposes a kickoff event in early April during which Committee members could visit RMT 5 for a demonstration of the validation study methodology. He said staff will communicate with the observers during the RMT field testing and during preparation of the study.

IT WAS MOVED BY REPRESENTATIVE FITZHENRY AND SECONDED BY REPRESENTATIVE OLESON TO APPROVE THE FIELD MONITORING SCOPE AND COMMUNICATION PLANS DESCRIBED IN THIS ITEM, AND FOR COMMITTEE COMMUNITY AND USER GROUP MEMBERS TO CONVEY TO THE NOC TECHNICAL ADVISOR BY 28 MARCH 2014 OF THEIR APPOINTMENTS TO THE MACNOMS VALIDATION STUDY OBSERVER TEAM, IF THEY WISH TO PARTICIPATE.

The motion carried by unanimous vote.

7. Permanent Remote Monitoring Tower Request – City of Edina

John Nelson, Technical Advisor, said that the MAC received a request from the City of Edina in February 2014 for the installation of three Remote Monitoring Towers (RMT), to provide an aviation noise baseline that could be used to measure the impacts of future navigational changes on noise levels in Edina. He said the MAC reviewed the request, and reviewed the methodologies that were used to site the existing RMTs. He said the methods used by the MAC to site RMTs are driven by spatial technologies and sound level meter performance parameters. He said the system was determined based on RMT monitoring coverage areas, and that flight track data were analyzed to determine instances in which operations departed MSP without passing through an RMT coverage area. He noted that the RMTs have the capacity to pick up noise events in areas much wider than depicted in his presentation.

J. Nelson reminded members that the Committee has established the following criteria to be evaluated when requests are made for mobile noise monitoring:

- Mobile noise monitoring will not be done where there is already an RMT that can provide the data being sought.
- Mobile noise monitoring will not be done to benefit a single resident or building.
- Mobile noise monitoring should be conducted only to the benefit of a large section of the community that is suffering the effects of unusual aircraft noise events that are difficult to monitor otherwise.
- The goal of the mobile noise monitoring effort must be well-defined and realistically achievable.

- The mobile noise monitoring request must identify why current monitoring data are inadequate for analysis.

J. Nelson noted that 99% of the February 2014 westbound departures off of Runway 30L over Edina went through the coverage areas of at least two RMTs. He said that the criterion of monitoring being done because of “unusual aircraft noise events” was not met; changes have not been observed in the headings given to westbound departing aircraft. He said the current configuration of RMTs provides complete coverage and has been validated as doing so. He said all of the criteria for a monitoring request has not been met with regard to Edina’s request.

Representative Petschel, Mendota Heights, noted that mobile noise monitoring was used several years ago in Richfield when there was unusual activity on the cargo side of MSP. She noted that the activity did not involve arrivals or departures, but was related to aircraft start-ups on the cargo apron. She said that a mobile noise monitor was the only way to determine what was occurring. **Representative Fitzhenry, Richfield**, concurred and said that the City of Richfield hired Orfield Labs to validate the activity. He said the results confirmed that the RMTs provide sufficient coverage and data. **Representative Miller, Eagan**, noted that the City of Eagan hired Wylie Labs in 2005 to collect baseline data before Runway 17/35 opened. She said their work confirmed that the RMTs were accurate and providing coverage for areas where no RMT was located.

Representative Bergman, At-large Representative, noted that the City of Edina has received all memos related to this issue, as has MAC Commissioner Peilen. He said the City of Edina hosted a meeting with the other at-large communities, which was attended by the representatives for Apple Valley, Burnsville and St. Louis Park. He said the communities that could not attend the meeting presented their views to the City of Edina, MAC staff and Commissioner Peilen.

Council Member Joni Bennett, City of Edina, thanked the Committee for considering the City of Edina’s request. She said the request is being made because of anticipated changes in operations levels at MSP, and changes in operations in terms of RNAV. She said the City’s request is to establish a baseline measurement to use going forward as changes take place. She said the request for RMTs in Edina is also based on the importance of data and data analysis to the Committee. She said the request is also based on providing education to Edina residents. She said the City understands the desire for RMTs to cover a sufficient area, but noted that the current placement of RMTs does not appear to have been established to capture just the “first ring” of noise impacts. She said that if that were the intention, she does not understand why all RMTs don’t simply encircle the airport. She said that flight patterns today are making turns to the south and southwest that they may not have taken in the past, and that there isn’t data to compare what is happening now to how it was previously.

Bennett noted that one of the seven at-large communities stated that it would support Edina having permanent RMTs only if all of the at-large communities had permanent RMTs installed. She said the City has no objection to the other communities having permanent RMTs. She said it is clear the criteria for mobile noise monitoring do not support the City’s request, which is why the City is requesting permanent RMTs and not mobile noise monitoring.

City Manager Scott Neal, City of Edina, said the City is looking for data to explain what Edina residents are experiencing in terms of aircraft noise. He said the City sees data from permanent RMTs in Edina as providing a baseline for residents.

Fitzhenry asked if the current RMT configuration can provide a baseline for Edina. **J. Nelson** said that, at points more distant from the airport, noise events can be recorded by RMTs that are not aircraft-related. He said more refinement would need to be done on flight track correlation to make sure non-aircraft events were not correlated inappropriately to flight tracks.

Quincy said he believes there is value in setting benchmarks early to help the City of Edina communicate noise event information to its residents. He noted that RMTs have nothing to do with the creation of noise contours but that the contours are reflective of actual noise experiences.

Representative Carlson, United Parcel Service, asked what the precedence has been for siting RMTs. **J. Nelson** said the original 24 RMTs were placed to monitor aircraft operations off of the runway ends and to provide sufficient coverage to the communities on MASAC. He said five RMTs were added based on MAC staff input on flight track locations. He said RMT placement has been driven by technical and acoustic needs of the system. He said 10 more RMTs were added as a result of work done by a task force of communities to the south of MSP anticipated to receive new overflights as a result of the opening of Runway 17/35.

Fitzhenry asked if it would be prudent to utilize mobile noise monitoring equipment in Edina to determine whether or not permanent RMTs should be established. **J. Nelson** said MAC staff would need time to examine that issue.

Miller noted that the City of Eagan hired Wylie Labs to do analysis because it knew Runway 17/35 was going to be built. She said Edina's request may be premature in light of it having been announced recently that RNAV departure operations will not be implemented at MSP at this time. She suggested that Edina might want to consider hiring a firm to conduct monitoring to establish a baseline, as Eagan did.

Neal said the City is interested in collecting data, but is concerned about collecting data that meet NOC protocol and that the Committee would have faith in.

IT WAS MOVED BY REPRESENTATIVE BERGMAN, AT-LARGE REPRESENTATIVE, AND SECONDED BY REPRESENTATIVE QUINCY, MINNEAPOLIS, TO ADD THREE PERMANENT REMOTE MONITORING TOWERS IN THE CITY OF EDINA.

The motion failed.

Bergman requested, on behalf of the at-large communities, that the Committee's 2015 Work Plan include an educational roundtable meeting of the Committee and at-large communities on the topic of the RMTs. **Petschel** said she was very supportive of that suggestion, particularly as the Committee may have more specific information at that time from the FAA about the RNAV arrival operations anticipated to be published in early 2015.

8. First Quarter 2014 Public Input Meeting Summary

John Nelson, Technical Advisor, noted that a Public Input Meeting was held on Tuesday, 28 January 2014 at the MAC's General Offices Building. He said 17 people attended the meeting and three people made comment at the meeting. Comments focused on:

- Routing of aircraft over non-residential land uses
- At-large representation on the NOC
- Noise mitigation eligibility under the First Amendment to the Consent Decree

9. Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

The next meeting of the NOC is scheduled for Thursday, 8 May 2014.

The meeting adjourned at 3:18pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Christene Sirois Kron, Recording Secretary