

## Public Input Meeting Responses - January 26, 2006 (Questions are in **bolded**)

Click [here](#) for the summary memorandum that was forwarded to members of the MSP Noise Oversight Committee (NOC) regarding the January 26, 2006 Public Input Meeting.

### **Is Runway 4/22 open?**

Runway 4/22 was closed on November 1, 2005 and is planned to open on June 3, 2006. The runway closure is due to a road tunneling project that will enhance airfield operations by providing a roadway that will transition underneath Runway 4/22.

However, it is important to note that Runway 4/22 is minimally used during normal operations due to the runway's location in relation to all of the other runways at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP). Specifically, Runway 4/22 crosses all runways at MSP and, as such, whenever Runway 4/22 is used it disrupts operation on all runways at the airport, impacting capacity. Prior to the Runway 4/22 closure, operations on the runway were less than 0.2% of the overall operations in September 2005. The minimal use of Runway 4/22 is forecast to continue into the future at MSP.

### **Planes seem to be low and over-flying on arrival to a runway other than Runway 35.**

The arrival path for Runway 35 is located approximately one mile east of your home, thus the vast majority of aircraft arriving on Runway 35 are not over-flying your location. However, aircraft that are flying parallel to the south parallel runway at MSP (Runway 12R/30L) on downwind to land on either Runway 12R or Runway 30L are over-flying your location on occasion at an average altitude of approximately 7,500 feet. This trend existed prior to the opening of Runway 17/35 in October 2005.

On a related note, Runway 17 departure operations average approximately 2,600 feet above your location. All aircraft departing MSP utilize the distant Noise Abatement Departure Profile (NADP) as established by the communities around MSP. This has the effect of reducing noise impacts slightly beyond 3.5 miles from the airport. Your location is approximately four miles from MSP.

### **In south wind conditions why can't westbound Runway 17 departures be routed more over the Minnesota River Valley as opposed to concentrated over the homes on the northeast end of Burnsville?**

In consideration of actual Runway 17 departure flight track locations and the question posed by yourself and others similarly situated, MAC staff has presented this question to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

In response, FAA stated that during south/southeast wind conditions when Runways 12L and 12R are being used for arrival operations (arrivals from the northwest over Minneapolis) and Runway 17 is being used for departure operations, FAA is not assigning a departure heading west of 190 degrees for those aircraft departing Runway 17. The reason for this is two-fold. (1) Aircraft that are being directed by Air Traffic Control to land on Runways 12L or 12R begin a descent when they cross the 190 degree track off Runway 17. Keeping Runway 17 departure aircraft at or east of the 190 degree heading allows the arriving aircraft to descend for landing while ensuring they are

separated from aircraft that are departing Runway 17. (2) There is a corridor of airspace just to the west of the 190 degree track that allows Air Traffic Control to transition non-MSP aircraft north and south of the airport while ensuring they are separated from aircraft arriving on Runways 12L and 12R or departing Runway 17.

MAC staff has had discussions with the FAA asking if there is any possibility of reconsidering the 190 degree provision that was put in place by the FAA, and open up these Runway 17 departure operations to more westerly headings, which are more on-course with the departure fixes.

To date, in response, FAA has stated that the corridor created through the MSP airspace by this westerly heading constraint on Runway 17 is essential for aircraft that transition MSP airspace from airports north and south of MSP. The FAA's position is that without this corridor transitioning aircraft would have to be rerouted 20 to 25 miles out of their way to avoid entering the MSP airspace. Moreover, the agency contends that removal of this corridor would increase complexity for controllers trying to manage the transitional traffic around the MSP airspace. In addition, it is the FAA's position that several years of local FAA personnel time went into designing the airspace around MSP to accommodate Runway 17/35 in a manner that ensures efficiency and safety. Such is the case with the 190 degree provision off Runway 17 to de-conflict Runways 12L and 12R arrivals and Runway 17 departures.

MAC staff will continue to discuss this issue with the FAA to ensure all possible options are considered.

**To follow up on the last meeting I want to remind people of a meeting scheduled for February 8, 2006 at 3:30 p.m. at Bloomington City Hall. A sub-group of the NOC will be discussing the issue of representation on the NOC for the City of Apple Valley and other cities looking for representation.**

Comment noted. In a February 15, 2006 NOC cities meeting a motion was made, and passed by a unanimous vote, to expand the cities represented by the At-Large Community seat to include Apple Valley. The by-law modification will be considered by the MSP NOC at their March 15, 2006 meeting.

**In general Apple Valley has received noise concern comments regarding nighttime operations and insuring there is a way to verify that the nighttime traffic is generally staying in an industrial corridor when possible.**

Comment noted. To date nighttime aircraft operations on Runway 17/35 have been limited with only 28 total aircraft operations (21 departures on Runway 17, 7 arrivals on Runway 35) occurring during the nighttime hours of 10:30 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. from November 1, 2005 to January 31, 2006. Furthermore, 20 of the 21 total departures during the nighttime hours occurred on November 6, 2005, when the parallel runways were not available for departures due to FAA flight testing.

The Runway Use System (RUS) establishes runway selection preferences based on impacted population (i.e. the runway that impacts the fewest people receives the highest preference). Noise benefits utilizing the RUS can be obtained during mid- and low-demand periods, which usually occur during the night. Under the RUS the first priority for operations during the nighttime hours is over the Egan/Mendota Heights Corridor (area that contains the Minnesota River and commercial and industrial land immediately east

of MSP). Although the RUS defines noise sensitive runway use preferences employed by ATC in prioritizing runway selection, it does not preclude the use of Runway 17/35 during the nighttime hours. However, MAC has developed the Runway 17 River Published Departure Procedure and the Runway 17 River Departure Heading to be used primarily during the core nighttime hours of 12:15 a.m. and 5:30 a.m. to route aircraft departing from Runway 17 over the Minnesota River Valley. Compliance with the Runway 17 River Published Departure Procedure and the Runway 17 River Departure Heading during the nighttime hours can be found on page 3 of the monthly Runway 17 Departure Analysis Report available online: <http://www.macnoise.com/opreports>.

### **Can the FAA reduce the use of 17/35?**

No, it is the position of the FAA that a purposeful and/or artificial limit on the runway's use, beyond that already agreed to, either by aircraft type, or by number of operations, would not be allowed. Such a position is grounded in the fact that Runway 17/35 was an approximately \$800-million-dollar investment at MSP in the name of increasing airport efficiency and capacity.

### **Can the arrival path follow Cedar as opposed to the present flight(s) path it is presently using over the residential areas?**

No, aircraft being lined up for arrivals on any of the runways at MSP (including Runway 35) track inbound on a navigational aid comprised of equipment on the ground (Instrument Landing System – ILS) interacting with instrumentation onboard the aircraft to ensure that aircraft follow a straight line that will align aircraft with the touchdown point of the runway. At MSP, during typical periods of arriving aircraft, the FAA is lining up as many as 10 to 15 aircraft at any given time. Many times aircraft are lined up on their final approach course as far out as 30 to 35 miles. Arriving aircraft use the same navigational equipment mentioned above to keep the aircraft at an angle and slope while descending that will bring them in perfectly to the touch down point of the runway. This standard procedure is used at airports all around the country and can not be changed to follow Cedar Avenue.

### **Can the altitude of the arrivals be increased and come in at a sharper angle?**

Research currently being conducted suggests that it is possible to modify traditional arrival patterns to reduce noise. By way of background, In September 2003 the Center of Excellence for Aircraft Noise and Aviation Emissions Mitigation and the Partnership for AiR Transportation Noise and Emissions Reduction (PARTNER), were established. The intent was to foster innovative and breakthrough approaches to address technical, operational, and workforce capabilities fostering quieter and cleaner aircraft operations. FAA, NASA and Transport Canada are co-sponsoring this effort to further understand aerospace environmental issues. PARTNER provides resources from academia, industry and government in an effort to identify solutions for present and future noise and emission issues. The group conducts research and develops prototype solutions for addressing noise and emissions issues.

PARTNER Project 4 is the Continuous Descent Approach (CDA) initiative. CDA is an aircraft approach procedure that reduces noise, engine emissions, and fuel consumption during the landing phase of flight. As part of the research conducted to date it has been proven that modification of decent paths and procedures can reduce noise. Traditional approach practices entail aircraft beginning their approach

descent several miles from the airport spending significant amounts of time at lower altitudes while “stepping” their way down to the airport. This process requires engine thrust applications at each point along the descent where the aircraft levels out and waits for the descent to the next lower altitude in the procession down to the runway.

When describing CDA, Dr. John-Paul Clark, lead researcher for PARTNER Project 4 states *“The new procedure, called a Continuous Descent Approach (CDA), keeps the aircraft at cruise altitude until they are relatively close to an airport. At this point, the aircraft make an even, continuous, descent to the runway. The result is an average noise reduction of four to six decibels.<sup>1</sup> A three-decibel difference is appreciably noticeable to the human ear while a ten-decibel reduction equates to a 50% less noise. Side benefits include reduced fuel burn and emissions, and slightly shorter flights, as aircraft operate at lower power settings, stay at higher altitudes, maintain higher speeds, and take more direct (and thus shorter) paths to the runway.”*

Consistent with a request made by the MSP Noise Oversight Committee (NOC), in August 2005 MAC sent a letter to Mr. Carl Burleson – FAA and Dr. Ian Waitz – PARTNER requesting consideration of MSP as a possible future test site. PARTNER is currently in the process of completing a study of the 30+ largest airports in the U.S. to determine the best places to introduce CDA at night. Key people involved with that effort met at the end of February and MAC was notified that they expect to be providing an update in the near future on the study and which airports were recommended for follow-on CDA test sites.

**I have lived here for 7 years now. Prior to the opening of the new runway, one 747 would fly by my house every other week. Now they start at 4:00 a.m. and don't end until 1:00 a.m. Planes are landing and taking off every two minutes during busy times.**

Comment noted. Given your home's location (approximately 5 ¾ miles from the departure end of Runway 17) to the new runway it is expected that you would experience an increase in aircraft operations over your neighborhood.

To date nighttime aircraft operations on Runway 17/35 have been limited with only 28 total aircraft operations (21 departures on Runway 17, 7 arrivals on Runway 35) occurring during the nighttime hours of 10:30 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. from November 1, 2005 to January 31, 2006. Furthermore, 20 of the 21 total departures during the nighttime hours occurred on November 6, 2005, when the parallel runways were not available for departures due to FAA flight testing. The operations you've heard during the nighttime hours were due to operations off of the existing parallel runways and/or Runway 4/22.

**I believe the planes using the old runways are using new flight paths.**

In considering this question posed by yourself and others similarly situated, MAC staff has presented this question to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

In response, FAA stated that when aircraft are departing on Runways 30L and 30R (over South Minneapolis) and when Runway 17 is being used for departure operations, those aircraft departing Runway 30L (south parallel runway) with a southbound destination will be vectored straight south to get in line with Runway 17 departures.

**We have to come up with a way to alter the flight paths so they do not impact residences. They should impact business or go over the river. Either have airplanes fly over the river until you are a couple of miles up or change your times when using the runway to have flights more in the middle of the day or higher levels.**

Prior to the opening of Runway 17/35 a departure procedure was developed to route westbound jet departure operations off Runway 17 further south over the Minnesota River Valley. Through extensive discussions and concurrence with the cities located south of MSP (Bloomington, Burnsville, Apple Valley and Eagan) the 2.5 Nautical Mile Turn Point Procedure for westbound jet departures was established. After completion of an Environmental Assessment (EA), which included open houses and a public hearing on the proposed procedure, the FAA issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) approving the procedure for implementation concurrently with the runway opening. The procedure requires all jet aircraft that are departing Runway 17 with a heading west of runway heading (170 degrees) to remain on runway heading until the aircraft reaches a point that is 2.5 nautical miles from the start of takeoff (north end of the runway). Upon reaching the 2.5 nautical mile point aircraft can then turn onto their assigned westerly heading. This results in westbound jet aircraft flying more over the Minnesota River Valley than over residential areas in Bloomington directly south and west of the new runway. The procedure also includes provisions for concentrating flights during the nighttime hours over the Minnesota River Valley to the extent possible.

It is important to point out that this procedure was designed to reduce over flights in residential areas in Bloomington located close to the runway end. This is possible due the orientation of the Minnesota River Valley which turns to the southwest allowing westbound aircraft to proceed west after departure while over flying a relatively uninhabited area. However, keeping all operations directly over the Minnesota River would severely impact runway capacity and would not be allowed by the Federal Aviation Administration. Such a position is grounded in the fact that Runway 17/35 was an approximately \$800-million-dollar investment at MSP in the name of increasing airport efficiency and capacity.

**The runway was a done deal by the Feds and the MAC and you weren't going to listen to any other input.**

The decision to expand MSP at its present location was a long and public process that culminated in legislative direction to expand MSP. This process included extensive evaluations that considered the impacts associated with Runway 17/35.

In 1989, the Minnesota Legislature directed the MAC and the Metropolitan Council (MC) to examine how to best meet the regions future aviation needs. This initiated a seven year series of planning and environmental review studies called the Dual Track Airport Planning Process, examining expansion of MSP at its current location or construction of a new replacement airport in Southern Dakota County. In 1996, the Minnesota Legislature reviewed the Dual Track Airport Planning Process recommendations and the environmental impacts and selected development of MSP as the preferred alternative. This was a significant public process that included a public comment period and two public hearings. The FAA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) in September 1998 that determined the document adequately assessed the environmental effects of the MSP 2010 plan.

**Aircraft are not going down the Cedar corridor all the way, they are coming over my house that is ½ mile to the west of Cedar.**

Use of what some have referred to as a “Cedar Avenue Corridor” was never part of the plans for Runway 17/35. Although arriving aircraft generally follow Cedar Avenue when coming into the airport from the south, departing aircraft are dispersed over a fairly wide area to the south of the airport.

However, because of separation requirements, if all aircraft were required to fly only one heading, even for a short distance, it would significantly impact the rate at which aircraft could depart the runway.

### **What will the impact on property values be with Runway 17/35?**

The impact of airport noise on housing values has been the subject of a number of studies around the nation. These studies have been useful in providing some insight into the complex issue, but results have varied and have been difficult to quantify out to the 65 and 60 DNL contour. In addition, results of published studies are greatly influenced by an airport’s location and surrounding housing and neighborhood base.

Historically, property values for homes around the airport that were impacted by aircraft noise before the opening of Runway 17/35, i.e. South Minneapolis, have not decreased in recent years. As evidence of this fact, recent statements made by Minneapolis Mayor RT Rybak, suggest that property values in the most impacted city around MSP continue to rise. Specifically, when announcing his bid for reelection on January 30, 2005, Mayor Rybak stated, “Housing values are rising all over Minneapolis, some of them dramatically, and if you own a home in this city you have made one smart investment.” The Mayor’s comments are consistent with an April 25, 1999 Star Tribune article regarding appreciating home values in the City of Minneapolis. When discussing the area most impacted in the City of Minneapolis by airport noise from MSP the article stated, “Virtually all of south Minneapolis is experiencing rising values, usually more than 10 percent.”

**I don’t think MAC has been forthright with the people in the community about the noise impact on the residents in the community and that the residents don’t understand it.**

MAC Noise Program staff conducted an extensive community information effort prior to the opening of the new runway to ensure that residents south of MSP were informed and their questions answered prior to the runway opening. This included over 50 presentations by MAC Noise Program staff to community groups, neighborhoods, city councils, realtors, school boards, and other interested groups. All of the information provided to the public was consistent with the six-year Part 150 Update process and associated operational/noise assumptions, as well as the information and assumptions contained in the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Runway 17 departure procedure. The operational trends that we are seeing today are consistent with the information that was presented to the general public. I can assure you that our goal in the MAC Noise Office is to maintain honesty and a high degree of accuracy when providing information to the general public.

### **What will the impact on property values be with Runway 17/35?**

The impact of airport noise on housing values has been the subject of a number of studies around the nation. These studies have been useful in providing some insight into the complex issue, but results have varied and have been difficult to quantify out to the 65 and 60 DNL contour. In addition, results of published studies are greatly influenced by an airport's location and surrounding housing and neighborhood base.

Historically, property values for homes around the airport that were impacted by aircraft noise before the opening of Runway 17/35, i.e. South Minneapolis, have not decreased in recent years. As evidence of this fact, recent statements made by Minneapolis Mayor RT Rybak, suggest that property values in the most impacted city around MSP continue to rise. Specifically, when announcing his bid for reelection on January 30, 2005, Mayor Rybak stated, "Housing values are rising all over Minneapolis, some of them dramatically, and if you own a home in this city you have made one smart investment." The Mayor's comments are consistent with an April 25, 1999 Star Tribune article regarding appreciating home values in the City of Minneapolis. When discussing the area most impacted in the City of Minneapolis by airport noise from MSP the article stated, "Virtually all of south Minneapolis is experiencing rising values, usually more than 10 percent."

**Why can't aircraft go over the river consistently and why are flights going over my home consistently?**

Given your home's location (approximately 8 ¼ miles from the departure end of Runway 17) to the new runway it is expected that you would experience an increase in aircraft operations over your neighborhood.

However, keeping all operations directly over the Minnesota River would severely impact runway capacity and would not be allowed by the Federal Aviation Administration. Such a position is grounded in the fact that Runway 17/35 was an approximately \$800-million-dollar investment at MSP in the name of increasing airport efficiency and capacity.

**Why is it that every plane one after another continually fly over the same residence? Can't they be scattered as they take off?**

In consideration of actual Runway 17 departure flight track locations and the question posed by yourself and others similarly situated, MAC staff has presented this question to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

In response, FAA stated that during south/southeast wind conditions when Runways 12L and 12R are being used for arrival operations (arrivals from the northwest over Minneapolis) and Runway 17 is being used for departure operations, FAA is not assigning a departure heading west of 190 degrees for those aircraft departing Runway 17. The reason for this is two-fold. (1) Aircraft that are being directed by Air Traffic Control to land on Runways 12L or 12R begin a descent when they cross the 190 degree track off Runway 17. Keeping Runway 17 departure aircraft at or east of the 190 degree heading allows the arriving aircraft to descend for landing while ensuring they are separated from aircraft that are departing Runway 17. (2) There is a corridor of airspace just to the west of the 190 degree track that allows Air Traffic Control to transition non-MSP aircraft north and south of the airport while ensuring they are separated from aircraft arriving on Runways 12L and 12R or departing Runway 17.

MAC staff has had discussions with the FAA asking if there is any possibility of reconsidering the 190 degree provision that was put in place by the FAA, and open up these Runway 17 departure operations to more westerly headings, which are more on-course with the departure fixes.

To date, in response, FAA has stated that the corridor created through the MSP airspace by this westerly heading constraint on Runway 17 is essential for aircraft that transition MSP airspace from airports north and south of MSP. The FAA's position is that without this corridor transitioning aircraft would have to be rerouted 20 to 25 miles out of their way to avoid entering the MSP airspace. Moreover, the agency contends that removal of this corridor would increase complexity for controllers trying to manage the transitional traffic around the MSP airspace. In addition, it is the FAA's position that several years of local FAA personnel time went into designing the airspace around MSP to accommodate Runway 17/35 in a manner that ensures efficiency and safety. Such is the case with the 190 degree provision off Runway 17 to de-conflict Runways 12L and 12R arrivals and Runway 17 departures.

MAC staff will continue to discuss this issue with the FAA to ensure all possible options are considered.

**What is the purpose of the public input meetings and what impact if any are these public meetings going to have?**

One of the elements of the MAC's approved framework for an MSP Airport Noise Oversight Committee (NOC) requires MAC staff to conduct quarterly public input meetings. The intent is to ensure residents' concerns are considered as part of the ongoing effort by the MAC and the NOC to address noise issues around MSP. The comments, questions and concerns are summarized into a memorandum that is provided to MAC Commissioners for informational purposes and to NOC members for consideration as possible future discussion items if the Committee members so desire.

**It is important for MAC to understand what the view of the people is and also that something happens as a result of that. I think it is incumbent of the MAC staff members to be sure the urgency of this issue gets the right attention and that something is done to change the flight paths.**

Comment noted. Commissioners receive quarterly updates on comments received at airport noise public input meetings, consider airport noise related recommendations forwarded by the MSP Noise Oversight Committee (NOC) and regularly hear testimony at MAC Committee and Commission meetings regarding airport noise. This specific point was outlined in the memorandum that was sent to MAC Commissioners and NOC members. The reality is, however, that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has sole authority for determining where aircraft will fly and flight paths will not change as a result of noise complaints.

**It is the Commission's role to help solve the airport noise issues.**

Concur. For several decades now a significant number of noise initiatives have been successfully pursued and implemented at MSP. Some of these initiatives include operational measures, voluntary agreements, and an extensive noise mitigation program, which to date, represents over \$338 million in residential and school sound mitigation and property acquisition in noise impacted areas around the airport. These efforts continue today, and regularly include the consideration of noise issues and the approval of related proposals/programs by MAC Commissioners.

**I am speaking on behalf of the Caponi Art Park in Eagan that serves hundreds and thousands of people. Who can I approach to figure out what accommodations can be made to get some reprieve from the overhead traffic at least on the weekends in the summer?**

Air Traffic Control will determine runway selection based on a number of factors including wind conditions, weather, safety requirements, traffic demand, runway capacity, direction of flight, runway length requirements, and prescribed runway use procedures. Events occurring throughout the communities, including those occurring at Caponi Art Park, are not taken into consideration by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) when determining runway use and actual aircraft flight paths.

**The eastbound planes turn too sharply and the amphitheater captures the noise from the airplanes. I would like MAC to consider straighter flight paths and higher altitudes for the airplanes to prevent them from making early turns.**

Departing aircraft from Runway 17 are in fact dispersed over a fairly wide area south of the airport. Because of separation requirements and the requirement to safely and efficiently manage departure traffic on-course to varying destinations, a wide degree of headings are used. Due to the dense residential land use along the north and west border of Eagan there is not one area that is better than another to concentrate Runway 17 eastbound departures (east of Runway centerline – 170°). Keeping all operations on one heading (straight out heading) would severely impact runway capacity and would not be allowed by the Federal Aviation Administration. Such a position is grounded in the fact that Runway 17/35 was an approximately \$800-million-dollar investment at MSP in the name of increasing airport efficiency and capacity.

**People's frustration is that they have nowhere to turn. The \$800 million put into the airport is the resident's money, not FAA's money.**

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) realizes that airport operations create quality of life concerns and as such we have undergone a number of noise initiatives that have been successfully pursued and implemented at MSP over the years.

Funding for the development of Runway 17/35 primarily came from passenger facility charges (PFC's - a charge levied on the airline ticket, to be used for preserving or enhancing safety, security, capacity, and to reduce noise or enhance competition), federal and state aid (funds collected from air transportation users to preserve, develop, or improve the airport infrastructure such as Airport Improvement Program grants), bond sales, and MAC revenues.

**I don't accept the premise that flight paths can't be changed. The FAA and policy makers at the state, federal and local levels could come up with something that makes more sense if people would contact them.**

Comment noted. The MAC will continue to work with the communities, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), airlines and other stakeholders to continue working towards noise reduction around MSP.

**The people in the room are just a small fraction of how many people are really upset about what is going on. Volume will get a lot louder when spring and summer is here. This summer will be a problem when people want to be outdoors.**

Comment noted. It is anticipated that residents can probably expect a graduated increase in use of the runway over the next several months with more noticeable impacts occurring next spring and summer. At that time the Air Traffic Control (ATC) will have had time to fully integrate the runway, homeowners will begin opening their

windows, and air traffic will most likely increase from the previous months, as it typically does in the spring and summer.

**I applaud MAC's efforts but I don't know what purpose of the meetings are if nothing can be done.**

One of the elements of the MAC's approved framework for an MSP Airport Noise Oversight Committee (NOC) requires MAC staff to conduct quarterly public input meetings. The intent is to ensure residents' concerns are considered as part of the ongoing effort by the MAC and the NOC to address noise issues around MSP. The comments, questions and concerns are summarized into a memorandum that is provided to MAC Commissioners for informational purposes and to NOC members for consideration as possible future discussion items if the Committee members so desire.

**I keep hearing at the meetings that the new planes are quieter but every day I read in the paper that the airlines are going broke. Are the airlines going to be able to buy the quieter planes?**

The older hush-kitted aircraft are generally much noisier than newer Stage 3 manufactured aircraft. Operational trends suggest that many airlines are phasing out their older noisier aircraft and replacing them with more efficient and cost effective aircraft. Operations of older hush-kit aircraft (DC-9, B727) were down 25.4% in January 2006 compared to January 2005 and 31.8% compared to January 2004. Although the reduction in older noisier aircraft at MSP represents a positive trend, these types of aircraft will likely continue to operate at MSP for several years.

**Can aircraft turn onto final approach closer than 6.5 miles?**

Yes, aircraft can be vectored onto their final approach as close as two miles from the airport. At MSP, during typical periods of arriving aircraft, the FAA is lining up as many as 10 to 15 aircraft at any given time. Many times aircraft are lined up on their final approach course as far out as 30 to 35 miles.

**I believe that people will be adversely affected by the sound waves caused by the airplanes. Noise is disruptive to the nervous system and people need to look at the noise issue from a health aspect. I am concerned about children in my neighborhood that play outside getting unnerved by the noise and developing hearing losses.**

The impact of airport noise on human health has been the subject of a number of studies around the nation. Some studies have suggested that people exposed to high levels of noise may be subject to adverse health impacts such as higher stress levels, hypertension and sleep disturbance. Typically, studies related to airport noise concentrate on areas that experience much higher levels of noise than your residence which is approximately 4 ¼ miles outside of the 2007 Mitigated 60 DNL contour.

**People deserve some kind of compensation to help with the anger because they are put in victim roles.**

MAC realizes that airport operations create quality of life concerns and as such we have undergone a number of noise initiatives that have been successfully pursued and implemented at MSP over the years. The MAC has implemented an extensive noise

mitigation program which, to date, represents over \$338 million in residential and school sound mitigation and property acquisition in noise impacted areas around the airport. Additionally, the MAC has proposed a mitigation program that goes beyond the federal eligibility standard of 65 DNL and offers improvements to eligible homes out to the 60 DNL. Unfortunately, your residence located at 13765 Fordham Court, Apple Valley, is located outside of the 60 DNL contour area and is not proposed for mitigation.

**No one had any say about the new runway.**

The decision to expand MSP at its present location was a long and public process that culminated in legislative direction to expand MSP. This process included extensive evaluations that considered the impacts associated with Runway 17/35.

In 1989, the Minnesota Legislature directed the MAC and the Metropolitan Council (MC) to examine how to best meet the regions future aviation needs. This initiated a seven year series of planning and environmental review studies called the Dual Track Airport Planning Process, examining expansion of MSP at its current location or construction of a new replacement airport in Southern Dakota County. In 1996, the Minnesota Legislature reviewed the Dual Track Airport Planning Process recommendations and the environmental impacts and selected development of MSP as the preferred alternative. This was a significant public process that included a public comment period and two public hearings. The FAA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) in September 1998 that determined the document adequately assessed the environmental effects of the MSP 2010 plan.

**Can the MAC restrict the number of operations at the airport?**

No the MAC can not set or limit the number of operations at the airport. Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP) is a public use facility which uses federal aviation dollars for improvements and development and federal policy supersedes local authority with respect to access and use of the facility. Availability of federal monies for airport expenses are subject to grant assurance provisions. Under those provisions the facility must provide access free of arbitrary and capricious restrictions.