

# N

## Appendix N: 2010 System Airport Assessments

An airport capability assessment is prepared for each facility in the regional system. The assessment sheet functions like a report card, providing a quick summary of the airport's condition. A 10-year retrospective look is included to show what progress has been made or where challenges/opportunities still remain. Capability in future years is predicated on implementation of facility long-term comprehensive plans (LTCP's) to meet forecasted demand for short, medium, and long-term planning horizons.

Each assessment is based upon the latest available airport development plan, environmental evaluation, capital improvement program, airport layout plan, Mn/DOT, MAC and FAA data/information. A number of general system evaluation criteria categories are used in the report card that identify various items monitored in the planning process. Each system evaluation criterion is determined to be, within a particular timeframe, as being (S) Satisfactory, (Q) Questionable, (U) Unsatisfactory, or (?) an unknown quantity. A definition of the assessment marks is as follows:

- Satisfactory (S) The particular element meets policy, planning, development, design/ performance, and regulatory requirements.
- Questionable (Q) Not all parts of the element meet requirements.
- Unsatisfactory (U) Element does not meet minimum thresholds.
- Unknown (?) The element has not been adequately documented, or included in the aviation planning process.

Sample Report Card Layout

System Evaluation Criterion	Airport				
	Status in [Prior 10 Yrs]	Current Status [Year]	Forecast Status Short-Term [Year]	Forecast Status Medium-Term [Year]	Forecast Status Long-Term [Year]
Airside – Capacity vs Demand	?	U	U	Q	S
Landside – Capacity vs Demand					
Ground Accessibility					
Environmental Compatibility					
Infrastructure – Utilities					
Safety					
Air Service					
Economic Impact					
Fiscal					
S – Satisfactory Q – Questionable U – Unsatisfactory ? – Unknown					

All criterion are included for consistency in each report card; however, a particular part of an element may not be included, or the scope can vary depending upon whether the airport is classified as a Major airport (airline service), an Intermediate airport (corporate business), Minor airport (small business, training, and recreational), or a Special Use facility that is primarily for recreational users.

### **Definitions of System Evaluation Criterion**

**Airside – Capacity vs Demand:** Comparison of the annual service volume (ASV) the airfield can accommodate with the number of operations counted, estimated or forecast. This element involves the type, number, orientation of the runway system, includes runway holding pads, and taxiways. It reflects the aircraft fleet mix, operational and instrumentation considerations.

**Landside- Capacity vs Demand:** Comparison of the number of gates and hangar spaces available with the number estimated or forecast. This element includes aircraft parking aprons/areas, passenger terminals and hangar building areas.

**Ground Accessibility:** Adequacy of highway access and parking for airport employees and users, including transit (both rubber tire and rail) if applicable. This element includes all types of roads immediately adjacent to the airport providing direct connection to the local or regional road system; it also includes all those roads within its service area that provide direct connections to the regional road system. Both surface and structure parking facilities are included, along with transit stations.

**Environmental Compatibility:** Includes planned land use and existing land use determined incompatible with aircraft noise in the approved community comprehensive plan; wetland issues, surface and groundwater issues, and air quality issues. This element involves adoption of guidelines, implementation of pollution prevention programs, mitigation programs, permits and regulatory requirements of other governmental units.

**Infrastructure and Utilities:** Airport and community plans provide appropriate levels of service and protection for sewer, water, fire and security, and utilities. This element involves provision of adequate public and private infrastructure and services to airport users, commensurate with airport development/operational needs, and consistent with environmental requirements.

**Safety:** Adherence to FAA Part 77 airspace surfaces, Mn/DOT airspace zoning and runway safety zoning. This element involves protection of airport-area airspace including runway approach zones, airport zoning reflecting both federal and state requirements. It not only addresses height and land use, but also visual or electronic interference to airport and aircraft operations. Region-wide airspace and navigation issues are addressed elsewhere in the TPP.

**Air Service:** Adequacy of the airport facilities to provide the air-service access designated for its system role and function (airline, regional, charter, air-taxi, corporate/business, general aviation, air cargo, military and/or personal use and recreational).

**Economic Impact:** Impact on the region including direct and indirect effects. Established economic plan.

**Fiscal:** Ability of airport owner to provide funding for needed improvements and long-term operation and maintenance.

## Regional System Airports

### Major Airport - Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	U	S	S	Q Pk. Hr. Issues, NextGen projects and ground control status, Twy's	Q Crossover Twy. End around Twy. Rwy capacity
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	Q Agreements	Q Gate #'s, Gate sizing, Gate use issues	
Ground accessibility	Q	Q	S I-494/34th Avenue So.	Q Funding Parking & Term.2 Rds.	Q Post Rd./TH55 Glumack Dr./TH55
Environmental compatibility	Q	Q	S Complete Mit. Prog. NPDES permits	Q Depends on # Ops' & Part 150	Q Depend on # Ops' & nighttime ops'
Infrastructure and Utilities	S	S	S	Q Depends on STAR	Q Depends on Hub Ops' & Fueling
Safety	Q	Q	S ANOMS upgrades imp's Radar shadowing	Q Ops' & NextGen in place	Q Depends upon Ops' & NextGen thru-put
Air service	Q	Q Small Cities	S Connections	Q Econ & Fcsts'	Q Delay Costs
Economic impact	S	Q Mergers	Q U.S. economy	Q Hub Status	S Enpl. #'s
Fiscal	S	Q Revenues	Q PFCs,	Q Debt	Q Funding
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – Many of the problems identified in 1990 were examined in development of the MSP 2010 LTCP. In 1996 the Minnesota Legislature approved Council and MAC dual-track recommendations to provide major airport capacity by expanding MSP. Additional detailed evaluations of the MSP LTCP

were conducted in preparing the Plan's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Various mitigation efforts and capital improvement projects were initiated throughout the 1990s, and several problem areas were improved; others are still in process. Generally, overall progress was made in each category. The improvements were adequate through 2010. The FAA indicated a continued strong growth in air traffic and the MSP EIS adopted the 1993 high range forecasts for 2010/2020. The Council completed a review of the 1993 forecasts and a joint agency effort to prepare new forecasts was initiated for the 2000 system update.

**Status in 2010** – Economic recession and the 9-11 terrorist attacks significantly changed the outlook from the 2000, historical high, air traffic activity. Because of economic conditions completion of the new runway 17/35 was delayed until Oct. of 2005. Activity in passenger traffic and operations have decreased from the historical high. A legal settlement in the noise mitigation program extends residential mitigation to the DNL 60 noise contour with completion in 2014 .

A 2015 Terminal Expansion Draft EA was prepared for initiation of a first phase of gate expansion at MSP but was put on hold due to airline industry economic conditions. As part of the 2015 EA the 2020 Concept Plan for future development, adopted as part of the Dual track planning process, was dropped as a planning option. Northwest airlines went into Chapter 11 Bankruptcy in 2005, reorganized and exited in May 2007; other airlines serving MSP were also in bankruptcy proceedings. Since that time fuel costs have increased substantially, and Northwest, including its subsidiaries, merged with Delta Airlines at the end of 2008.

All airlines are cutting back on the number of flights, parking older inefficient aircraft, and laying off personnel. A number of airlines have recently gone out of business and there are concerns of liquidity for several large domestic carriers to remain solvent; United and Continental have recently agreed to merge. New parking facilities were completed since demand is still high and they provide an important source of revenue. Fuel costs are tied to the low value of the U.S. currency, political instability in oil-producing/refining areas, and poor overall economic conditions.

Of MSP- based airlines, Mesaba Airlines was acquired by NWA and a new wholly-owned subsidiary, Compass Airlines, was created; both were subsequently sold by Delta, Champion Air charter operator has gone out of business, and Sun Country is out of bankruptcy. Aircraft maintenance work is increasingly outsourced and NWA/Delta merged headquarters is located in Atlanta. The MAC has the 2030 LTCP Update for MSP expansion.

## Intermediate Airport - St. Paul Downtown Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	St. Paul Downtown Airport (Primary Reliever)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	S	S	S	S	S
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	S	Q Hangar consolidation	Q Storage limits
Ground accessibility	S	S	S	S	S
Environmental compatibility	S	S	S	S	S
Infrastructure and Utilities	U	S flood protection	S	S	S
Safety	S	Q	S	S	S
Air service	Q	Q	S	S	Q Not Part 139 certified & MSP Ops'
Economic impact	S	S Activity	Q Econ. recovery	Q # Ops'	Q # Ops'
Fiscal	S	Q	Q reliever funding	Q sustainability	Q sustainability
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – Parts of the 1977 development plan were implemented during the 1980s with completion of a new main-wind runway and taxiways, and initial phase of a raised hangar building area. The military hangar and operational apron areas were upgraded. In 1992 a LTCP was completed for the airport. It reaffirmed most of the earlier plan, with implementation lighting and precision landing system, new air – traffic control tower, continued development of the elevated building area, agreements for improved FBO services, and new rates-and-charges in the 1990s for improvements and agreement to improve the cost/revenue situation, and minor changes for flood control.

The MAC initiated an update of the LTCP in 1999 and a public hearing was held on February 28, 2001. Completion of the LTCP review/approval process was on hold by the MAC until FAA concerns with runway safety, and MAC continuing concerns with flood protection, were addressed.

**Status in 2010-** The airport has seen a number of improvements to runway safety, installation of an ILS, provision of flood control measures including a dike for 100 yr flooding levels. Continued hangar development has occurred in the raised hangar area and redevelopment to higher-end users has occurred in the other hangar areas. Urban encroachment is a continuing issue with community redevelopment in the airport environs, including expansion of the Lafayette Bridge.

A major change in MAC reliever airport funding has been put in place to make the reliever airport system as self-sufficient as possible, and included potential non-aviation land use development on-airport. Activity levels have declined from historical highs and runway use is less than 50% of runway capacity. The MAC has completed a LTCP Update a 2025 planning horizon. No major changes to the airport are planned, the seaplane base has been decommissioned and the second riverside hangar has been sold to 3M. . Zoning of the airport to meet state requirements is underway; approval of a zoning ordinance may occur in 2010.

### Minor Airport - Airlake Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Airlake Airport (Reliever)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	Q	S Utility , no crosswind	S Rwy length	S Cedar Ave. Relocation	S Rwy Extension
Landside – capacity vs. demand	S	Q	Q Hangar needs & Pvt. Funding	Q Pvt. Funding	Q Bus. Demand
Ground accessibility	S	Q	Q	S	S
Environmental compatibility	Q	S	Q Land use & jurisdiction issues	Q	S
Infrastructure and Utilities	U	Q	Q Sewer and water service	Q sewer/water	S
Safety	S	S	Q Increasing development, JZB	S	S ILS+
Air service	S	S	S	S	Q
Economic impact	Q	S	Declining activity	S	S
Fiscal	S	Q	Q reliever funding	Q funding	Q sustainability
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – The MAC updated the LTCP in 1996. The plan reaffirmed earlier evaluations concerning the runway layout; it was refined to reflect a 4,600-foot length for the main-wind runway, a 3,200-foot crosswind runway (4/22), and associated taxiways. Railroad and roadways are serious physical constraints to extension of the main runway. The proposed crosswind runway would require acquisition of about eighty acres of land. New demand forecasts indicated the need for an additional [south] building area to be constructed on the existing airport site.

**Status in 2010-** The airport airside development has been focused upon acquisition of private in-hold-

ings to meet FAA design requirements for the parallel taxiway. Taxiway alley and other building area preparation for a new southwest hangar area were initiated but not implemented. A cross-wind runway was also not implemented. Issues with sewer service still remain. Urban growth continues in Lakeville and the industrial parks are also expanding east and west of the airport.

A major change in MAC reliever airport funding has been put in place to make the reliever airport system as self-sufficient as possible. Capital funding is a continuing issue and areas of the airport may become non-aviation use areas for supplemental revenue generation. Activity levels have declined from historical highs and runway use is less than 50% of runway capacity. In 2007 the MAC adopted an airport 2025 LTCP update that eliminated the crosswind runway and land acquisition proposal from the plan, recommended that the southwest building area be completed, and that extension of the main-wind runway to 5,000' be maintained for the long-term.

### Minor Airport - Anoka County - Blaine Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Anoka County - Blaine Airport (Reliever)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	Q	S	S	S	S # MSP Ops"
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	S	S	S	S
Ground accessibility	Q	S	S	S	S
Environmental compatibility	Q	S	S	S	Q Rwy Cap.
Infrastructure and Utilities	Q	S	S	S	S
Safety	Q	S	Q JZB, ordinance	S	S ILS+
Air service	Q	Q Dev. NW bldg area and services	Q Eco. Recovery	Q # Ops'	Q Bus. Ops'
Economic impact	S	Q Declining activity	Q Econ. recovery	Q	S
Fiscal	S	Q	Q Non-Avia. Dev.	Q Reliever Funding	Q sustainability
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – In May 2000 a settlement was reached between the City of Mounds View, MAC and the Council concerning litigation on the 1986 stipulation agreement. The LTCP was resubmitted for Council review and approved, with a number of conditions, on August 30, 2000. The 1999/2000 legislature limited all Minor airport runways to a maximum of 5,000' – this was included in the settlement agreement.

The agreement is in effect until Dec. 31, 2020. A major shift in the system assessment ratings occurred between 2003 – 2007 as projects are completed.

**Status in 2010** – Most of the 2015 plan elements have been implemented. Improvements include a new runway approach lighting system and installation of a precision instrument landing system (ILS). The northwest hangar building area and extension of the east/west runway to 5,000’ have been accomplished through a private public partnership involving the City of Blaine, Anoka County and private investors. Large parts of the airport are being used for recreational and other governmental purposes. Urban growth has occurred with development occurring in sod farms adjacent to the airport.

A major change in MAC reliever airport funding has been put in place to make the reliever airport system as self-sufficient as possible. Some areas of the airport have been identified as non-aviation use areas for supplemental revenue generation. Activity levels have declined from historical highs and runway use is less than 50% of capacity. The airport LTCP has been updated to a 2025 planning horizon. New runway development is not justified in this planning period. Several hangar building areas can be developed if demand warrants. Capital funding is a continuing issue. An airport joint zoning board will be proposed for establishment by 2011.

**Minor Airport - Crystal Airport**

System Evaluation Criteria	Crystal Airport (Reliever)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Fore-cast vs. LTCP	2020 Fore-cast vs. LTCP	2030 Fore-cast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	S	S	S	S	S
Landside – capacity vs. demand	U	Q	Q Hangar Types	Q Re-Dev. Bldg Areas	Q # Ops’
Ground accessibility	S	Q	S TH 81 dev.	S	S
Environmental compatibility	Q	S	S	S	S
Infrastructure and Utilities	Q	S	S	S	S
Safety	S	Q	Q JZB and revised ordinance.	S	S
Air service	Q	S	Q FBO & services	Q	Q
Economic impact	S	S Declining activity	Q Non-Avia. Dev.	Q Econ. Recovery	Q
Fiscal	S	Q	Q Non-Avia. Dev.	Q Reliever funding	Q sustainability
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – The City of Crystal comprehensive plan was reviewed by the Council in January 1994. The Council determined that the community plan could not be put into effect until it was modified to address airport-related issues. A key result of the Crystal community plan review process was that the MAC commit to preparation of a LTCP, since there was no plan adopted for the airport. An LTCP was prepared in 1994 and a public hearing held in June 1995. The public hearing report, and LTCP, was reviewed by the MAC Planning and Environment Committee in September 1995. The P&E Committee recommended that the Commission: adopt the hearing officers report; adopt the Crystal LTCP; authorize forwarding of LTCP to Metropolitan Council for review/approval; and request that Met Council initiate an airport system economic study.

In October 1995 the MAC appointed an “Obstruction Committee,” and throughout 1996/97 the committee met with the Crystal Airport Tri-City Airport Commission to resolve the airport safety ordinance and other issues. In early 1997 the MAC CIP included \$450,000 for removal of obstructions—primarily trees—many on private property. The Council completed a regional economic study in 1998, including data for Crystal Airport. In August of 1999 the MAC completed removal of all tree obstructions in the runway approaches. A Crystal LTCP has still not been submitted for Council review. The Council reviewed the city comprehensive plan on June 26, 2000. The city continues to desire that the airport be closed in the 2020 time period and does not want to participate in any noise mitigation program or land use compatibility programs.

**Status in 2010** - The airports runway configuration has been in place since the early 1960’s, hangar area development and taxiway improvements have been made over the years. Adjacent airports have improved their individual capabilities relative to Crystal. During 2008 the MAC completed a 2025 LTCP Update which was reviewed and approved by the Council. The plan proposes to eliminate the turf cross-wind runway and turn one of the parallel main-wind runways into a taxiway. No new hangar areas are proposed since sufficient vacant hangars are currently available on-site. A major change in MAC reliever airport funding has been put in place to make the reliever airport system as self-sufficient as possible. Some areas of the airport may be developed as non-aviation use areas for supplemental revenue generation. Capital funding is a continuing issue. Activity levels and based aircraft numbers have declined from historical highs and runway use is less than 50% of capacity. The airport is fully encroached by urban development. Airport safety zoning will need to be revised by the joint airport/community zoning board to meet state standards and reflect the runway changes. Adjacent communities have agreed with the runway reductions, but still want the airport to be closed.

## Minor Airport - Flying Cloud Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Flying Cloud Airport (Reliever)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	Q	S	S	S	S
Landside – capacity vs. demand	U	Q	Q Hangar needs and Pvt. Funding	S	S
Ground accessibility	Q	S	S	S	S
Environmental compatibility	Q	S	S	Q mitigation	Q #Ops
Infrastructure and Utilities	U	Q	Q	S	S
Safety	Q	S cross rwy	Q JZB, ordinance	S	S
Air service	U	Q	Q	S	S
Economic impact	S	Q Declining activity	Q	S	Q # Bus. Ops'
Fiscal	S	S	Q Non-Avia. Dev.	Q Reliever funding	Q sustainability
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – Ratings in 2000 reflect the 1992 [Amended] LTCP, 1994 FCM Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and the 1999 FCM Expansion Plan DEIS. The development plan is essentially the same as the preferred alternative initially proposed in 1988. Since a FEIS/ROD is not completed the proposed development was not in place as of 2000. Therefore airside and landside capacity deficiencies remained, although land acquisition for the new building area indicates improvement. Ground access was better defined but implementation not completed. EIS is in process, and LTCP approval conditions not yet implemented. Land acquisition for runway approaches is well under way and expected to be satisfactory before 2010. Air service will remain deficient until lengthened runway is operational. Economic impact is improved with information for Flying Cloud available from regional economic study. Fiscal is improved with MAC adoption of new rates-and-charges for their general aviation airports.

**Status in 2010** - A FEIS and federal record of decision (ROD) was completed. An Agreement between the City of Eden Prairie and the MAC is in place for addressing land use issues, noise mitigation, utility services, and airport/aircraft operational limits. Sewer service was provided to the north in 2008, and to south and east hangar areas in 2002. A major change in MAC reliever airport funding has been put in place to make the reliever airport system as financially self-sufficient as possible. Some areas of the airport may be developed in non-aviation use areas for supplemental revenue generation. Capital funding is

a continuing issue. The approved LTCP includes extension of the parallel main-wind runways, and a new south-west hangar building area. The north parallel was extended to 3,900' in 2008 and the south parallel to 5,000' in 2009. An update of the LTCP to a 2025 planning horizon was completed in 2008. A joint airport/community zoning board will need to prepare airport zoning that reflects the new runway extensions and LTCP update projects. Activity levels and based aircraft numbers have declined from historical highs and runway use is less than 50% of capacity. The crosswind runway is being shifted slightly north and extended, including zoning, and a new south hangar building area is also being developed. The VOR has been moved and the FAA ATCT is proposed to be moved over the long-term. Road access and security gates have been improved. Efforts are being made to prevent runway incursions. Adjacent airports have not improved their capabilities and a private, multi-aircraft airport in Carver Co. is being lost to urban development.

### Minor Airport - Lake Elmo Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Lake Elmo Airport (Reliever)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2007	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	S	S	S	S	Q crosswind Rwy extension
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	Q Hangar needs and Pvt. Funding	Q	Q
Ground accessibility	S	S	S	S	S
Environmental compatibility	S	S	Q Noise and land use	Q	S
Infrastructure and Utilities	U	Q	Q Sewer and water service	Q	S
Safety	S	S	Q JZB and ordinance	Q land use controls	S
Air service	S	S	Q Runway length	Q	S
Economic impact	S	Q Declining activity	Q Econ. Recovery	Q	Q # Ops'
Fiscal	S	Q	Q Reliever Funding	Q Reliever funding	Q sustainability
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – Ratings are based upon the 1992 long-term comprehensive plan (LTCP); it was approved by the Council in 1994. The 1992 plan indicated that demand was less than earlier forecasts, and in the 10-year time-frame extension of the main-wind runway to 3,300', along with a non-precision VOR approach, should be sufficient. A supplement to the LTCP was prepared in 1993 concerning stormwater and groundwater management. During the 1990s continued growth in general aviation has almost filled capacity of existing hangar areas and capacity is questionable unless a new building area is opened. Sewer and water service issues with individual users have been addressed, and longer-term issues with potential central services are included in the new MAC policy on services at its reliever airports. Economic impact was identified in the 1998 Regional Economic Impact Study. Fiscal status improved with MAC adoption of new rates and charges for their general aviation airports.

**Status in 2010** - No major airside improvements implementing the approved 1992 LTCP has occurred. The MAC transferred all ground water monitoring and mitigation responsibilities for the TCE contamination in the vicinity of the Lake Elmo Airport to the MCPA with the discovery of a major ground water contamination source on the eastern edge of the City of Lake Elmo that impacts the down-gradient ground water for the community and airport areas to the east. An EAW was prepared in 2001 for a potential new east hangar building area. A major change in MAC reliever airport funding has been put in place to make the reliever airport system as self-sufficient as possible. Capital funding is a continuing issue. Urban growth and airport encroachment is still an issue. Central sewer and water service may become available in the near term. In 2007 the MAC completed a draft 2025 LTCP Update. It proposes keeping the planned 3,900' new main-wind runway in the plan for long term growth potential, but in the short term to extend the cross-wind runway to 3,300', and develop a new east hangar area. A joint airport/community Airport zoning board will need to revise the airport zoning ordinance to reflect the LTCP proposal. Some areas of the airport may be developed as non-aviation use areas for supplemental revenue generation. Activity levels and base aircraft numbers have declined from historical highs and runway use is at about 25% of capacity. Adjacent airports have improved their individual capabilities relative to Lake Elmo.

## Minor Airport - South St. Paul Municipal Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	South St. Paul Municipal Airport (Reliever)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	S	S	S	S	S
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	S	S	S	S
Ground accessibility	Q	S	S	S	S
Environmental compatibility	?	Noise contours dated	S	S	S
Infrastructure and Utilities	Q	S	S	S	S
Safety	Q		Q REIL's	S	S
Air service	S	S	S	S	S
Economic impact	S	S	S	S	Q
Fiscal	U	?	Q Local funding	Q Econ. Recovery	Q sustainability
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – Ratings in 2000 reflect the City of South St. Paul's 1999 Comprehensive Plan and draft airport layout plan (ALP), as well as the Council's 1998 Regional Economic Impact Study. Airside capacity is satisfactory. Sale of property in Inver Grove Heights, included in the 1976 master plan for future building area improvements, substantially affected long-term growth options. Continued development of the south building area occurred to meet demand. ALP update identified new hangar areas in east and west portions of the airport for future development. Landside capacity still questionable until ALP approved by the FAA. Ground access improved with connection to Hwy. 52, and new signage. Adequacy/availability of documentation on environmental compatibility unknown. RPZ protection and obstruction removals still an issue; airfield fencing improved safety situation. Airspace operational interaction with STP and MSP needs continuous monitoring. Airside pavement and lighting improvements satisfactory; still need improvement in navigational aids. Air service has improved dramatically with provision of self-fueling and construction of an air terminal and services. Economic impact for SSP was identified in the regional evaluation. The City has identified economic development goals for the airport. Fiscal has improved with hiring of full-time airport manager; capital funding remains an important issue.

**Status in 2010** – The City has improved the taxiway system and opened a new west-side forty-seven hangar building area with separate access road. Spillover effect of lease rate increases at MAC airports is a potential growth factor in activity levels. The 2010 Metro System Plan Update to 2030 has indicated a need for installation of runway end identification lights; this development needs to be coordinated with the Mn/DOT 5-year capital improvement plan.

## Minor Airport - Forest Lake Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Forest Lake Airport (Municipal)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	Q Condition and utility of runway	Q Extension	Q Paving
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	S Relocated building area	Q	S
Ground accessibility	Q	Q	S access rd. relocated	S	S
Environmental compatibility	Q	S	S	S	S
Infrastructure and Utilities	Q	S	S	S	S
Safety	Q	S	Q Obstructions	Q Obstructions	Q
Air service	Q	Q	Q Design -aircraft needs	Q	Q # Ops'
Economic impact	?	Q	Q Level of Activity	Q New activity	Q # Ops'
Fiscal	Q	U Local funding only	Q Econ. Recovery	Q in NPIAS	Q sustainability
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – The ratings for 2000 are based upon information listed previously, the 1996 Airport Acquisition Feasibility Study prepared by Forest Lake Township, and the Comprehensive Plans prepared by the City and Township of Forest Lake. The airport study investigated the possibility of public purchase of the private facility; it included assessing future development opportunities for the airport, defining the amount of land required by FAA and Mn/DOT standards to satisfy existing and proposed development, and ultimate revenue streams and operating costs that could be expected from the airport. The study did not include any aviation forecasts for determining facility demand or specific timing for development phasing. In 1999 there were 20 based aircraft at the airport. Assumptions on development needs were based upon meeting federal and state design standards; therefore, most of the ratings go from “unknown” to “questionable.” These categories remain as questionable until specific evaluations occur, funding programmed, and projects implemented. The airport zoning was approved by Mn/DOT.

**Status in 2010** – The airport has been making progress in its land acquisition and land use safety efforts over the past few years with assistance from Mn/DOT Aeronautics. A new access road and new hangar area are under development for 28 conventional hangars and 15 T-hangars including paved alleyways. All leaseholds are served with water, sewer, electricity and natural gas. A paved taxiway is completed and paving of the runway to 2,700’ is planned with eventual extension to 3,300’ when power line obstruction is removed. Future CIP projects are programmed in state 5-year CIP Regional system plan supports change in role from a Special Purpose facility to a designated Minor airport. The community will seek to apply for NPIAS status.

## Special Purpose Airport - Surfside Seaplane Base (located on Rice Lake in Lino Lakes)

System Evaluation Criteria	Surfside Seaplane Base (Private - Lino Lakes)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	?	S	Q Water levels	Q	Q
Landside – capacity vs. demand	S	S	S Storage capabilities	S	S
Ground accessibility	S	S	S	S	S
Environmental compatibility	?	S	S	S	S
Infrastructure and Utilities	S	S	S	S	S
Safety	?	S?	S RPZ areas	S	S
Air service	?	S	?	?	?
Economic impact	?	S?	S Econ. Eval.?	S	S? # Ops'
Fiscal	?	? Private funding	S Econ. Recovery	S	S
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – Ratings in 2000 reflect information in the 1998 Lino Lakes comprehensive plan update. New general aviation forecasts were prepared as part of the Aviation Policy Plan Update 2000 – 2020; projections of fixed-wing aircraft growth were included, but a separate assessment of seaplanes was not prepared. The status of airside capacity has not changed since 1990. Landside capacity is estimated to have become more constrained in the last 10 years. Status of most other categories has remained unknown. Urban development is expected to continue and put additional pressures on the private airports in the metro region.

**Status in 2010** - Preliminary ratings for 2010 have not changed based upon the 2008 Lino Lakes CPU. Some reduction in activity reflects current trends in G.A. Projections of G.A. fixed-wing aircraft growth as determined in the 2030 Metro system plan forecasts; A second building area and access has been added. Status of airside and landside capacity is essentially unchanged since 2000. Land use compatibility with nearby residential development and regional park reserve/watershed district do not appear to be an issue, although long term urban development and park use may increase. Future activity is unknown due primarily to private ownership and that most “based” aircraft are straight- float equipped, and the dirt runway is not available for regular operations or easily expandable.

## Special Purpose Airport \* - Benson Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Benson Airport (White Bear Township)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2010	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	?	S Restricted Use	Q Runway length	Q	Q
Landside – capacity vs. demand	?	S	S Hangar Size changes	S	S
Ground accessibility	S	S	S	S	S
Environmental compatibility	?	?	S	S	S
Infrastructure and Utilities	?	?	S	S	S
Safety	U	?	S Restricted	S	S
Air service	?	S	Q restricted	Q	Q
Economic impact	?	?	?	?	?
Fiscal	?	?	? Private Funding	?	?
S–Satisfactory Q–Questionable U–Unsatisfactory ?–Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – White Bear Township became owner of the Benson Airport in 1996. Under terms of the owner’s estate, the 62-acre airport will be operated for at least 40 years by the Benson Airport Association. The Township received 19 acres for parkland and another four acres to locate a new water tower. Many of the ratings have remained unchanged since 1990; it is anticipated that this will change soon due to three key items:

- The preparation of an updated comprehensive plan by the Township that is to include aviation information (the plan was still not submitted for Council review as of June 2001).
- The FAA- change to the MSP International Airport Class-B airspace, did have a dramatic effect upon sailplane operations, the Red Wing Soaring Association relocated to the Osceola, WI airport having a direct impact on Benson Airport use.
- The possibility of changes in state aeronautics rules/regulations that would set licensing standards, based upon runway length of 2,000’, for airports designated as “special purpose.” This new designation would be the same as currently used in the regional aviation system plan.

**Status in 2010** – The Red Wing Soaring Association moved to Osceola, WI and air traffic activity is down as a result. Some new conventional hangars are being developed but a number of existing T-hangar facilities are being removed, so overall landside capacity for aircraft storage is essentially unchanged. Airside capabilities have been downgraded by removal of the runway lighting. The turf runway remains the same; no improvement to approach hazards or safety zoning has occurred. The airport management

association does not appear to encourage ultralights, homebuilts or light-sport aircraft. This facility, under new state rules could conceivably be a “Special Purpose” licensed facility; however, it appears there is no desire either by the Township or the airport association to promote the airport to try and eventually become eligible for federal or state capital funding. Given these conditions the Council assumes that the facility closure sunset date of 2036 is highly likely and therefore will not include this airport in the metro system, but will continue to monitor the facility in relation to operations at the other system airports. It is possible that some of Benson’s airport users and private airstrips in the area under urban development pressures may elect to move to the Forest Lake Airport due to its on-going planned improvements.

**Note: This airport is not in the system, but may have a future impact and is included here to recognize potential forecast impacts and to present an example of issues to be examined for including potential facilities into the regional system plan.**