



**MSP Airport Long-Term Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Panel
MEETING MINUTES**
Thursday, August 4, 2022

Stakeholder Advisory Panel Meeting #5
Virtual: Zoom Meeting
In-Person: Bloomington Convention and Visitor's Bureau

- Panel Members:** Hank Moody, Delta Air Lines; Gary Berndt, Sun Country Airlines; Kyle O'Neal, Southwest Airlines; Jana Webster, Executive Director, Airport Foundation; Shari Paul, Medtronic; Gina Mitchell, FAA ADO; Nancy Nistler, FAA ADO; Brian Peterson, Transportation Security Administration (TSA); Glen Markegard, City of Bloomington; Cheryl Jacobson, City of Mendota Heights; Loren Olson, City of Minneapolis; Kevin Gallatin, City of St. Paul; Dan O'Leary, City of Sunfish Lake; Bill Goins, Supply Chain Management; Bill Deef, Meet Minneapolis; Terry Mattson, Visit St. Paul/River Centre; Bonnie Carlson, Bloomington Convention and Visitor's Bureau; Dan O'Neill, Bloomington Convention and Visitor's Bureau; Jan Kroells, Bloomington Convention and Visitors Bureau; Dan Jasper, Mall of America; Kyle Schmaltz, Signature; Emily Koski, City of Minneapolis; Rylan Juran, MnDOT Aero; Sarah Alig, City of Eagan
- MAC Staff:** Roy Fuhrmann, Chief Operating Officer; Eric Gilles, Airport Planner; Alan Howell, Senior Airport Architect; Brad Juffer, Manager of Community Relations; Abby Kes, Event Coordinator; Mitch Killian, Associate Vice President – Governmental Affairs; Chad Leque, Vice President – Management and Operations; Jennifer Lewis, Community Relations Coordinator; Dana Nelson, Director of Stakeholder Engagement; Naomi Pesky, Vice President – Strategy and Stakeholder Engagement; Brian Peters, Director – Air Service Development; Bridget Rief, Vice President – Planning and Development; Michele Ross, Assistant Manager of Community Relations; Brian Ryks, Executive Director/CEO; Cassie Schmid, Director – Strategic Marketing; Melissa Scovronski, Manager – Strategic Campaigns; Kalae Verdeja, Administrative Specialist
- Others:** Todd Streeter, Community Collaboration; Andrew Blaisdell, HNTB; Bill Schmitz, Kimley-Horn; Joe Chang, Ricondo & Associates; Phil Kolctan; MBI Construction

1) Welcome Remarks

Bridget Reif, Vice President of Planning and Development of the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) welcomed everyone to the fifth meeting of the Minneapolis-St. Paul (MSP) Stakeholder Advisory Panel.

2) MSP Airport Long Term Plan Overview and Engagement Program

Ms. Rief reviewed the overarching goal of the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC): “Our goal is to create a plan that positions MAC to meet future demand, enhances our financial strength, leverages environmental stewardship, and infuses sustainable and innovative thinking in all that we do”. Ms. Rief also gave an overview of the preparation going on behind the scenes regarding planning.

Ms. Rief introduced **Dana Nelson, MAC’s Director of Stakeholder Engagement**. Ms. Nelson thanked Jan Kroells, Dan O’Neill and Bonnie Carlson from the Bloomington Convention and Visitor’s Bureau, for hosting our meeting. Ms. Nelson reviewed the various ways to participate in the virtual portion of the meeting. She continued reviewing the meeting’s agenda and objectives which included: the MSP Long-Term Plan goals, process, and engagement program; progress to date, including projected terminal, airside and landside facility requirements and a set of concepts (“alternatives”) intended to fulfill projected requirements; and invite questions, ideas, and concerns from panel members about these alternatives.

Ms. Nelson then gave an overview, including a step-by-step process, of the Long-Term Plan. Ms. Rief expanded by noting there were some items in the process that have already been approved in the current plan. Ms. Nelson reviewed the Long-Term Plan Goals which include:

- (1) Plan for future facilities that will meet projected passenger activity levels in a manner that maintains and enhances customer service, while facilitating a seamless experience.
- (2) Produce a development plan that positions the MAC to:
 - meet future demand levels,
 - enhance financial strength,
 - leverage environmental stewardship, and
 - infuse sustainable thinking.
- (3) Conduct the planning process in a manner that includes meaningful stakeholder engagement process.

Ms. Nelson elaborated on what steps of the Long-Term Planning Process MAC is currently working on and what next steps could be expected. She reviewed the Stakeholder Engagement Program which includes the Stakeholder Advisory Panel, Experience MSP Public Event Series, Project Website www.metroairport.com/long-term-plan, E-News Monthly Project Updates, Public surveys and polls, Project Newsletters, Print Notifications

for Public Events, as well as Updates at the Noise Oversight Committee and MAC's Planning, Development and Environment Committee.

The definition of the stakeholder advisory panel was discussed. Several important functions that the panel serves include: Representing a broad range of stakeholder groups; receiving information about the planning process; communicating public concerns and aspirations as the voice of key stakeholders.

The Project Website was reviewed. The site contains the overview, community and stakeholder engagement, progress and schedule, documents and links, and frequently asked questions.

Questions or Comments about the MSP Long-Term Plan can be sent:

Contact us via email at:

MSPAirportLongTermPlan@mspmac.org

Visit the project website at:

www.mispairport.com/long-term-plan

Sign up to receive news updates at:

[Metropolitan Airports Commission \(govdelivery.com\)](http://Metropolitan Airports Commission (govdelivery.com))

3) Update from MAC's Airport Planner

Eric Gilles, MAC's Airport Planner, thanked the group for their participation. Mr. Gilles gave some of his background, education, and experience. He also reviewed his roles and responsibilities as the current airport planner at MAC.

Mr. Gilles gave a refresher on the Long-Term Plan Project process. Prior to COVID, the focus was on an inventory of existing conditions and aviation activity forecast. There was approximately an 18-month pause due to COVID, but since then the focus has been on two elements: facility requirements and preliminary alternatives analysis. Going forward, the study will move toward: the selection of a preferred alternative and phasing, high-level environmental review, public comments, MAC board approval, and eventually Met Council review. Mr. Gilles noted that the primary goal is to have the study wrapped up at the beginning of 2023. He then defined a term that would be used a lot during the presentation: PAL which is Planning Activity Level. PALs are used to consider when development should occur but does not authorize construction. It also helps the Long-Term Plan follow activity-based airport development instead of a specific year. Although, years are associated with each PAL to tie them into the forecast timeline as an estimate. For the purposes of this Long-Term Plan, PAL 2 is referring to approximately 2030 and PAL 3 refers to 2040 but will fluctuate based on actual demand.

Mr. Gilles gave an overview of the Facility Requirements. This included gate requirements and passenger connectivity Federal Inspection Services (FIS), airfield efficiency, long-term Remain Overnight (RON) aircraft parking needs, airfield design and standards, curbside and roadway congestion and long-term parking needs.

Loren Olson, City of Minneapolis, asked for a more descriptive definition of Annual Service Volume (ASV). Mr. Gilles explained that ASV is a theoretical throughput based on how many operations are going through the airport based on the runway configuration that MSP has. The potential delays could deter airlines from doing business at MSP.

Ms. Olson inquired more about the future private parking capabilities. Ms. Rief and Mr. Gilles each responded to the inquiry. There is no specific answer at this point in the planning process, as there are a number of unknown logistics such as moving airlines to a different terminal. Mr. Gilles also noted the number of parking requirements at each terminal is difficult to quantify at each facility without a preferred layout.

Bill Goins, Supply Chain Management, posed a question regarding Cargo. He brought up the cargo study that was recently done and the potential of increasing the cargo business at MSP. Mr. Gilles mentioned the alternatives will show potential cargo expansion opportunity areas on the airfield, and also offered to follow up with more information.

Dan O`Leary, Village of Sunfish Lake, made the comment the inbound roadway system around the airport is an existing issue. Mr. O`leary suggested MAC review the roadway system around the airport to help ease congestion. Mr. Gilles responded by stating we are limited in the plan to review what is on airport property. He also mentioned some of the congestion issues in front of the terminal with curbside drop-off, if alleviated, would help with inbound roadway congestion issues as well.

Eric Gilles continued after the break. He spoke about the draft alternatives. Alternative 1A consists of a single Federal Inspection Services (FIS) at Terminal 1 and maximizing preferential gating. Alternative 2A consists of a single FIS at Terminal 2 and an emphasis on common-use gating. Alternative 3A consists of two FIS facilities (Terminals 1 and 2), maximizing preferential gating which is how the airport operates today. Mr. Gilles then outlined each of the draft alternatives individually.

During the explanation of Alternative 1A, **Mr. O`Leary** inquired about the current United States Postal Service (USPS) building and the anticipated changes. Mr. Gilles responded the USPS footprint may need to be used for vehicle parking expansion, and could be an enabling project for future parking structure rehabilitation projects, but is not known yet if it will be needed.

Mr. Goins asked about the cargo expansion acreage and the potential of having larger cargo planes at MSP during Alternative 2A. Mr. Gilles responded the recent cargo facility study

showed modest growth in cargo activity, but the potential for cargo growth near Runway 17-35 as shown on the alternatives could accommodate approximately one large aircraft.

Kyle Schmaltz, Signature Flight Support, inquired about the alternatives being discussed in the event of moving their facility. He also mentioned Signature's preference to be located on the north field option near the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) facility.

Gary Berndt, Sun Country Airlines, asked if the sterile corridor option would be added to all three alternatives. Mr. Gilles responded by indicating that is being considered as a priority for the preferred alternative but has not been finalized yet.

Mr. Gilles responded to numerous questions regarding the FIS process at Terminal 2.

4) Panel Discussion

Dana Nelson, MAC Director of Stakeholder Engagement, reviewed the initial question posed to the panel, "What questions, concerns or ideas do you have about projected facility requirements or preliminary alternatives"? Ms. Nelson opened the floor to questions.

Mr. O'Leary congratulated the group for the thoughtful process in putting the long-term plan together. He mentioned the ongoing challenge with noise complaints in his community. He asked if there were any plans underway for the arrival and departure of passengers by inbound roadway.

Mr. Gilles and Ms. Rief both responded to the inquiry regarding the inbound roadway traffic challenges. Mr. Gilles also commented on the curbside linear footage. Ms. Rief mentioned the opportunity of expanding the curbside footage when the parking ramps are being deconstructed.

Mr. Berndt also commented on the constraints for passengers being dropped off and picked up at the airport, especially at Terminal 2.

Mr. Gilles responded to an inquiry from **Glen Markegard, City of Bloomington**, who asked more about the potential commercial development mentioned during the presentation off of 34th.

Ms. Olson built upon the conversation regarding accessing the airport by car. She offered that there are robust public transportation options including buses, light rail and bicycling. She acknowledged that there are safety concerns surrounding the light rail currently but wanted to emphasize the potential lowering of the carbon footprint at the airport and its neighboring areas.

Ms. Olson also inquired about the taxiway that was shown on one of the slides. She wanted to know how that would be used and if it would increase ground noise, especially if it were to be used as a queuing area.

Mr. Gilles explained the intention of the end around taxiway would decrease the number of taxiway crossings.

Mr. Gilles and Ms. Rief also responded to an inquiry from **Mr. O'Neill** regarding clarification on enhancing priority check-in.

5) Comments and Announcements

Mr. Gilles thanked everyone for their participation.

Ms. Nelson also mentioned that questions and feedback are encouraged.

Questions or Comments about the MSP Long-Term Plan can be sent:

MSPAirportLongTermPlan@mspmac.org

Respectfully Submitted,
Kalae Verdeja, Recording Secretary