



Building a Better World  
for All of Us®



## MEETING MINUTES

**RE:** DLH Master Plan Advisory Committee (MPAC)  
Meeting #2

**Date of Meeting:** December 18, 2019

**Project Manager:** Kaci Nowicki

**Time of Meeting:** 2:30 p.m.

**SEH No.:** 150733 16.00

**Location of Meeting:** Duluth International Airport,  
Amatuzio Room - 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

**Attendees:**

- Adam Fulton – City of Duluth
- Alissa Brown – Envoy Air
- Brian Hanson – APEX
- Daniel Rust - UW Superior
- David Ross – Duluth Area Chamber of Commerce
- Don Berre – MnDOT Office of Aeronautics (via phone)
- Don Monaco – Duluth International Airport Tenant Association (DIATA)
- Elissa Hanson – Northspan
- Hannah Alstead – US Senator Tina Smith (via phone)
- Jacob Martin - FAA Airport District Office (ADO) (via phone)
- Jana Kayser - Duluth Airport Authority
- Jason Serck – City of Superior
- Jayne Heim – City of Rice Lake
- Jenn Ryan – Hermantown Chamber of Commerce / Bremer Bank
- John Elortanta – Congressman Pete Stauber
- John Mulder – City of Hermantown
- Kaci Nowicki – SEH
- Kevin Carlson – MnDOT Office of Aeronautics (via phone)
- Kevin Cornick – Canosia Township / JAZB
- Marcel LaFond – Resident
- Mathew Stewart – SEH
- Matt Lebens – MnDOT Office of Aeronautics (via phone)
- Matt Sjoberg – State of Minnesota Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Board (IRRRB)
- Mike Wenholz – Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council (MIC)
- Ron Chicka – Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council (MIC)
- Scott Sannes – SEH
- Shawn McMahon – SEH
- Suzanne Herstad – City of Rice Lake
- Taylor Pederson – Superior-Douglas County Chamber of Commerce
- Tom Klevan – MnDOT Office of Aeronautics (via phone)
- Tom Werner - Duluth Airport Authority

The following is a summary of the discussion at the above referenced meeting:

- I. Welcome and introductions – Tom Werner welcomed the group and individual introductions were given.
- II. Master Plan progress update

1. Kaci gave an overview of the current master plan efforts. The majority of the efforts over the last six months have been in the 'investigation phase'. The project team has been gathering information and meeting with stakeholders to gather feedback and input. Efforts have also been focused on development of activity forecasts. The Master Plan process continues to finalize documentation of user and stakeholder needs and will be moving into identification of solutions and alternatives in the coming months.

III. Stakeholder and public outreach update (see **Slides 7-15**)

A. Project website

1. Kaci gave an overview of the project website and various items that stakeholders and the public could find. The Master Plan site has over 1,300 unique page views. The majority of the traffic comes directly to the site with the remaining traffic largely coming from referral sites (news, social media, etc.).

B. Public Open House summary

1. Kaci discussed the Open House that was held on September 17<sup>th</sup>. Approximately 25 people attended the open house. An overview of the Master Plan process and goals was given and stakeholders were able to provide feedback and input at various stations. The interactive boards that were available for feedback at the Open House were on display in the back of the room for MPAC Members to view.
2. **See Public Open House Summary Memo** provided in meeting packet for additional information.

IV. Master Plan Inventory Highlights

A. Airport infrastructure condition overview

B. Pavement condition (See **Slides 19-25**)

1. Shawn gave an overview of the airside pavement condition. Airside pavement condition is evaluated by MnDOT every 3 years.
2. Shawn gave an overview of the landside pavement condition. These pavements are not evaluated by MnDOT and were evaluated as part of the Master Plan inventory.

C. Building assessment (See **Slides 28-31**)

1. Kaci gave an overview of the building assessments being completed as part of the Master Plan process. Example summary results were given for the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) and Hangar 101. Tom added that Hangar 101 was condemned in the summer of 2019 and tentatively slated for demolition in the summer of 2020.
2. Tom discussed that there is a lot of work to do in the next 20 years. The airport inherited buildings from the USAF and were able to use them until the end of their useful life. Tom also discussed a future Economic Development TAC and opportunities with aging building infrastructure.
3. Jenn Ryan asked that if hangar 101 was coming down if there would be a need to rebuild that hangar.
  - a. Tom said that building is coming down and the area is best suited for aeronautical purposes. The property would be marketed for development once demolished.
4. Jenn also asked what type of funds would be used for a potential new ATCT.
  - a. Tom indicated that the exact funding sources are still unknown. However, he shared that it would likely include a bonding request. The Federal government may be able to participate in a portion however conversations with the FAA regional office will need to occur.

V. Aviation forecast / Air Service

A. Kaci gave an overview of the preliminary forecast. (see **Slides 32-43**).

1. Industry trends influence the forecasts – these include the phase-out of 50-seat jets.
2. Origin traffic comes from throughout the region. Origin locations are shown on **Slide 36**.

B. Leakage trends (see **Slide 37**).

1. Tom discussed how about 50% of passengers choose to fly out of DLH as opposed to MSP. In 2016 only 35% of travelers flew out of DLH and 65% chose to drive to MSP. Increases in air service and lower fares have made this possible. Choosing to fly local is what makes the increases in service and lower fares possible. Flying local makes a difference.
    - a. Taylor Pederson asked Tom Werner what the challenges to overcome with the “Fly Local” campaign were.
      - (1) Tom responded that reliability of service and number of options. Airline you choose and efficiency. Increase delta flights and united/American have 6 total flights to ORD. Discussed landline allows for another connection to the flight network if there is a delay or disruption out of Duluth. Leisure travel is always price
  - C. Top markets (for commercial passengers) to/from DLH
    1. Kaci gave an overview of top markets flown to/from DLH. (See **slide 38**)
      - a. Denver has grown in recent years.
    2. Tom shared that the top 20 markets figure would have been much different 10 or 20 years ago. Leisure destinations that used to be served by Allegiant were much bigger when that service was in place.
  - D. Preliminary air service forecasts
    1. Primary forecasts were developed and are considered conservative. DLH has seen recent high growth rates. The primary air service forecast assumes growth levels off or some airline growth continues but a network airline eliminates service from DLH.
    2. Preliminary air service forecast alternatives – The following alternative scenarios are included in the forecasts. While not the selected forecasts, the Master Plan will consider implications of each scenario.
      - a. Alternative 1 – United adds service to Denver
      - b. Alternative 2 – Sun Country adds seasonal service to Fort Meyers and Orlando
      - c. Alternative 3 – Combined United service to Denver and Sun Country routes
  - E. General Aviation forecasts
    1. Kaci gave an overview of where GA flights come from and go to. (See **Slides 41 and 42**).
      - a. Don Monaco discussed trends with General Aviation and why they stop at DLH. Changes in future fleet mix and fuel efficient aircraft may lead to longer aircraft ranges and may not need to stop in DLH for fuel. Don also discussed why aircraft stop at DLH, both GA and military.
    2. Kaci gave an overview of the general aviation forecasts
      - a. Based aircraft anticipated to increase from 68 in 2018 to 85 in 2038.
      - b. Operations (takeoffs or landings)
        - (1) Local operations expected to grow at a higher rate than itinerant. This is due to increasing activity from Lake Superior College and Cirrus Aircraft. Itinerant operations (to and from another airport) are expected to grow minimally.
  - F. Forecasts discussion
    1. Don asked if cargo forecasts will be prepared in the Master Plan. He also asked if it would consider the possibility of a FedEx sweep aircraft to operate at DLH. He also posed the question if facilities for air freight and general cargo processing should be considered when it comes to economic development.
      - a. Kaci said cargo activity will be documented and forecasted; however, not expecting a huge change in tonnage at this time.
  - G. **See Preliminary Activity Forecasts Summary Memo** is provided in meeting packet for additional information on the preliminary draft forecasts.
- VI. Break – 10 Minute Break
- VII. Runway 3/21 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) process update
- A. Overview of Runway 3/21
    1. Kaci gave an overview of how Runway 3/21 is currently being used.

- B. Meeting #1 takeaways – Kaci gave an overview of stakeholder feedback from Meeting #1. See **Slides 47-54**.
  - C. Meeting #2 takeaways (See **slides 55-59**)
    - 1. Kaci discussed the Runway 3/21 alternatives and the processes used to develop them.
      - a. The preliminary preferred alternatives developed so far in the process include:
        - (1) Alternative 2C – 8,000 feet and ½ mile approaches
        - (2) Alternative 2A – 8,000 feet and 1-mile approaches
      - b. These alternatives will be further refined and evaluated. This includes evaluation of noise impacts. The noise study will need to advance further before additional Runway 3/21 analysis will take place.
    - 2. Tom discussed how improving approaches may impact the viability of the proposed zoning ordinance as-is.
    - 3. Kaci discussed unknown impacts to environmental challenges north of Runway 3/21 (unpermitted dump area) that could influence cost of a Runway 3/21 extension.
    - 4. Brian Hanson asked if moving some aircraft to Runway 3/21 would decrease maintenance cost to runway 9/27.
      - a. Tom said it would be negligible.
    - 5. Suzzane Herstad asked who would be responsible for the cost of the clean-up with the unpermitted dump and if the unknowns could potentially lead to the extension not happening.
      - a. Kaci and Tom indicated that additional research is still needed regarding this topic; however, based on what we know today we believe impacts would be limited to increased costs.
  - D. **See Runway 3/21 TAC Progress Summary Memo** provided in meeting packet for additional information.
- VIII. Taxiway Network Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) process update (See **slides 60-70**)
- A. The first TAC meeting was held on December 3. The goals of the first meeting were to document how users use the system and what needs and challenges there are to solve.
  - B. Kaci gave an overview of the existing non-standard design aspects of the taxiway system and Hot Spot #1.
  - C. Meeting #1 takeaways
    - 1. Kaci gave examples of stakeholder feedback including areas of airfield parking constraints, taxiway geometry challenges, growth constraints, limited line-of-sight for the air traffic control tower and poor pavement conditions in some areas. Feedback received will be studied as part of the Master Plan. Minutes are still being finalized for the meeting and will be posted on the project website.
  - D. The next steps include documentation of the problems to solve and development of alternatives. Meeting #2 will evaluate these alternatives.
- IX. Part 150 Noise Study update (See **slides 71-78**)
- A. Kaci gave a brief overview of the Part 150 Noise Study which is a separate but concurrent project to the Master Plan.
  - B. Progress to date was summarized (see **slide 72**). This includes development of a project website, initial research, Public Advisory Committee Meeting #1 (Sept. 2019), Open House #1 (Oct. 2019), Noise Monitoring (November, 2019) and ongoing preparation of the Noise Exposure Map. Public Advisory Committee Meeting #2 is anticipated in February.
  - C. Stakeholders can get project information on the project website throughout the process, similar to the Master Plan.
- X. Next Steps
- A. MPAC Meeting #3 – This is currently scheduled for March 28. However, this falls during Duluth and St. Louis County Days in St. Paul. This meeting will be either rescheduled or cancelled. A notice will be sent to the group in January.

This was an in-person meeting. A call-in number and GoTo meeting were set up for persons not able to attend.

*SEH believes that this document accurately reflects the business transacted during the meeting. If any attendee believes that there are any inconsistencies, omissions or errors in the minutes, they should notify the writer at once. Unless objections are raised within seven (7) days, we will consider this account accurate and acceptable to all.*

**If there are errors contained in this document, or if relevant information has been omitted, please contact Kaci Nowicki at (651) 490-2085.**

c: file

s:\ae\d\dulai\150733\1-gen\16-meet\master plan advisory committee mpac\meeting 2 - december 18, 2019\mpac meeting #2 minutes.docx