MEETING SUMMARY

RE: Taxiway and Apron Network
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Date of Meeting: March 9, 2020

Project Manager: Kaci Nowicki

Time of Meeting: 10:00 a.m.

Location of Meeting: Duluth International Airport, Amatuzio Room

SEH No.: 150733 16.00

Attendees:

Tom Werner – DAA
Mark Papko – DAA
Steve Wabrowetz - DAA
Kaci Nowicki - SEH
Shawn McMahon - SEH
Matt Stewart - SEH
Chad Ronchetti – City of Duluth
Scott Rautio - ATCT
Scott Poldoski – Monaco Air
Loren Kahly – DGS
Dan Lysher – 148th ANG

Chris Blumquist – 148th ANG
Ryan Kaspari – 148th ANG
Jeff Solberg – 148th ANG
Eric Monson – Lake Superior Helicopter
Bill King – Cirrus & DIATA
Gina Mitchell - FAA
Jake Martin – FAA (Phone)
Don Berry – MnDOT (Phone)
Matt Labens – MnDOT (Phone)
Kevin Carlson – MnDOT (Phone)

Invited, not in attendance:
Citizens Committee of Environmental Concern

The following is a summary of items discussed at the above referenced meeting. A full transcript of the meeting is also kept in the project records. A copy of the meeting presentation slides, as well as all handouts, are attached to these minutes and posted on the project website here.

I. Meeting #1 Summary (See slides 5-10)
   A. Kaci Nowicki gave a summary of the December Taxiway TAC meeting and recapped taxiway design standards and existing DLH Taxiway Network non-standard design features.
   B. Initial stakeholder feedback (See Figure 2 attached)
      1. Initial user feedback from TAC Meeting #1 in December of 2019 was discussed. Below is additional feedback received in Meeting #2, which has been added to Figure 2, Stakeholder Feedback (attached).
         a. ATCT discussed pilots taxiing past A5 without a clearance. This continues to be a challenge.
         b. ARFF (148th) stated that a more direct access route to the runways would add value. 90-degree turns can create a hazard for ARFF vehicles that are top-heavy and have the potential to flip over.
         c. 148th mentioned that the arm/dearm pad would need to remain on the Runway 9 end and discussed challenges if the pad was removed.
         d. A discussion was had on the location of a compass calibration pad. South of Runway 9/27 was preferred by the stakeholder group.
II. **ADG vs TDG and UFC Requirements (See slides 11-23)**
   A. Kaci Nowicki gave a high-level overview of how airports are designed including the differences between Airplane Design Group (ADG), Taxiway Design Group (TDG) and military airfield design standards. Previous 5-year operations included TDG 4 aircraft. **Figure 5 attached** shows the different requirements or recommendations for different TDG and UFC groupings.
   1. Loren with DGS mentioned that Delta 717 service was starting in mid-March. The 717 that Delta flies is a TDG 2 aircraft.
   B. Shawn McMahon discussed how pavement strength is developed and the life of different types of pavement.

III. **Existing taxi routes and large aircraft taxi routes (See slides 24-30)**
   A. The group reviewed TAC Meeting #1 feedback on where aircraft go and how the pavement is currently designed (**See Figure 4 attached**). In general, stakeholders prefer shoulders on taxiways. The 148th noted that the presence of shoulders helps to reduce FOD. It was also indicated that concrete pavement is preferred over asphalt.

IV. **Taxiway A Network Alternatives (See slides 32-36 and Figure 5)**
   A. Initial, high-level Taxiway A alternatives were presented to the group.
   B. Gina Mitchell (FAA ADO) discussed the possible change in the FAA Design Advisory Circular (draft guidance is in development) which includes the use of non-parallel taxiways to mitigate wrong surface landings by pilots.
   C. Feedback from the group is listed below.
   1. Tom Werner indicated that DAA acknowledges that at least two midfield ramp connectors are needed.
   2. Bill King indicated that having a full-length straight parallel taxiway may add value and preserve more space for development.
      a. 148th indicated that a straight parallel taxiway could be used in an emergency.
   3. Multiple stakeholders indicated that a taxiway connector to the east of Taxiway A2 (potentially could be a relocated A2) in-between the delineated wetlands would be preferred.
   4. Discussions were had about the location and design of the arm/de-arm pad as well as a hold bay on the Runway 9 end. The existing arm/de-arm pad at Taxiway A1 is not designed to current standards. The 148th indicated that if a holding bay was added with paved shoulders and islands they could utilize it for an arm/de-arm pad. The 148th noted that any islands within the hold bay would need to be paved to meet their operational needs.

V. **Taxiway C Network Alternatives (See slides 38-40 and Figure 6)**
   A. Initial high-level Taxiway C alternatives were presented to the group.

VI. **Taxiway D and Taxiway F (See slides 41-42 and Figure 7)**
   A. Extending Taxiway D full length on the east side of Runway 3/21 was discussed. It was noted that runway crossings would increase and could be a safety concern.
   B. The 148th stated that they could evaluate impacts to their apron area if this were pursued. They did not have initial concerns with civilian aircraft taxiing near their apron.

VII. **Next steps**
   A. Refined alternatives will be developed and feedback from this meeting will be incorporated into these alternatives. Apron alternatives will also begin.

*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 knowicki@sehinc.com.
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