

Public Comments

This section includes the official comments that were received during the public hearing and comment period for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for the Duluth International Airport. One (1) comment (Comment 1) was given during the oral testimony portion of the Public Hearing. Two (2) comments were submitted via U.S. mail service during the public comment period (Comment 2 & 3). These comments and responses to these comments are provided in the following pages.

Oral testimony given during public hearing:

Comment 1

Suzanne Herstad
Rice Lake City Council
4261 Miller Rd
Rice Lake, Minnesota

So my question is, or what I need more clarification on is the land use mitigation preventative strategies. And I see that is at the discretion of each municipality to implement. How does that look – how much power do we have to be able to still develop along the corridors and the areas?

And what kind of things would you be looking at limiting? Is it single family housing? Business? How does that look?

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
1	Suzanne Herstad	<p>So my question is, or what I need more clarification on is the land use mitigation preventative strategies. And I see that is at the discretion of each municipality to implement. How does that look – how much power do we have to be able to still develop along the corridors and the areas?</p> <p>And what kind of things would you be looking at limiting? Is it single family housing? Business? How does that look?</p>	<p>The Duluth Airport Authority in itself has no controlling authority over land use and/or zoning and development policies in the surrounding communities. Each municipality would determine how best to incorporate the preventative land use mitigation recommended measures into future planning policies and ordinances. Ideally these preventative land use controls would be incorporated into future Joint Airport Zoning Board (JAZB) ordinances as it pertains to overlay districts and the safety of the communities surrounding the Airport.</p> <p>Information regarding the types of preventative land use policies and techniques that could be adopted by each municipality to limit the potential development of incompatible land uses (residential, schools, hospitals, churches, nursing homes) within determined boundaries (Airport Land Use Management District) are contained in Chapter 4 and Appendix F. This information will be sent to each municipality surrounding the Airport following the acceptance of the Noise Compatibility Program by the FAA.</p>
2	Jackie Carlson	<p>Once recommendations are sent to FAA to decide, what happens if they don't approve the recommendations or just part of them?</p>	<p>In the instance the FAA does not approve the program and/or certain measures of the program, the project staff will work with the FAA in order to determine what modifications would need to be made before FAA approval is granted.</p>

<p>3</p>	<p>Dwight Morrison on behalf of Citizens Committee for Environmental Concerns (CCEC)</p>	<p><i>(Summarized)</i> Why are there no new noise abatement recommendations?</p>	<p>In order to evaluate each alternative, a set of evaluation criteria was established and used to identify the benefits and drawbacks of each alternative. The criteria include feasibility, safety, operational considerations, and noise reduction. After it was determined that an alternative was feasible, safe, and had no major operational drawbacks, an assessment of the benefits in terms of noise and land use compatibility was conducted. Because a decrease in one area may result in an increase in another area, priorities were developed to clarify the evaluation process. The noise impact priorities were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Reductions in the 65+ Day-Night Average Noise Level (DNL) noise contours (most important)▪ Sensitivity to shifting noise from one area to another (important)▪ Ensuring that the tradeoffs of increased versus decreased noise are understood before making a decision▪ Recognizing that an alternative may have a net reduction in noise impacts, but may be eliminated because those impacts are a result of decreases in one area with a similar level of increases in another <p>Within the aforementioned context, a two-step evaluation method was conducted for potential new abatement alternatives. First, a qualitative screening analysis was conducted on the full range of potential new abatement alternatives for DLH to determine whether or not they were feasible, and safe, and whether or not they would cause operational impacts. Secondly, those alternatives that were determined to be feasible were then subjected to a quantitative analysis, including, where applicable, an analysis of the benefits or drawbacks and potential implementation costs.</p> <p>Each noise abatement alternative and the qualitative screening was reviewed with the membership of the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC). The results of the noise abatement qualitative screening was presented at the 3rd public workshop which was conducted in February of 2021. A summary of this screening analysis is provided in Appendix E.</p>
----------	--	--	--