

# Appendix M: 2007 Preliminary System Airport Assessments



## Regional System Airports

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

System Evaluation Criteria	Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2007	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	U	S ?	Pk. Hr. Issues, Rolling Hub, end around		
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	Existing Gates, sizing & user issues		
Ground accessibility	Q	Q	Parking Capacity, I-494/34 <sup>th</sup> Avenue So.		
Environmental compatibility	Q	Q	Insl. Program \$, Glycol		
Infrastructure and Utilities	S	S			
Safety	Q	Q	New ATCT, Radar shadowing		
Air service	Q	Q	# & Type aircraft and service providers		
Economic impact	S	Q	DL/NWA Merger, U.S. economy		
Fiscal	S	Q	DL acquisition, PFCs, Debt		
S – Satisfactory    Q – Questionable    U – Unsatisfactory    ? – Unknown					

**Status in 2000** – Many of the problems identified in 1990 were examined in preparation of the MSP 1996 [for 2010] Long Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP). In 1996 the Minnesota Legislature accepted Council and MAC dual-track recommendations to provide major airport capacity by expansion at the existing MSP site. Additional detailed evaluations of the MSP LTCP were conducted in preparation of the Plan’s Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Various mitigation efforts and capital improvement projects were initiated throughout the 1990s, and several problem areas have been improved; others are still in process. Generally, overall progress is being made in each category. It is assumed that the improvements will be adequate through 2010. The FAA has 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 in 2001.

**Status in 2007** – 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 was 17/35 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 will extend home insulation out to the DNL 60 noise contour and take until 2014 to complete.



A 2015 Terminal Expansion EA was prepared to initiate a first phase of gate expansion but has been put on hold due to industry economic conditions. As part of the 2015 assessment 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, has decided to merge with Delta Airlines by 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 into 2009. Parking facilities are continuing to be 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, Champion Air charter operator has gone out of business, and Sun Country is requesting aid from the state. Aircraft maintenance work is increasingly outsourced and NWA/Delta merged headquarters will be located in Atlanta. The MAC has initiated forecasting work for an update of the MSP development plan to a 2020 planning horizon.

### Intermediate Airport - St. Paul Downtown Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	St. Paul Downtown Airport (Primary 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			
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	Storage consolidation, and limits		
Ground accessibility	S	S			
Environmental compatibility	S	S			
Infrastructure and Utilities	U	S	Implementation of flood protection		
Safety	S	S			
Air service	Q	Q	No longer Part 139 certified		
Economic impact	S	S ?	Activity decline		
Fiscal	S	Q	reliever funding		
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-services in the 1990s of improvements to 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 has been put on hold by the MAC until FAA concerns with runway safety, and MAC continuing concerns with flood protection, are addressed.

**Status in 2007-** 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.

A major change in MAC reliever airport funding has been put in place to make the reliever airport system as self-sufficient as possible. Activity levels have declined from historical highs and runway use is less than 50% of runway capacity. The MAC has started an update of the LTCP to a 2025 or 2030 planning horizon. It is anticipated that the update will be completed by the end of 2008. Zoning of the airport to meet state requirements is underway; approval of a zoning ordinance may occur in 2009.

### Minor Airport - Airlake Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Airlake Airport (Reliever)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2007	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	Q	S ?	Utility without crosswind?		
Landside – capacity vs. demand	S	Q	Hangar needs & Pvt. Funding		
Ground accessibility	S	S			
Environmental compatibility	Q	S ?	Land use & jurisdiction		
Infrastructure and Utilities	U	Q	Sewer and water service		
Safety	S	S ?	Increasing development, JZB		
Air service	S	S			
Economic impact	Q	S	Declining activity		
Fiscal	S	Q	reliever funding		
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 2007-** The airport airside development has been focused upon acquisition of private in-holdings 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 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 runway capacity. In 2007 the MAC adopted an airport 2025 LTCP update that recommended that the crosswind runway proposal be dropped from the plan, 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 2007	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	Q	S			
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	S			
Ground accessibility	Q	S			
Environmental compatibility	Q	S			
Infrastructure and Utilities	Q	S			
Safety	Q	S ?	JZB, ordinance		
Air service	Q	Q	Dev. Of NW building area and services		
Economic impact	S	Q	Declining activity		
Fiscal	S	Q	Reliever funding		
S – Satisfactory    Q – Questionable    U – Unsatisfactory    ? – Unknown					

**Status in 2000 –** In May 2000 a settlement agreement 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 ratings is expected to occur between 2003 – 2007 as projects are completed.

**Status in 2007** – 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’ has 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. Capital funding is a continuing issue and remaining 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. A update to the airport LTCP to a 2025 or 2030 planning horizon will have been started with completion by end of the year. Airport zoning will need to be revised to reflect the LTCP.

### Minor Airport - Crystal Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Crystal 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			
Landside – capacity vs. demand	U	Q	Hangar expansion		
Ground accessibility	S	Q	Hwy 81 development		
Environmental compatibility	Q	S			
Infrastructure and Utilities	Q	S			
Safety	S	Q	JZB and ordinance.		
Air service	Q	Q-S	FBO and services		
Economic impact	S	S?	Declining activity		
Fiscal	S	Q?	Reliever funding		
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 Com-

mittee 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 1990, 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 2007-** 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 2007 the MAC prepared a draft 2025 LTCP update. The plan is to eliminate the turf cross-wind runway and one of the parallel main-wind runways. 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. Capital funding is a continuing issue and areas of the airport have been identified as non-aviation use areas for supplemental revenue generation. 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; there are no redevelopment plans by adjacent communities or the airport. Airport zoning will need to be revised to meet state standards. Adjacent communities have approved of the runway reductions and still want the airport to be closed.

## Minor Airport - Flying Cloud Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Flying Cloud Airport (Reliever)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2007	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	Capabilities for design aircraft		
Landside – capacity vs. demand	U	Q	Hangar needs and Pvt. Funding		
Ground accessibility	Q	S			
Environmental compatibility	Q	S			
Infrastructure and Utilities	U	Q	Sewer and water service		
Safety	Q	S ?	JZB, ordinance		
Air service	U	Q	Runway length		
Economic impact	S	Q	Declining activity		
Fiscal	S	S ?	Reliever funding		
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 are not changed, although land acquisition for the new building area indicates improvement. Ground access has been 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 study. Fiscal is improved with MAC adoption of new rates-and-charges for their general aviation airports.

**Status in 2007**- A FEIS and federal record of decision (ROD) has been recently 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 to the north hangar area is occurring in mid 2008. 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. The approved LTCP includes extension of the parallel main-wind runways, and a new south-west hangar building area. The north parallel is being extended to 3,900' in 2008 and the south parallel to 5,000' in 2009. An update of the LTCP to a 2025 or 2030 planning horizon is expected to be completed by end of 2008. Airport zoning will need to be revised to reflect the new runway extensions and LTCP update proposal. Capital funding is a continuing issue and areas of the airport have been identified as non-aviation use areas for supplemental revenue generation. Activity levels and based aircraft numbers have declined from historical highs

and runway use is less than 50% of capacity. Adjacent airports have not improved their capabilities and a private use 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			
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	Hangar needs and Pvt. funding		
Ground accessibility	S	S			
Environmental compatibility	S	S?	Noise and land use		
Infrastructure and Utilities	U	Q	Sewer and water service		
Safety	S	S?	JZB and ordinance		
Air service	S	S?	Runway length		
Economic impact	S	Q?	Declining activity		
Fiscal	S	S-Q?	Reliever funding		
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. A monitoring and mitigation agreement between the MAC and MPCA has been implemented concerning groundwater contamination in the airport area. Economic impact was identified in the 1990 Regional Economic Impact Study. Fiscal status improved with MAC adoption of new rates and charges for their general aviation airports.

**Status in 2007**- No major airside improvements implementing the approved 1992 LTCP has occurred. An EA was prepared for a potential new south-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. 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 finished 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 hangar area. Airport zoning will need to be revised to reflect the LTCP proposal. Capital funding is a continuing issue and areas of the airport have been identified 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 2007	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	S	S			
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	S			
Ground accessibility	Q	S			
Environmental compatibility	?	?	Noise contours dated		
Infrastructure and Utilities	Q	S			
Safety	Q	?	RPZ relocation, land acquisition		
Air service	S	S			
Economic impact	S	S			
Fiscal	U	?	Local funding		
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 1976 master plan for future building area improvements, substantially affected long-term growth options. Continued development of 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, issue with 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 2007** – 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.

### Special Purpose Airport - Forest Lake Airport

System Evaluation Criteria	Forest Lake Airport (Municipal)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2007	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	Condition and utility of runway		
Landside – capacity vs. demand	Q	Q	Relocated building area		
Ground accessibility	Q	Q	Relocated access rd.		
Environmental compatibility	Q	S ?	Noise inf. lacking		
Infrastructure and Utilities	Q	S			
Safety	Q	S			
Air service	Q	Q	Design aircraft needs		
Economic impact	?	Q	Plan is lacking		
Fiscal	Q	Q	Local funding		
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 2007** – 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 anticipated for 2008 with eventual extension to 3,300’ when power line obstruction is removed. Future CIP projects are uncertain with state aviation trust funds

used to reduce state debt in 2007/08 legislative session. Not requesting a GPS approach. Spillover effect of rate increases at MAC airports is a potential growth factor.

### Special Purpose Airport - Surfside Seaplane Base

System Evaluation Criteria	Surfside Seaplane Base (Private - Lino Lakes)				
	Status in 2000	Status in 2007	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	?	S?	Water levels		
Landside – capacity vs. demand	S	S?	Storage capabilities		
Ground accessibility	S	S			
Environmental compatibility	?	S			
Infrastructure and Utilities	S	S			
Safety	?	S?	RPZ areas		
Air service	?	S			
Economic impact	?	S?	Economic eval.?		
Fiscal	?	U?	Private funding		
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 2007**- Preliminary ratings for 2007 may change when the 2008 Lino Lakes CPU is submitted for Council review. Some reduction in activity reflects current trends in G.A. Projections of G.A. fixed-wing aircraft growth was included as part of the Sport Aviation Study, a separate seaplane assessment was not prepared. 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 is expected to increase. Future activity is unknown due primarily to private ownership and that most “based” aircraft are straight- float and not amphibian 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 2007	2015 Forecast vs. LTCP	2020 Forecast vs. LTCP	2030 Forecast vs. LTCP
Airside – capacity vs. demand	?	S ?	Runway length		
Landside – capacity vs. demand	?	S ?	Hangar Size changes		
Ground accessibility	S	S			
Environmental compatibility	?	?			
Infrastructure and Utilities	?	?			
Safety	U	?			
Air service	?	S			
Economic impact	?	?			
Fiscal	?	?			
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 got 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-proposed change to the MSP International Airport Class-B airspace, which could have a dramatic effect upon sailplane operations. Benson Airport is home to the Red Wing Soaring Association and the proposed airspace change could become a serious cost issue, forcing them to relocate, having a direct impact on 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 2007** – The Red Wing Soaring Association has moved to Osceola, WI and air traffic activity is down as a result. Some new conventional hangars are being proposed 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 of 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 2030 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 system airports. It is possible that some 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 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.**