

7

Development Program



RST

MASTER PLAN

ROCHESTER

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT | **MN**

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

7.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter identifies the Airport’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) recommendations from the Airport Master Plan for a 20-year planning horizon (2020 to 2040) at the Rochester International Airport (“the Airport” or “RST”). The CIP is a strategic year-by-year project development schedule for the continued maintenance, upgrade, and expansion of Airport capital facilities and equipment. The Master Plan CIP was developed in accordance with federal and state aviation grant programs and structured with respect to the Airport’s financial capabilities.

The CIP provides a list of the projects identified in the Master Plan and the associated cost estimates. This information serves as a critical planning tool for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in establishing priorities and budgeting expenditures at RST when compared with the needs of other airports. From the local sponsor’s perspective, the CIP identifies improvement needs and allows budgeting/financial decisions to be made with a comprehensive understanding of financial implications.

This chapter introduces the Development Program/CIP and project cost estimates in 2020 dollars, while the next chapter (**Chapter 8 – Financial Implementation Analysis**) provides a detailed financial analysis and accounts for escalation.

Environmental and physical features near an airport can pose constraints on development options. Because of this, this chapter also includes an environmental overview. Known or readily visible environmental resource categories are assessed in conformance with FAA Order 1050.1F *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, and applicable federal, state, and local regulations to present a summary of potentially sensitive features and identify environmental issues that should be considered during future development at RST. The CIP project list and environmental considerations identified in this chapter reflect what was current as of the initial development of this chapter in 2020-2021.

7.2 APPROACH

Project Phasing

The Master Plan CIP projects are envisioned by the Airport to facilitate an orderly sequence of improvements. Projects are prioritized to address:

- ✓ Airport safety, efficiency, and standards
- ✓ Facility conditions and deficiencies
- ✓ Upgrades and expansions needed to meet user demand and level of service
- ✓ Air service initiatives

Project Costs

Project costs have been developed for each Airport CIP designated project. Costs are planning-level estimates derived from quantity and unit-cost opinions and reflect 2020-dollar amounts. Runway 2/20 projects have been adjusted for inflation, which was a requirement to receive State bond funding. The remainder of the CIP projects, while not adjusted for inflation, include contingencies to account for typical administrative, design, and construction fees, which is normally 10 to 15 percent of the total project cost.

Funding Participation and Commitment

The Airport CIP is a planning recommendation and does not obligate local Airport funds nor does it represent a commitment of federal or state funding participation. In addition, Airport projects may require further federal and state programming coordination to satisfy project justification and environmental clearances, prior to receiving funding commitments or implementing project developments.

7.3 AIRPORT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The Airport Master Plan CIP includes project recommendations and preferred site development alternatives envisioned by the Airport as documented on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). This includes projects meant to:

- ✓ Satisfy projected forecast and user demands
- ✓ Upgrade Airport facilities and equipment to attain an appropriate level of service
- ✓ Protect the Airport land use and property interests to the greatest planning extent possible

Master Plan 20-Year Capital Improvement Plan (2020 to 2040)

The 20-year CIP, shown in **Table 7-1**, is a development program that captures the projects being considered for local Airport programming, budgeting, and funding purposes. The 20-year CIP is used by FAA to identify, prioritize, and assign federal airport funds and includes FAA non-eligible projects and other non-capital projects. The 20-year Master Plan CIP includes 81 projects totaling \$244.2 million in 2020 dollars. This Airport Master Plan CIP is predominately a plan for capital facilities and is not intended to capture all the Airport's routine operating and preventative maintenance projects.

TABLE 7-1: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
ROCHESTER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 - 2040, STATE FY2022 - 2041, FEDERAL FY2021 - 2040

1/18/2021

Fiscal Year			No.	Description	Funding Share			Project Cost	Eligible Funding Amounts				
FED (Oct-Sep)	State (Jul-Jun)	CITY (Jan-Dec)			Federal	State	Local/Other		FAA-Entitlement	FAA-Discretionary	MNDOT - Aeronautics	Local	Other
2020	2021	2020	ST-1	Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 1 of 6: Middle 3.750' (Includes CA)	100			\$ 8,103,970	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 6,703,970			
2020		2020	ST-3	Runway 2/20 Planning Study	100			\$ 548,631	\$ 548,631	\$ 450,000			
2020		2020	ST-4	Environmental Assessment for Runway 2/20	100			\$ 534,463	\$ 534,463				
2020		2020	ST-5	Mobile Foam Test Cart	90		10	\$ 48,000		\$ 43,200		\$ 4,800	
		2020	ST-6	Passenger Terminal Carpet			100	\$ 200,000				\$ 200,000	
2021	2022	2021	ST-14D	Design for Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 2 of 6 (Road Relocation & Twy B to 400')	90	8.2	1.8	\$ 1,000,000		\$ 900,000	\$ 82,000	\$ 18,000	
2021	2022	2021	ST-2	Design for Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 3 of 6 (Pipeline Relocation)	90	8.2	1.8	\$ 1,250,000		\$ 1,125,000	\$ 102,500	\$ 22,500	
2021	2022	2021	ST-14C	Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 2 of 6 (Includes CA, Road Relocation & Twy B to 400')	90	8.2	1.8	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 5,800,000	\$ 656,000	\$ 144,000	
2021	2022	2021	ST-35	Land Acquisition (RWY 2 RPZ, Approx. 40 acres)	90	8.2	1.8	\$ 940,000		\$ 846,000	\$ 77,080	\$ 16,920	
	2022	2021	ST-9	Airfield maintenance trucks and skid loader with attachments		70	30	\$ 295,000			\$ 206,500	\$ 88,500	
	2022	2021	ST-10	Critical Fuel Farm Upgrades - Pump Replacement, phase converter, code compliance and dispensers		70	30	\$ 325,000			\$ 227,500	\$ 97,500	
		2021	ST-13	Terminal Emergency Generator			100	\$ 1,000,000				\$ 1,000,000	
		2021	ST-16D	Design for CAT II Approach Lighting System - Phase 2 of 2			100	\$ 250,000				\$ 250,000	

Color-coding is used to easily distinguish one fiscal year from the next

TABLE 7-1: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
ROCHESTER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 - 2040, STATE FY2022 - 2041, FEDERAL FY2021 - 2040

1/18/2021

Fiscal Year			Funding Share					Eligible Funding Amounts					
FED (Oct-Sep)	State (Jul-Jun)	CITY (Jan-Dec)	No.	Description	Federal	State	Local/ Other	Project Cost	FAA- Entitlement	FAA- Discretionary	MNDOT - Aeronautics	Local	Other
2022	2023	2022	ST-8	Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 3 of 6 (Includes CA, Pipeline Relocation)	80.9	17.6	1.5	\$ 11,800,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 8,546,200	\$ 2,076,800	\$ 177,000	
2022	2023	2022	ST-18D	Design for Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 4 of 6 (South 2,100' Rwy 2 & Twy B)	80.9	17.6	1.5	\$ 1,350,000		\$ 1,092,150	\$ 237,600	\$ 20,250	
	2023	2022	ST-11	Re-roof Terminal Building Concourses and Main Hold Room		70	30	\$ 300,000			\$ 210,000	\$ 90,000	
		2022	ST-16C	Construction of CAT II Approach Lighting System - Phase 2 of 2			100	\$ 3,750,000				\$ 3,750,000	
		2022	ST-7 & ST-12	Passenger Terminal Elevator Overhaul			100	\$ 280,000				\$ 280,000	
2023	2024	2023	ST-18C	Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 4 of 6 (Includes CA, South 2,100' Rwy 2 & Twy B)	80	18.5	1.5	\$ 12,100,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 8,280,000	\$ 2,238,500	\$ 181,500	
2023	2024	2023	ST-25D	Design for Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 5 of 6 (Extend Rwy 2 and Twy by 1,647')	80	18.5	1.5	\$ 1,700,000		\$ 1,360,000	\$ 314,500	\$ 25,500	
2024	2025	2024	ST-25C	Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 5 of 6 (Includes CA, Extend Rwy 2 and Twy by 1,647')	71.3	27.5	1.2	\$ 15,300,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 9,508,900	\$ 4,207,500	\$ 183,600	
2024	2025	2024	MT-16D	Design for Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 6 of 6 (Rwy-Rwy Intersection)	71.3	27.5	1.2	\$ 1,300,000		\$ 926,900	\$ 357,500	\$ 15,600	
	2025	2024	ST-24	Parking Lot Reconstruction/Upgrades - Design, Phase 1 of 3		50	50	\$ 135,000			\$ 67,500	\$ 67,500	
	2025	2024	ST-31	SRE Equipment - Blower		70	30	\$ 1,000,000			\$ 700,000	\$ 300,000	
		2024	ST-34	Hangar Design & Construction (20,000 SF)			100	\$ 9,000,000				\$ 9,000,000	

Color-coding is used to easily distinguish one fiscal year from the next

TABLE 7-1: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
ROCHESTER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 - 2040, STATE FY2022 - 2041, FEDERAL FY2021 - 2040

1/18/2021

Fiscal Year			Funding Share					Eligible Funding Amounts					
FED (Oct-Sep)	State (Jul-Jun)	CITY (Jan-Dec)	No.	Description	Federal	State	Local/ Other	Project Cost	FAA- Entitlement	FAA- Discretionary	MNDOT - Aeronautics	Local	Other
2025	2026	2025	MT-16C	Runway 2/20 Reconstruction, Phase 6 of 6 (Includes CA, Rwy-Rwy Intersection)	90	8.4	1.6	\$ 12,300,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 9,670,000	\$ 1,033,200	\$ 196,800	
	2026	2025	ST-33	Parking Lot Reconstruction/Upgrades - Construction, Phase 1 of 3		50	50	\$ 1,350,000			\$ 675,000	\$ 675,000	
	2026	2025	MT-15D	Parking Lot Reconstruction/Upgrades - Design, Phase 2 of 3		50	50	\$ 135,000			\$ 67,500	\$ 67,500	
	2027	2026	MT-15C	Parking Lot Reconstruction/Upgrades - Construction, Phase 2 of 3		50	50	\$ 1,350,000			\$ 675,000	\$ 675,000	
	2027	2026	MT-17D	Parking Lot Reconstruction/Upgrades - Design, Phase 3 of 3		50	50	\$ 135,000			\$ 67,500	\$ 67,500	
	2028	2027	MT-17C	Parking Lot Reconstruction/Upgrades - Construction, Phase 3 of 3		50	50	\$ 1,350,000			\$ 675,000	\$ 675,000	
	2028	2027	MT-18D	Terminal Entrance Road & Loop Drive Microseal - Design		50	50	\$ 50,000			\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	
		2027	ST-17	Exit Lane Technology			100	\$ 200,000				\$ 200,000	
2028		2028	MT-7	Maintenance Building/SRE Pavement Crack/Joint Sealing & GA Apron Rehab/Expansion, Phase 1 - Design	90		10	\$ 225,000	\$ 202,500			\$ 22,500	
2028		2028	ST-22D	SRE Building Improvement Design	90		10	\$ 250,000	\$ 225,000			\$ 25,000	
2028		2028	MT-10	Master Plan & ALP Update	90		10	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 900,000			\$ 100,000	
2028		2028	ST-21	SRE Multi-function Vehicle	90		10	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 900,000			\$ 100,000	
2028		2028	ST-27	North GA Development, Phase 1 - Design	90		10	\$ 200,000	\$ 180,000			\$ 20,000	
	2029	2028	MT-18C	Terminal Entrance Road & Loop Drive Microseal - Construction		50	50	\$ 400,000			\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	

Color-coding is used to easily distinguish one fiscal year from the next

TABLE 7-1: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
ROCHESTER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 - 2040, STATE FY2022 - 2041, FEDERAL FY2021 - 2040

1/18/2021

Fiscal Year				Funding Share				Eligible Funding Amounts					
FED (Oct-Sep)	State (Jul-Jun)	CITY (Jan-Dec)	No.	Description	Federal	State	Local/ Other	Project Cost	FAA- Entitlement	FAA- Discretionary	MNDOT - Aeronautics	Local	Other
2029		2029	MT-8 & MT-9	Maintenance Building/SRE Pavement Crack/Joint Sealing & GA Apron Rehab/Expansion, Phase 1 - Construction	90		10	\$ 2,325,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 1,875,000		\$ 232,500	
2029		2029	ST-20	ARFF Vehicle	90		10	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 900,000			\$ 100,000	
2029		2029	ST-22C	SRE Building Improvements - Construction	90		10	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 2,200,000		\$ 250,000	
2029		2029	MT-3	North GA Development, Phase 1 - Construction	90		10	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 210,000		\$ 180,000	
2029		2029	MT-14	GA Apron Rehabilitation - Design	90		10	\$ 50,000	\$ 45,000			\$ 5,000	
	2030	2029	ST-23	GA Access Road Rehab - Design (Mill & Overlay)		70	30	\$ 40,000			\$ 28,000	\$ 12,000	
2030		2030	MT-2D	Design for Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 1 of 5	90		10	\$ 900,000	\$ 810,000			\$ 90,000	
2030		2030	MT-2C	Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 1 of 5 (Includes CA)	90		10	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 6,700,000		\$ 900,000	
2030		2030	LT-24D	Design for Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 2 of 5	90		10	\$ 900,000	\$ 810,000			\$ 90,000	
2030		2030	LT-2	ARFF Vehicle	90		10	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 900,000			\$ 100,000	
2030		2030	LT-4	GA Apron Rehabilitation - Construction	90		10	\$ 500,000	\$ 450,000			\$ 50,000	
	2031	2030	LT-5	GA Access Road Rehab - Construction (Mill & Overlay)		70	30	\$ 250,000			\$ 175,000	\$ 75,000	
	2031	2030	LT-6	Parking Lot & Entrance Road Rehabilitation - Design		70	30	\$ 50,000			\$ 35,000	\$ 15,000	
2031		2031	LT-24C	Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 2 of 5 (Includes CA)	90		10	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 6,700,000		\$ 900,000	
2031		2031	LT-25D	Design for Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 3 of 5	90		10	\$ 900,000	\$ 810,000			\$ 90,000	
2031		2031	LT-8	SRE Multi-function Vehicle	90		10	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 900,000			\$ 100,000	
	2032	2031	LT-10	Parking Lot & Entrance Road Rehabilitation - Construction		70	30	\$ 500,000			\$ 350,000	\$ 150,000	

Color-coding is used to easily distinguish one fiscal year from the next

TABLE 7-1: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
ROCHESTER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 - 2040, STATE FY2022 - 2041, FEDERAL FY2021 - 2040

1/18/2021

Fiscal Year				Funding Share				Eligible Funding Amounts					
FED (Oct-Sep)	State (Jul-Jun)	CITY (Jan-Dec)	No.	Description	Federal	State	Local/ Other	Project Cost	FAA- Entitlement	FAA- Discretionary	MNDOT - Aeronautics	Local	Other
2032		2032	LT-25C	Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 3 of 5 (Includes CA)	90		10	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 6,700,000		\$ 900,000	
2032		2032	LT-26D	Design for Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 4 of 5	90		10	\$ 900,000	\$ 810,000			\$ 90,000	
2032		2032	LT-11	SRE/ARFF Refresh/Addition	90		10	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,800,000			\$ 200,000	
2032		2032	LT-13	North GA Development Expansion, Phase 2 - Design	90		10	\$ 250,000	\$ 225,000			\$ 25,000	
2033		2033	LT-26C	Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 4 of 5 (Includes CA)	90		10	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 6,700,000		\$ 900,000	
2033		2033	NEW	Design for Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 5 of 5	90		10	\$ 900,000	\$ 810,000			\$ 90,000	
2033		2033	LT-15	North GA Development Expansion, Phase 2- Construction	90		10	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,250,000			\$ 250,000	
2034		2034	NEW	Runway 13/31 & Connector Taxiway Reconstruction, Phase 5 of 5 (Includes CA)	90		10	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 6,700,000		\$ 900,000	
2034		2034	MT-11	Runway 2/20 & Taxiway B Crack/Joint Sealing & Rejuvenation - Design	90		10	\$ 140,000	\$ 126,000			\$ 14,000	
2034		2034	LT-27D	Terminal & Cargo Apron Rehabilitation & Expansion - Design	90		10	\$ 225,000	\$ 202,500			\$ 22,500	
	2035	2034	MT-12	Rental Car Wash Facility		50	50	\$ 1,500,000			\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	
	2035	2034	LT-17	Fuel System Upgrades		50	50	\$ 250,000			\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	

Color-coding is used to easily distinguish one fiscal year from the next

TABLE 7-1: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
ROCHESTER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 - 2040, STATE FY2022 - 2041, FEDERAL FY2021 - 2040

1/18/2021

Fiscal Year				Funding Share				Eligible Funding Amounts					
FED (Oct-Sep)	State (Jul-Jun)	CITY (Jan-Dec)	No.	Description	Federal	State	Local/ Other	Project Cost	FAA- Entitlement	FAA- Discretionary	MNDOT - Aeronautics	Local	Other
2035		2035	MT-13	Runway 2/20 & Taxiway B Crack/Joint Sealing & Rejuvenation - Construction	90		10	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 1,260,000			\$ 140,000	
2035		2035	LT-3D	Add South Partial Parallel Taxiway - Design	90		10	\$ 750,000	\$ 675,000			\$ 75,000	
2035		2035	LT-27C	Terminal & Cargo Apron Rehabilitation & Expansion - Construction	90		10	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 2,025,000			\$ 225,000	
2036		2036	LT-3C	Add South Partial Parallel Taxiway - Construction	90		10	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 6,750,000			\$ 750,000	
2037		2037	LT-1	Terminal Expansion, Phase 1 - Design and Planning	90		10	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 4,050,000			\$ 450,000	
2037		2037	LT-22	Maintenance Building/SRE Pavement Crack/Joint Sealing	90		10	\$ 100,000	\$ 90,000			\$ 10,000	
2038		2038	LT-7	Terminal Expansion, Phase 1 - Construction	90		10	\$ 30,000,000	\$ 27,000,000			\$ 3,000,000	
2038		2038	LT-14	Terminal Expansion, Phase 2 - Design and Planning	90		10	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,350,000			\$ 150,000	
2038		2038	LT-23	Master Plan & ALP Update	90		10	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 900,000			\$ 100,000	
2039		2039	LT-16	Terminal Expansion, Phase 2 - Construction	90		10	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 9,000,000			\$ 1,000,000	
2039		2039	LT-19	Terminal Expansion, Phase 3 - Design and Planning	90		10	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 2,025,000			\$ 225,000	
2040		2040	LT-21	Terminal Expansion, Phase 3 - Construction	90		10	\$ 15,000,000	\$ 13,500,000			\$ 1,500,000	
2040		2040	NEW	Property Acquisition/Easement	90		10	\$ 330,000	\$ 297,000			\$ 33,000	

Color-coding is used to easily distinguish one fiscal year from the next

7.4 ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW

The purpose of this section is to present a high-level overview and screening of the potential environmental considerations of the implementation of future projects at RST. The following narrative provides preliminary information concerning environmental resources to define and identify critical resources that would need to be addressed in the preparation of environmental documentation in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the proposed Airport development program. The environmental overview is not intended as a substitute for a NEPA document.

An environmental inventory and a set of alternatives have been reviewed in previous chapters. The primary changes proposed in the project list include the reconstruction of the Airport's two runways, a 1,647-foot extension to Runway 2/20, a total reconfiguration of the airport taxiway system, a new vehicle parking area, and a terminal building/parking expansion. The resource categories included in this section are:

- ✓ Air quality
- ✓ Farmlands
- ✓ Floodplains
- ✓ Hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention
- ✓ Historical, archaeological, and cultural resources
- ✓ Noise and compatible land use
- ✓ Threatened and Endangered Species
- ✓ Wildlife management
- ✓ Department of Transportation Section 4(f)
- ✓ Water quality
- ✓ Wetlands

Airport Environs and Land Use

RST is located within the city limits of Rochester, in Olmsted County, Minnesota. Rochester is home to the Mayo Clinic Medical Center and is located 85 miles southeast of the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. Vehicle access to RST is reliable, as it is located adjacent to the junction of Highway 63 and Interstate 90 (I-90).

Olmsted County is in Southeast Minnesota in a deciduous forest biome characterized by gentle hills and farmland development. The City of Rochester rests adjacent to the South Fork of the Zumbro River, a 57.6-mile-long tributary of the Mississippi River. Located in the Driftless Area, a large section of land in the upper Midwest where the flattening effects of glaciation did not occur, the natural topography near the City of Rochester remains far more rugged than other areas of the upper Midwestern region. Deeply carved river valleys, rolling hills, and a lack of naturally occurring lakes deeply characterizes the geography of Olmsted County.

The climate of Rochester is characterized as a warm-summer humid continental climate. The City and County regularly sees four distinct seasons, high humidity, and significant precipitation year-round. Annual rainfall averages 33 inches per

year, while the average snowfall is about 52 inches per year. The average annual maximum temperature is 82° F, and the average annual minimum temperature is 9° F.

RST property is zoned as M1 – Light Industrial District, which allows a mixture of commercial and industrial uses. The Airport is surrounded by several zoning uses, including:

- ✓ A1 – Agricultural Protection District to the east and west
- ✓ A4 – Agricultural-Urban Expansion District, A.R.C. – Agricultural Residential Cluster District, and HC – Highway Commercial District to the south
- ✓ A4, RC – Recreational Commercial District, AG – Agricultural District, I – Industrial District, and R1 – Low Density Residential District to the north.

The above land uses remain compatible with Airport operations, as they primarily comprise agricultural or industrial uses and sporadic business uses northeast and southeast of the airport along Highway 63 and 90th Street SW. A golf course is located adjacent to the Airport to the north. Residential development around the airport is classified as low-density residential that remains sparsely inhabited. Because the area is largely undeveloped, airport noise and other incompatibilities are less likely to fall into areas where they may be a nuisance, and development on the ground is unlikely to cause a hazard to airport operations. While some crops can cause concerns due to their potential for attracting wildlife, RST has a wildlife hazard management plan used to manage these hazards. There is, therefore, minimal risk of incompatible residential development around the Airport property line.

Future Conditions

The following future conditions discussion assumes that all the projects included in the CIP are implemented. An analysis of the potential environmental impacts of implementing these projects allows for the identification of any potentially significant environmental concerns and allows for the identification of the level of documentation that may be required to receive environmental clearance for each project. It is anticipated that the majority of the terminal area projects can be environmentally cleared under a Categorical Exclusion Form. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be conducted for projects requiring a higher level of environmental review. Ultimately, the level of documentation will be determined by the FAA ADO based on individual project factors at the time of review. It is anticipated the following categories will be evaluated to ensure compliance with all federal, state, and local environmental concerns that may arise because of the development alternatives listed in the Conceptual Development Plan (CDP).

Air Quality

The proposed developments outlined in the CDP are not expected to have an immediate effect on air quality standards in the vicinity of the Airport. According to the EPA, Olmsted County is currently in attainment for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) since 2000.¹ Two County pollutants previously in nonattainment, Particulate Pollution (PM) from 1992 to 1994 and Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) from 1992 to 2000, have been re-designated to maintenance and presently remain in maintenance. A maintenance area is defined as an area where air pollution levels had previously been in nonattainment, but now “maintains” the air quality standard under the NAAQS threshold.

¹ *Minnesota Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for All Criteria Pollutants [Advertisement]. (2018, March). Retrieved April 2018 from https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo_mn.html*

Short-term air quality impacts may be expected during construction of the proposed projects from heavy equipment pollutant emissions or fugitive dusts resulting from cut and fill activities. Compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal air quality regulations and permitting requirements will be the responsibility of construction contractors.

Impacts to long-term air quality standards could result from increased airport activity following the completion of projects such as the expansion of parking facilities including the park and ride. Improved landside capacity could result in an increase to aircraft operations and vehicle traffic and these potential impacts would have to be considered in future environmental documentation for these projects.

Farmlands

Soils within airport boundaries are classified as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Not Prime Farmland. Lands classified as Not Prime Farmland are concentrated in the airfield area, due to previous disturbance and fill. Other Airport-owned land, including areas currently leased for agricultural production inside and outside airfield fences, primarily fall into Prime or Statewide Importance categories. Additionally, future land acquisition will expand the Airport property line to encompass Runway 2/20's extension across 90th Street SW/former Trunk Highway 30 SW, a road relocation around the extension, and the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) for each runway end. Because of these factors, conversion of land currently in agricultural production related to projects in the CIP may need further review as part of an EA or documented Categorical Exclusion, including consultation with the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service to score the impact of converted cropland.

Floodplains

There are no floodplains identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) on existing RST property or the future acquisition areas outlined in the CDP.

Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention

Several short-term impacts related to hazardous materials and solid waste can be expected due to construction activities and future airport development projects. These activities can include hazardous waste or substances like fuel, oil, lubricants, paints, solvents, concrete-curing compounds, fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides. If properly managed, such impacts could be mitigated below any thresholds of significance.

Construction and Demolition (C&D) waste represents the most significant short-term contributor to waste production at RST. C&D waste is accounted for in the Airport waste plan, where tracking and reporting of any waste generated could assist in mitigation and proper disposal of the material. Other items such as toxic waste are not covered under the waste plan and would require their own accounting and disposal processes as the need arises. Long-term waste production could occur from the previously discussed vehicle parking expansion and park and ride creation. As with short-term impacts, long-term waste demands should be addressed in the Airport's waste plan as its needs develop.

Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources

According to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), there are no historic buildings, structures, or cultural artifacts currently known to be on or near airport property. The nearest sites listed on the NRHP are the Mayowood Historic District, located 4.6 miles northwest of the Airport, and the Toogood

Barns 5.6 miles north.² Proposed projects that affect undeveloped areas, including current farmland, will likely require archaeological field work to verify that no artifacts or sites of significance are present.

Noise and Noise Compatible Land Use

The FAA has adopted guidelines for evaluating the compatibility of various land uses with various noise levels resulting from aircraft (FAA Order 1050.1F). In accordance with FAA guidance, excessive aircraft noise exposure is levels at or above 65 A-weighted decibels (dB) measured using the Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL). The DNL metric represents the average sound level, in decibels, for the 24-hour period from midnight to midnight as weighted to reflect additional annoyance for sounds generated between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. A significant noise impact would occur if analysis showed that a proposed action would cause noise-sensitive areas to experience an increase in noise of DNL 1.5 dB or more at or above DNL 65 dB noise exposure when compared to a No Action Alternative for the same timeframe. Existing and future noise contours show that the 65 DNL contour falls entirely within airport property. Existing and future noise contours are illustrated on the Land Use Plan sheet of the ALP Drawing Set provided in **Chapter 6 – Airport Layout Plan**.

While most of the short-term CDP projects would not result in changes to aircraft noise levels, construction activities associated with development projects could result in temporary noise level increases. The proposed extension of Runway 2/20 would shift contours to the southwest, but increased operations are not expected as a result, and the 65 DNL contour would remain on Airport property. The RST noise contours do not encompass any noise-sensitive land uses such as residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes, or churches, and no proposed projects are anticipated to have an impact on the number or type of aircraft operations occurring at RST or to significantly alter the noise contours over the 20-year planning period. Therefore, an aircraft noise analysis will likely not be required prior to implementation of any projects beyond the Runway 2/20 extension.

Threatened and Endangered Species

According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) search tool, three threatened species may potentially be in the project development area: the Northern Long-eared Bat, Leedy's Roseroot, and the Prairie Bush-clover. The IPaC species list also included the Bald Eagle, which is not a species of concern, but is protected by the Eagle Act. No endangered species were listed in the IPaC species list, and the tool additionally states there are no critical habitats listed on Airport property.

There have been no sightings or wildlife strikes of threatened, endangered, or special concern species at RST. Due to vegetation management practices that limit hospitable habitat, it is assumed that no threatened or endangered species currently listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), USFWS, or the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) currently inhabit RST property or its surrounds. However, projects involving tree removal may require further consultation with the USFWS regarding the Northern Long-eared Bat.

Wildlife Management

As required by the FAA, RST conducted a Wildlife Hazard Assessment (WHA) to monitor for general wildlife activities on Airport property. The WHA identified several different types of non-threatened species; coyote, red fox, striped skunk, eastern cottontail rabbit, white-tailed jackrabbit, domestic cat, thirteen-lined ground squirrel, plains pocket gopher,

² Minnesota National Register [Online Database]. (n.d.). Retrieved April 2018, from <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/nrhp/>; Minnesota Historical Society, & Toogood, W. (n.d.). Toogood Barns. Retrieved April 2018, from <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/nrhp/NRDetails.cfm-NPSNum=75001003.html>

badger, white-tailed deer, and bald eagles were all observed throughout the airfield and perimeter areas. A Wildlife Hazard Management Plan (WHMP) was created because of the WHA, which provides strategies to minimize the potential for future aircraft wildlife strikes.

In conjunction with the WHMP, it is expected that the proposed developments outlined in the CDP can proceed with minimal impact to wildlife in and around the Airport.

Section 4(f) Property

The proposed development will not have an impact on Section 4(f) properties. There are no 4(f) protected properties located within the airport boundary, and the nearest known Section 4(f) properties are at least 1.5 miles away from RST.

Water Quality

Short-term development impacts related to the implementation of development projects at RST are likely to occur in the form of construction pollutants, such as material waste and job site runoff. Impacts are currently addressed in the RST Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and additional provisions have been made to mitigate for any future increased runoff.

The introduction of airfield impervious pavement through airfield development projects is likely to be the largest contributor to increased stormwater runoff. Approximately 66 total acres of new airfield pavement will be added to accommodate the recommendations listed in the CDP, with roughly 17 acres of pavement to be removed for similar reasons. This results in a net total impervious area increase of 49 acres that will increase stormwater runoff from the airfield's surfaces. Additional measures, such as the introduction of additional filtration trenches or other stormwater infrastructure, need to be addressed in future versions of the SWPPP. Further impacts to water quality because of the large increase in impervious surface may require additional environmental review.

To prevent potential water quality impacts, grading plans and storm water design will be developed to follow FAA standards for airfield construction. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Stormwater Permit from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) will be required for construction activities disturbing one acre or more. The Construction Storm Water General Permit requires the SWPPP be developed, and that sediment, erosion, and pollution prevention control measures be implemented. Water quality impacts from construction would be minimized with the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) identified by NPDES.

BMPs detailed in the RST SWPPP are designed to minimize stormwater impacts, and it is not anticipated that significant adverse impacts to the wetlands will result from stormwater discharges. These BMPs involve good housekeeping procedures to establish a clean and orderly airport environment, including:

- ✓ Containment of contaminated runoff in dedicated bioswales to enhance the filtration of sediment and biodegradation of glycol-impacted water.
- ✓ Snow removal prioritizing distribution of non-glycol impacted snow in grassy or easily infiltrated areas.
- ✓ Maintaining a cleaning program for airport pavement and fleet vehicles.
- ✓ Proper storage of potentially hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, and lubricants.

Wetlands

Wetlands in the State of Minnesota are protected under the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA), Section 404, and the State Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) to minimize the destruction, loss, or degradation of wetlands, and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands. Recent field surveys in 2019, 2020, and 2021 identified 46 wetlands on airport property and in potential project areas.

Most CDP projects will not have long-term effects on existing wetlands at RST. However, the Runway 2/20 extension project will potentially impact designated wetlands on Airport property. These impacts and potential mitigation for the impacts will be further assessed and disclosed in the Runway 2/20 EA. Additional on-airport wetlands are anticipated to be impacted by the Runway 13/31 reconstruction project and future GA hangar area development. These impacts will require further review prior to project implementation.

Should Airport activities or development result in significant adverse impacts to wetlands or require the physical alteration of wetlands, the Minnesota Wetland Standards and Mitigation Rules §7050.0186 should be consulted to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

7.5 FUTURE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND CIP CONSIDERATIONS

Federally obligated airports operate under increasingly complex project implementation and grant-in-aid funding procedural requirements. The competition for federal and state funds places an emphasis on the Airport Master Plan as a means to reasonably commit to the project improvement schedule, in terms of project justification, costs, funding sources, and matching participation. It should be noted that the Airport Master Plan represents the development views of the Airport Sponsor and does not commit or obligate financial support to the recommended Airport projects, even if identified in the Airport CIP or depicted on the ALP drawings.

Airport CIP Strategy

The Airport Master Plan has assessed Airport project needs throughout the 20-year planning period. It is recognized that the proposed costs of project improvements are beyond the Airport's current financial capabilities. However, each project supports a justifiable recommendation as identified by the Master Plan development team and Airport Sponsor.

Projects also must satisfy FAA standards. For this reason, each project recommendation has been included as part of the Master Plan CIP and depicted on the ALP drawings. This provides the Airport reasonable flexibility in accommodating planned or other strategic improvements as demand warrants and the financial resources become available.

The following are advantages based on these considerations:

- ✓ Airport Master Plan projects must be depicted on the ALP to be considered for FAA funding. A project not identified on the ALP would have to go through extenuating FAA procedures, and risk not being implemented or funded. The Airport cannot risk this circumstance, especially with scheduled commercial air cargo and airline passenger service.

- ✓ A full assessment of Airport project improvements and site development considerations ensures that the Airport is being developed in a strategic, sequential, and orderly manner. Thereby, planned projects can occur and be implemented without the Airport second-guessing the long-term implications, or wondering if projects would compete for the best use of available space.
- ✓ There are often several procedural and pre-project requirements to implement even basic project improvements, including environmental, land use regulations, codes, and stakeholder support. Addressing these strategically allows the Airport to avoid the more arbitrary “build on demand” arrangements. Also, a well-envisioned Airport Master Plan offers a more appealing sense of opportunity and development.
- ✓ As FAA programming and discretionary funds can change rapidly, the Airport CIP should be reviewed and prepared annually, including possible FAA reimbursable agreements. Airport CIP projects can often be scaled-back, combined, or accelerated as needed. Some FAA grants are reimbursable to the Airport.
- ✓ The Airport lobbies extensively to compete for limited FAA resources and funding. Projects identified in this Airport Master Plan are similar to projects being pursued aggressively and competitively by similar commercial service airports.

Airport Master Plan CIP Summary

The following are critical factors for implementing the Airport CIP and advancing project improvements to meet future Airport demands and level of service expectations:

- ✓ Continued improvements to configure the airfield as a two-runway system that provides 24/7/365 operational capabilities even if one runway is closed for maintenance or emergency
- ✓ Airport to rely heavily on FAA funds (entitlement *and* discretionary)
- ✓ Substantial Airport investments for planned facility and building/hangar improvements
- ✓ Airport may require additional public funding and/or new revenue sources to meet FAA grant matching share and fund local-only Airport project costs
- ✓ Project recommendations and site developments planned beyond the first 10 years of the Airport’s CIP will likely require reassessment prior to programming and funding implementation.