

## **Appendix B   User Correspondence**



October 1, 2007

Mead & Hunt, Inc.  
6501 Watts Road  
Madison, WI 53719-2700

ATTN: Ms. Laura Morland

Dear Ms. Morland:

Thanks for the opportunity to make our concerns known regarding the MKE Runway Safety Area Project once again.

Our previous correspondence outlined the technical details about the specific impacts to our operations if the "declared distances" option were used. To summarize, the use of declared distances on 1L/19R would cause a significant maintenance cost impact (\$1.6M to \$2.0M per year) due to a reduction of the amount of reduced takeoff thrust that we would be able to use.

Of the proposals discussed today, we would favor a revised version of Alternative 4C1 (bridging over College Avenue) with the addition of an extension of the runway pavement to the south, allowing the same ASDA that we have today (9690').

Please let us know if you need any additional information from us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Mark J. Zweidinger".

Mark J. Zweidinger  
Vice President, Flight Operations



Delta Air Lines, Inc.  
Post Office Box 20706  
Atlanta, Georgia 30320-6001

October 15, 2007

Jim Zsebe  
GMIA Engineering  
5300 S. Howell Ave.  
Milwaukee, WI 53207  
(414) 747-5394 - Phone  
(414) 747-5010 - Fax  
jzsebe@mitchellairport.com

SUBJECT: MKE RUNWAY 1L/19R SAFETY AREAS

Dear Mr.Zsebe,

Delta Air Lines has evaluated the proposed Alternatives for General Mitchell International Airport. With our currently scheduled aircraft operating into MKE and based on our current missions, Alternative 4C1 will be sufficient for our operations off of Rwy 1L/19R. Delta Air Lines favors the 4C1 alternative versus the 4B1 alternative due to the added element of safety. However, as we are continuously and aggressively expanding routes, we are in support of Midwest's position on the extended pavement over the tunnel, to assure the capability of any future changes of equipment or markets out of MKE.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "D. Carlos Phillips".

D. Carlos Phillips  
Sr. Engineer Flight Operations Engineering  
Delta Air Lines, Inc.  
carlos.phillips@delta.com  
404-773-3845 Office  
404-715-7202 Fax

## Laura Morland

**From:** Doug R Myers [Doug.Myers@midwestairlines.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 12, 2007 4:25 PM  
**To:** jzsebe@mittchellairport.com  
**Cc:** Laura Morland; David C Reeve  
**Subject:** 1L/19R RSA project meeting

Dear Jim --

Thank you for the opportunity for Skyway Airlines to respond to your solicitation for comments on the proposed MKE GMIA Runway 1L/19R Runway Safety Area project and the resulting options proposed. We are pleased that GMIA and FAA Airports Division are attempting to collaborate for the enhancement of the safety of our passengers and all the traveling public at GMIA.

With the safety of our passengers as a primary consideration, we are concerned that 'Alternative 3' (merely relocating the landing thresholds of both runways) and 'Alternative 4B1' (relocating College Avenue) appear solely to cater to a technical change in FAA Runway Safety Area requirements and offer little or no safety benefit in a scenario with an aircraft undershoot or overrun path that actually crosses College Avenue.

The additional RSA distance proposed in these alternatives may seem comforting. However, FAA standards that GMIA and FAA Airports are now in pursuit of compliance with at MKE were, indeed, changes to a previous, supposedly safe FAA RSA standard that was recently proven inadequate, and with unacceptable consequences. The above-cited alternatives propose to use multiple millions in passenger-funded dollars apparently believing that every aircraft overshoot and overrun will remain within the associated, proposed RSA. We cannot endorse either of these alternatives as a wise investment when 'Alternative 4C1' (proposing an RSA tunnel for College

Avenue) presents the possibility of a safety enhancement that completely removes College Avenue and the associated vehicle traffic from an overrun/undershoot scenario.

We would further point out what we mentioned in the meeting that we believe the 'S-curve' re routing of College Avenue, as proposed in Alternative 4B1, may not be in the public interest as relates to motorists on that roadway.

Many of our employees and passengers travel that portion of College Avenue.

We are concerned that this reconfiguration could result in increased hazard to motorists, ar especially during inclement weather conditions. We believe that our company should not lend support to any proposed project in which the FAA, as a part of the Department of Transportation, is funding, with passenger taxes, highway modifications that, in any way, increase the hazards to highway motorists.

We urge GMIA, in its infrastructure investments, to place highest priority on using passenger tax funds (and all public funds) in a way that results in the maximum safety enhancement. Of the alternatives presented, we conclude that only Alternative 4C1 meets such criteria.

doug

Doug Myers, Director  
Safety & Security  
Skyway Airlines, Inc.  
dba Midwest Connect

----- Forwarded by Doug R Myers/SYX/MEH on 10/09/2007 03:14 PM -----

Doug R Myers

09/26/2007 02:32

[laura.morland@meadhunt.com](mailto:laura.morland@meadhunt.com), George C

To: [jzsebe@mittchellairport.com](mailto:jzsebe@mittchellairport.com)  
cc: David C Reeve/MEP/MEH@MEH,

PM

Velguth/SYX/MEH/MEH  
Subject: 1L/19R RSA project meeting

Jim, Skyway Airlines would like to respond to your solicitation for our comments on the Runway 1L/29R Runway Safety Area project. However, to do so with appropriate internal coordination would require a response on or about 15 October. We apologize for the delay but trust you will understand that it is necessary.  
doug

Doug Myers, Director  
Safety & Security  
Skyway Airlines, Inc.  
dba Midwest Connect

**Laura Morland**

---

**From:** Daddio Daniel - LtCol 126ARS/CC 417 [daniel.daddio@wimilw.af.mil]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 23, 2006 9:39 AM  
**To:** Laura Morland  
**Cc:** Dunbar, Donald - Col 128ARW/CC 405; Stasiewicz Michael - Col 128MSG/CC 421  
**Subject:** RWYIDman.pdf  
**Attachments:** RWYIDman.pdf

Laura,

I found this FAA document which may help in clearing up the definition of some terms that are not clearly understood by all operators. I will have to contact the Air Force TERPS folks to get the exact information that is applicable to military operations on runways that utilize declared distances. In reading the definition of ASDA, it appears to be the most restrictive distance suitable for aircraft that may need to abort a takeoff. Looking at alternative 3, you can clearly see that ASDA provides a 1000 foot safety zone at the end of the runway being used for takeoff. If I use TORA for my takeoff data, I will not be utilizing those safety zones as part of the calculation. I'm not sure at this point, without further guidance, that we would be allowed to use TODA for our takeoff calculations. Assuming that we can use TODA, the only restriction would then be runway available for landing. Our max landing gross weight for normal operations is 210,000 pounds. Using declared distance data from your alternative 3 diagram, 70degrees, wet runway, 10 knot headwind, full flaps, our max landing gross weight for runway 01 would be 190,000 pounds. Using the same conditions for runway 19, our max landing gross weight would be 179,000 pounds. Other environmental factors such as gusty winds, wind shear, snow or ice would further reduce our max landing gross weight capabilities. The shortened landing distances would adversely impact our operations. I would estimate that half of our training sorties take off at gross weight exceeding 200,000 pounds and all of our operational sorties exceed 200,000 pounds for takeoff. The problem arises during emergencies or changes to the mission which require an early or immediate landing shortly after takeoff. Fuel dumping or alternate fields would have to be used to accommodate the landing distances required. If you have any questions, please feel free to give me a call, Dan.

6/28/2006



May 26, 2006

Ms. Laura D. Morland, PE  
Senior Project Manager  
Mead & Hunt Inc.  
6501 Watts Road  
Madison, WI 53719-2700

Dear Ms. Morland:

Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns on the MKE Runway Safety Area Project for the General Mitchell International Airport of Milwaukee.

Our previous correspondence outlined the technical details about the specific impacts to our operations if the "declared distances" option was used. To summarize, declared distances would cause a significant payload impact on runways 7R/25L, and while there would be no direct payload hits for declared distances on 1L/19R, any reduction in available runway length on either runway 1L/19R and/or 7R/25L would cause an unacceptable maintenance cost burden (\$1.6M to \$2.0M per year).

Of the proposals discussed at the meeting, we would favor the following options:

- 5A3 for Runway 1L/19R
- 5A or 5B for Runway 7R/25L, with the additional conditions that on either of these options that the pavement not be removed at the east end of the runway, necessitating the use of declared distance for 7R.

Please keep in mind that the impact on Midwest Airlines is with our current fleet. As we intend to continue our growth at this airport, the future impact will be even greater. Additionally, in the last meeting we asked that the impact on international and domestic air carriers either actually using or planning MKE as an alternate airport be included in the impact statement.

Please let us know if you need any additional information from us to support these options.

Sincerely,

David C. Reeve  
Sr. Vice President-Operations

Cc: Barry Bateman  
David Reynolds