



# Airlake Airport ADVISORY COMMISSION



ALAAC

**METROPOLITAN AIRPORTS COMMISSION  
AIRLAKE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

Thursday, September 11, 2025, 4:00 p.m.  
Lakeville City Hall  
20195 Holyoke Avenue, Lakeville, MN 55044

The meeting started at 4:01 p.m. There were 16 in-person and 4 online participants for a total of 20 participants. A quorum of at least 3 User Representatives and 3 Public Representatives was established. In attendance were:

**Representatives:** J. Bermel, City of Lakeville; K. Chatfield, Dakota County (via Teams); T. Fitzhenry, Airport User; A. Forsberg, Airport User (FBO); S. Guetter, Airport User; K. Jech, Airport User (Chamber); J. Miller, City of Lakeville; P. Moynihan, Airport User; D. Wolbert, Airport User

**MAC Staff:** R. Anderson, Manager - Community Relations; K. Fisher, Attorney; Joe Harris, Vice President - Management and Operations; S. Lakku, Intern - Community Relations; J. Lewis, Technical Advisor (via Teams); M. Ross, Director - Stakeholder Engagement

**Others:** J. Diener; Jack Hoza (via Teams); J. Saji; J. Vossen, Bolton & Menk (via Teams); R. Ziegler, Recording Secretary

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. A moment of silence was held for those involved in the recent helicopter crash and for ongoing other issues in the world. The Commission members then briefly introduced themselves.

## **2. Agenda Discussion**

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** opened a discussion on the agenda. No comments were made at this time.

**Representative Guetter motioned and Co-Chair Bermel seconded to approve the agenda as presented.**

**The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

*Approved 3-12-2026*

**8140 220th Street West, Lakeville, Minnesota 55044**  
Sam Seafeldt, MAC Airport Manager • [sam.seafeldt@mspmac.org](mailto:sam.seafeldt@mspmac.org) • 651-224-4306



### **3. Consent Items**

#### **3a. Approval of Minutes: June 26, 2025**

#### **3b. Aircraft Noise Complaints & Operations**

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** opened a discussion regarding the consent items.

**Representative Moynihan motioned and Co-Chair Bermel seconded to approve the consent items as presented.**

**The motion passed by unanimous vote.**

### **4. Public Comment**

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** introduced the public comment period both for online and in-person participants. No comments were made.

### **5. Business Items**

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** noted there were no business items.

### **6. Information Items**

#### **6a. Airport Manager Update**

**Mr. Anderson** presented data regarding second quarter operations and noise complaints, including that there was just one noise complaint received related to Airlake Airport, which regarded a helicopter operation west of I-35.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** inquired when the complaint was received and by whom.

**Mr. Anderson** answered that the complaint was made in June, but did not know the exact date.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** noted there is power line construction occurring which uses helicopters that fly low and hover for a long time and that the complaint could be related to that.

**Mr. Anderson** agreed that could be the case.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** asked if there were any further questions regarding operations or noise complaints, and there were none at this time.

**Mr. Anderson** noted that **Airport Manager Sam Seafeldt** was not present because his family had recently welcomed a new child.



**6b. Update on FAA's Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification (MOSAIC)**

**Mr. Anderson** updated the Commission on MOSAIC, which the Co-Chairs had asked to be included on the agenda. He reviewed the history of the FAA announcement and their final ruling on MOSAIC, which significantly expands the Light Sport Aircraft category. He hoped that the new rule would increase aviation participation and expand activity at Airlake.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** said the rule change could also allow some senior pilots to continue flying.

**Co-Chair Bermel** questioned how the rule change might impact air traffic at Airlake.

**Mr. Anderson** did not have any specific projections on that as the final rule was very recently announced, but he stated that the change had been eagerly anticipated by many people in the community, especially older pilots and those who do not fit into other categories.

**6c. Non-Local Training Flights**

**Mr. Anderson** explained that the Co-Chairs had asked staff to look at non-local training flights as far as data on flights originating from the Minnesota State aviation program in Mankato and coming to Airlake. He reviewed the data and information that had been collected and studied, including that Mankato's training fleet has approximately 50 aircraft and partners with North Star Aviation for training. He explained that the months of July and August were reviewed, and he presented that data to the Commission.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** inquired regarding what data is known about whether they are doing approaches at Airlake.

**Mr. Anderson** stated that staff could not discern specifically if they are doing instrument approaches or not based on the data they have.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** thanked staff for their report.

**Co-Chair Bermel** brought up two items that have been talked about in the past that are pending: the roadway from Cedar Avenue to Maynard Lane, and the runway extension.

**Mr. Anderson** introduced Michele Ross for further information on those topics.

**Ms. Ross** thanked the Commission for the inquiry. She noted **Joe Harris** was on the way to the meeting but had been delayed, so she indicated she would provide an update and introduced herself. In terms of the roadway and the runway extension, she said the MAC, tenants, and the community are aligned in wanting to see this developed and that they are working to make it happen. She indicated that MAC is exploring options to complete new alignment and repaving of that road as soon as possible. There are several necessary steps in the process that MAC is



working through. With regard to the runway, MAC is coordinating with pipeline companies to fulfill FAA encumbrance requirements to begin the FAA process to complete runway extension.

**Co-Chair Bermel** asked what specific activity could be expected on the road project in the coming months.

**Ms. Ross** stated that more definite information would be coming soon, likely within the next few weeks, about the timeline and schedule for the road. MAC is moving as quickly as they can to have a timeline and schedule to share with the group in advance of the next meeting.

**Co-Chair Bermel** thanked **Ms. Ross** for the information and noted the road gets a lot of attention because it is important economically and as part of the airport. He noted appreciation for progress on the issue.

**Ms. Ross** said she appreciates the strong community support.

**Representative Wolbert** asked if there were any updates or details regarding the negotiations with the pipeline companies and stated that it had been an issue for years.

**Ms. Ross** shared frustration that the process takes so much time. She had no specific details, but expressed hope that there would be more information soon. She stated that senior MAC leadership is meeting with the FAA to restart the EA process. The latest update was that they were fine-tuning issues with the FAA and pipeline companies in order to come to resolution.

**Representative Wolbert** thanked **Ms. Ross** for the additional update.

## **7. Member Announcements**

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** called for member announcements.

**Representative Moynihan** made inquiry as to the franchise fees imposed on hangars. He noted that there seems to be inconsistent application and that he does not understand the process. He asked who sets the classifications and is responsible for assigning the three categories in the ordinance and who determines what categories are applied.

**Representative Miller** indicated that there is information on Lakeville's website regarding the topic. He stated that the categories are assigned based on how utility companies meter the properties. He indicated that hangars do not easily fit into the residential, commercial, or industrial labels. He said the city does not make that determination but does determine rates.

**Representative Moynihan** noted that utility companies treat properties inconsistently.

**Representative Miller** agreed that can happen.



**Representative Moynihan** sought confirmation that utility companies determine categorization.

**Representative Miller** confirmed that to be the case.

**Representative Moynihan** said utility companies indicate the city determines categorization.

**Representative Miller** said the city determines rate structure but not property categorization.

**Representative Guetter** asked about the process to have decisions reviewed. He said the city is passing the buck to the utility companies but that they are the party who is billing the fees. He asked how it can be confirmed that it is being done appropriately, especially with different companies coming to different conclusions. He stated that it is not allowed to do business out of hangars, so they should not be classified as commercial. He asked what can be done to engage with the city to have properties properly classified by the utility companies.

**Representative Miller** recommended communicating with the city so that they can reach out to customer service people. He noted the difficulty is that hangars are not residential, so that only leaves commercial and industrial designations since there is no hangar classification.

**Representative Guetter** asked if the city feels it is appropriate for hangars to be designated as commercial properties.

**Representative Miller** stated that the city feels it is appropriate that hangars are not designated as residential properties.

**Representative Wolbert** asked for confirmation that the franchise fee rate is determined by the style of the meter.

**Representative Miller** confirmed that it is determined by the account and how the utility companies categorize the account type.

**Representative Wolbert** stated that seemed like semantics and asked about creating a new category that would be more accurate.

**Representative Miller** stated the category would need to be assigned by the utility companies.

**Representative Wolbert** asked if that might be negotiated as a group with the companies.

**Representative Miller** agreed that might be possible.



**Representative Wolbert** stated the city should reach out to the companies to inquire.

**Representative Miller** said that the companies are large and probably will not come up with a hangar rate, but that the conversation could certainly be had.

**Representative Wolbert** noted that airport users in this situation are a big contingency and are not being represented well.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** stated that some kind of conversation would be nice. He further inquired into the type of metering that might occur on land in Lakeville that had both a house and a pole barn with separate meters.

**Representative Miller** said the rates would be determined and charged by the account types. If the two meters were on two accounts, they could be categorized differently. He reiterated that the utility companies determine the classifications. He said that several properties within the city have multiple meters and multiple accounts and have asked to combine them and that they are told it is done on a case-by-case basis.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** said interested airport users should get together as a group to discuss the issue and that this may not be the proper forum for the discussion.

**Representative Guetter** stated that the issue is with the city and that the city is passing the buck to the utility companies.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** noted that they should communicate with Xcel Energy as a group about hangar classification and arrange a meeting to discuss further.

**Representative Wolbert** said he cannot imagine hangar owners are aware that they are being charged as commercial accounts and that he thinks the issue has been under the radar.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** noted that franchise fees are more than electricity charges and that the issue is noted and airport users will need to meet further on this.

**Representative Wolbert** asked if the Commission could follow up on the topic.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** indicated it would be put on the next meeting's agenda. He then inquired as to whether or not hangars at Lake Elmo and similar airports have the same situation.

**Mr. Anderson** indicated he would talk to other airport managers to see if they have heard of this issue with their tenants.

**Representative Jech** stated that the Lakeville Convention & Visitors Bureau has been working with **Representative Forsberg** for welcome-center signage at the new hangar, with a charging station and brochure rack and artwork coming soon. They are also working on the Stepping Into Your Future event in January for eighth graders. She thanked **Representative Forsberg** for providing the space. She also expressed gratitude to Visit Lakeville and the MAC for expediting the discussion on the roadway paving. She noted tourism and welcoming the community is important, especially with the incoming restaurant, so they need amenities and appreciate the work done to get the road improved.

**Representative Forsberg** apologized for his late arrival. He noted recent meetings have had a negative feel and that he wanted to start with positive things that are occurring. He is grateful that the ball is moving and feels there is genuine progress on issues. Cirrus Aviation Services will be coming in, and Aloft will become a limited Cirrus service and training center. They are also receiving a Noble flight simulator so they can offer simulation training and Cirrus training. He is proud of how much is going on at the airport and of the fast pace of airport growth. He said the road improvement will benefit the restaurant and allow a nice arrival/departure area.

He noted after a meeting yesterday that participants left with muddy tires because of rain. He said the current road is not maintained well and that he would appreciate anything that could be done in the interim to improve the situation until paving can occur. He understands the desire to put the right road in at the right time. He noted it is hard to invest money at the airport and then have customers on a gravel road, but he appreciates the forward progress.

He then asked about the upcoming MAC barbecue.

**Representative Moynihan** said it is scheduled for the 22nd at 4:30.

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** confirmed that date, from 4:30 to 6:30, at the MAC maintenance hangar.

**Representative Forsberg** stated ALAAC is an advisory committee, not a board, and that they can advise but really have no teeth. He recommended that representatives from the city and the airport attend MAC board meetings regarding Airlake to gain information on how decisions are made, how money is spent, and why things are happening. He said questions asked by the Commission get vague answers, but not a lot of detail. He stated the issues are important to the Commission and airport users and that it would be nice to be included in those decisions and informed about them. He gave an example of the negotiations with the pipeline attorneys. The Commission asks about it and understands it is still in process, but receives no real answers on its status. Sometimes it feels to him like there is a lack of transparency.

He then wanted to go back to more positive topics and again mentioned the Cirrus training center. He said that flights are up 10% this quarter and that the airport is still growing. He thanked all those who support him and work towards airport growth and improvement.



**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** asked for any other member announcements. There were none at this time.

**Adjourn**

**Co-Chair Fitzhenry** adjourned the meeting at 4:36 p.m.

