



MSP NOISE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, March 18, 2026, at 1:30 PM
MAC General Offices
6040 28th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55450



Call to Order

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport (MSP) Noise Oversight Committee (NOC), having been duly called, was held Wednesday, March 18, 2026, at the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) General Offices Legends conference room. A videoconference option (Teams) was also provided.

The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m. The meeting participants were:

- Members:** S. Alig, Eagan; R. Benz, Delta Air Lines; K. Bonner, Endeavor Air (via Teams); L. Chamberlain, St. Louis Park (via Teams); C. DesCamps, Richfield; K. Gallatin, St. Paul (via Teams); C. Jacobson, Mendota Heights; K. Jansen, Sun Country Airlines (via Teams); D. Lowman, Bloomington; A. Luce, Delta Air Lines; L. Moore, Bloomington (via Teams); A. Moos, United Parcel Service (via Teams); L. Olson, Minneapolis; J. Otzen, Minnesota Business Aviation Association; M. Ray, Burnsville;
- Staff:** R. Anderson; K. Fisher (via Teams); D. Lafferty; J. Lewis; M. Peloski; N. Pesky; M. Ross; K. Skogquist; J. Sonju (via Teams);
- Others:** J. Bergman; T. Lopac; J. Vossen, Bolton & Menk (via Teams); Y. Xu, HTNB (via Teams); R. Ziegler; J. Ziemer.

A quorum of at least four Community and four User Members was established and confirmed.

Community Members: Alig, Chamberlain, DesCamps, Gallatin, Jacobson, Lowman, Moore, Olson, Ray
User Members: Benz, Bonner, Jansen, Luce, Moos, Otzen

Chair Benz welcomed everyone, introduced himself, and explained meeting procedures. He gave information regarding the public comment period and confirmed with the recording secretary that a quorum was present. He noted the agenda and meeting materials can be found at <https://metroairports.org/noc>.

1. Consent

Chair Benz introduced the consent agenda items and stated each item would be reviewed individually and then a motion sought for their approval together.

1.1. Approval of January 21, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Chair Benz opened discussion of the January 21, 2026, meeting minutes. No comments were made, and no changes were requested.

1.2. Reports

1.2.1. Monthly Operations Reports: January and February 2026

Ryan Anderson, Technical Advisor, provided an overview of monthly operations and noise complaints. He reviewed total operations numbers, daytime and nighttime flight statistics, runway usage, fleet mix, complaint metrics, and comparisons to data from January and February 2025. In comparison to 2025, total operations were down approximately 3%. For runway usage, January was spent predominantly in North flow, while February was more evenly split between North, South, and Mixed flows. Year to date, runway usage is still leaning heavily on North flow due to wind and weather.

He reviewed the fleet mix, which stayed consistent with recent data. He noted there has been a UPS MD-11 aircraft sitting at the airport for some time, explaining that model was grounded by an FAA Emergency Airworthiness Directive following a tragic accident in November 2025. UPS has opted to retire the planes as of the end of 2025 and has started flying more 747-400 and -800 freighters, which are large and noticeable aircraft. There are approximately one to two flights of these planes per day on average, and members of the community are probably noticing them because of their significant size, although the noise impact is negligible because of the small percentage of operations flown with these planes.

With regard to complaints, he stated there was a 43% increase in volume of complaints during the period, but that the number of complaining households shows only a slight increase. He reminded that there was no significant change in airfield operations from January and February 2025 and that operations were even slightly less, but there was a large increase in complaint volume.

He explained the noise metrics used for measuring and reporting aircraft sound, noting what appeared to be a significant change from 268 hours, 32 minutes above 65 decibels in January to 323 hours, 3 minutes in February. He added that this is largely due to two noise monitors which had been down, Sites 10 and 14, that are now back up and running as of February. He also reviewed noise abatement protocol adherence, which was high for both January and February.

He completed his report and indicated he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Benz thanked **Anderson** for his report and asked if there were any member questions.

Member Olson stated that Minneapolis is getting many inquiries about drones, helicopters, and unidentified aircraft. She inquired as to whether complaints regarding those types of things would be reflected in the data presented. She noted the data looks consistent with commercial flights, but asked whether people calling in identify other aircraft causing noise.

Anderson said that, as far as complaint filing, they can select the aircraft type. Helicopters are a selectable option, but drones are not, as there is not drone activity associated with airports and those activities are outside of the airport environment. However, the topic of drones has come up more in the last couple of months. He added that MAC is closely monitoring helicopter complaint activities and following up with residents to explain patterns. Unfortunately, some flight data is scrubbed for federal, military, or other purposes and does not always show up in the system to correlate to complaints. Drones may need to be considered moving forward as drone activity increases, but there is currently no mechanism to complain specifically about a drone other than a phone call. Further options might be needed in the future to deal with drone activity.

Member Olson asked if noise that is picked up by remote monitoring towers must be correlated to a flight in order to show up in the data.

Anderson indicated that, if they do not have flight data for aircraft or helicopters that may have operated in the area and are unable to correlate noise events to that activity, it does not get reflected in the system. Additionally, there is no flight data associated with drone activity, so that cannot be tracked or correlated to noise events by monitors. He said that is the nature of the data and the government's policy about data scrubbing. He remarked that the topic has come up at noise conferences, including the recent Airport Noise & Emissions Symposium, not just with regard to government activity but also private/personal aircraft blocking information, so this is a topic being widely discussed and will probably be an issue for the future in terms of privacy and the government's willingness to share data.

Member Lowman said he was curious about flows shown on page 8 in terms of the daily level for correlation with noise complaints, specifically as to whether there is analysis of the timing of the flights, such as when the operations are close in time to one another as opposed to spread throughout the month. He wondered if there was a standard deviation or how the data is looked at when broken down.

Anderson answered that MAC does see an increase in complaints when the airport is in a certain configuration for a consistent period of time. For example, if North flow is predominantly used for many days in a row, people under those paths get worn out by the consistent noise. They also tend to see an uptick in complaints when the airport is in one flow for a consistent period of time and switches to a different flow, as people under the new flow are now impacted and generate complaints. So there is correlation between noise complaints and the timing of operations and flow usage. Reporting on flow usage helps to explain complaint patterns, because it affects the experience of noise for those on the ground.

Member Gallatin said he was glad to see Station 10 back up and running for noise monitoring.

Anderson said MAC is as well and that it was a long and painful process that hopefully will not recur.

Member Gallatin thanked **Anderson** and the MAC for their work on that issue.

Chair Benz asked if there were any further questions at this time, and there were none.

1.2.2. Review of Winter Listening Session

Information regarding the Winter Listening Session was provided in the meeting packet.

Chair Benz reviewed voting procedures and asked members to prepare for a vote.

Member Olson moved to approve the consent agenda items. Chair Jacobson seconded the motion. There was a call for any further discussion, and there was none at this time. A vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Comment Period

Chair Benz introduced the public comment period. He reviewed procedures for public comment and noted that such an opportunity is always included in NOC meetings. No comment cards were received, no comments were made, and the public comment period was concluded.

3. Business

Chair Benz stated there were no business items on the agenda.

4. Information

4.1. 2025 Annual Noise Contour Report Overview

Chair Benz introduced the topic and turned to **Anderson** to further present.

Anderson said he was happy to bring to the Committee the results of the Annual Noise Contour Report for 2025. He explained the consent decree requirements with regard to the annual actual noise contour analysis. He noted the 2025 report was modeled in the most recent version of the FAA's Aviation Environmental Design Tool at the time work began. MAC published the 19th Annual Noise Contour Report on February 17. He reviewed highlights of the report and stated the entire report is available on the website at <https://metroairports.org/msp-annual-noise-contour-analysis-reports>.

He gave an overview regarding noise contours and the metrics used for their modeling as established by the FAA. He showed the 2025 contour and compared it to the baseline contour from 2007. He discussed elements that heavily affect the contours, including total operations, nighttime operations (for which there is a significant penalty), fleet mix, and runway use. He explained that the total operations were 47% below the 2007 forecast for 2025 and that nighttime operations were also significantly lower than had been forecast. Hushkit operations were also much less than anticipated in 2007, as there were projected to be 275 average daily hushkit operations, but there are none occurring today.

He then compared the 2025 contour to 2024's contour, noting that operational numbers and fleet mix are almost exactly the same for those two years. Runway use was a variable that influenced the shape of the contours in each year. Looking at the comparison, the overall contour size did not change, but the shape was significantly different. He noted lobes associated with parallel Runways 12R and 30L had significant shrinkage, primarily due to closure for construction last summer. Runways 12L and 30R picked up a lot of those operations, and he showed the corresponding growth on that side of the airport.

He gave an overview of the consent decree's residential noise mitigation eligibility requirements. 119 single-family homes in Minneapolis achieved the first year of eligibility in 2025, and 20 single-family homes in Richfield achieved second-year status. He reiterated that the full report and all modeling information is available on the website, which also includes a full list of addresses that have achieved eligibility with an interactive map to see homes in relation to the contour.

He then concluded his presentation and stated he would be happy to answer any questions.

Member Olson asked **Anderson** to speak to the number of Minneapolis homes that previously had some level of eligibility but dropped off as a result of the 2025 contour.

Anderson said he did not have the exact number but that it was in the 100s, as there were a number of multifamily units on the northwest side of Lake Harriet that were in the 2024 contour but not the 2025.

Member Olson asked if any of those homes were in Year 2 eligibility status as of 2024.

Anderson said there were homes that had second-year eligibility as of 2024 that had fallen out due to the 2025 contour. He added that the consent decree allows for sound insulation packages for homes

that are in an area of greater increase now than before and that there were a number of homes that had achieved some level of eligibility for those who have also now fallen out.

Member Olson clarified that those would have been homes that went from the 63 decibels to higher noise exposure for already really loud areas, because many of the homes are covered for the 60 decibels, and so they would be homes getting a comprehensive mitigation package once full eligibility is reached.

Anderson confirmed that understanding to be correct.

Member Olson said it had been stated that 2025's construction would affect the noise contours or cause the contours to look different. She noted that fleet mix and operations are largely the same, so that, but for the construction, 2025's contours should look similar to 2024's. She expressed concern that the 2025 contour may be an anomaly that causes some homes to need to start over in eligibility. She would like the Committee to find a way to keep such homes eligible going forward because the construction was an anomaly and does not reflect historical use of runways or noise impacts.

Anderson said that there is some sort of variable such as construction or runway closures at large international airports happening very regularly and that establishing what the contour would be but for certain events is very difficult because there are so many variables. He pointed out that the contour is based on annual data and includes the full year of operations, not just the construction period, and that this annual average hopefully evens out many monthly variables.

Member Lowman asked if the Committee has ever gone back to previous years to try to normalize data from particular events from a statistical standpoint such as isolating COVID impacts, etc.

Anderson was not aware of that being done in the past. He stated MAC does look at many metrics and variables and comparisons to previous years as included in the reports, but he was unaware of specific attempts to segregate out sections of the annual data and correlate them with specific events or causes.

Member Lowman asked what would be in the best spirit of the consent decree and what makes sense. He understands that it is based on actual results and baselines, but he was interested if there could be a way to normalize the data to separate out the effects of construction or other events. He added it would be important to be cautious in any analysis because of the multiple variables, but that within a review of a larger data set, he would be curious to see if noise averages out when taking into account construction and other factors, if that could be done.

Anderson stated he would be happy to review and analyze any data within reason and that the MAC collects a large amount of data. This is the 19th Annual Noise Contour Report, so there is a plethora of information available to review and help inform this discussion.

Member Ray commented he would be curious to go back to 2011 to look at the intent of the consent decree versus what the outcome has been over that time frame with a more holistic view of the contours and eligibility status. He was unsure how that could be done.

Member Alig asked if homes that have fallen off the eligibility list in 2025 would still have an opportunity to become eligible by 2029.

Anderson indicated they would have that opportunity. He said that a home needs to achieve first-year eligibility by 2028, so any properties that fall back into the noise contour between now and 2028 could still achieve that three-year consecutive eligibility for mitigation.

Member Olson said the goal of the mitigation program is to improve livability in places with noise exposure. She added that you can tell these areas have noise exposure, that the contours show that exposure, and that the exposure is likely to continue going forward. She stated she understands there is always construction at an airport, but that this project was an extremely significant and disruptive event. In the most recent consent decree, she remembered there was something in place to account for an anomaly in the data and that it was acknowledged that data could be impacted by a one-time event or change. She knows not all contingencies were included within the decree, but that the intent to not have unusual situations interfere with program eligibility was acknowledged. She reiterated her desire to keep homes that fell out of the contour due to construction in 2025 eligible going forward.

Member Lowman agreed that analysis of the data could help better understand the construction impact and whether there were anomalies in the 2025 data. He said he would be interested to see how previous construction projects have affected the data.

Anderson said MAC is definitely interested in addressing significant noise impacts and helping those affected to mitigate such impacts. As part of the consent decree, MAC has invested almost half a billion dollars to mitigate the impacts as defined within the decree. It is important to wisely use the funds to maximize investments into areas that have significant noise impacts that remain consistent over time.

Chair Benz asked if there were any further questions or comments, and there were none at this time.

5. Announcements

Chair Benz introduced the agenda item and invited **Anderson** to give MAC announcements.

Anderson stated the next meeting is scheduled for May 20, 2026, at 1:30 p.m. and that the Spring Listening Session is scheduled for April 22, 2026. He thanked Bloomington for agreeing to host the Spring Listening Session. He said that further information will be updated and published on the website, and he encouraged all to participate.

Chair Benz asked if members had announcements. There were no further announcements at this time.

Adjourn

Chair Benz thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

May NOC Meeting:

Wednesday, May 20, 2026 @ 1:30 p.m.

Location: MAC General Offices, Legends conference room + Teams

[NOC Meetings](#)

NOC Spring Listening Session:

Wednesday, April 22, 2026 @ 6:00 p.m.

Location: Bloomington, MN

[Listening Session website](#)