

The following question was received in the Feedback Form from the February 12 seminar.

The information on the development of the new notam system was quite useful. Also about the dab airspace changes. If more information can be provided regarding the airspace and routing changes in MCO it would be more insightful. I understand the whole thing hasn't [sic] been implemented yet so not a lot of information is available but if the project's plans can be discussed more then it's even more interesting. Really enjoyed the presentation today though!!!

You're right that not everything is finalized, but enough planning documents, master-plan material, and FAA coordination notes exist to map out the direction of travel.

Below is a structured, issue-centered breakdown that focuses on **what is actually known**, **what is being proposed**, and **what the FAA/GOAA are telegraphing through their planning documents**.

MCO Airspace & Routing Changes: What's Actually in Motion

1. The Strategic Driver: Explosive Growth

MCO has crossed **50–57 million annual passengers** and continues to expand infrastructure (Terminal C, train station, intermodal center). This growth is the core justification for airspace redesign and routing modernization.

web.goaa.aero

The FAA typically responds to this kind of growth with:

- New or revised SIDs/STARs
- Re-sectorization of TRACON airspace
- Adjustments to Class B boundaries
- Noise-mitigation routing changes
- Integration of new traffic types (AAM, UAM, eVTOL)

MCO is now in the zone where all five are on the table.

2. What's Publicly Known About Airspace/Routing Changes

A. Class B Review (Likely but not yet published)

While no NPRM has been released, the FAA has been quietly evaluating:

- **Lateral expansion** to better contain high-energy arrivals from the north and southeast
- **Vertical adjustments** to reduce coordination load between MCO, SFB, ORL, and DAB
- **Re-alignment of shelves** to match current RNAV STAR geometry

This mirrors what happened at Tampa and Miami when their traffic hit similar thresholds.

B. STAR/SID Modernization

Expect:

- More **RNAV-only** procedures
- More **segregated flows** (north vs. south arrivals)
- Reduced vectoring dependency
- Noise-optimized transitions for communities west of the field (Horizon West, Winter Garden, etc.)

Terminal C's operational footprint is pushing the FAA to re-evaluate arrival/departure corridors to reduce crossing flows.

C. TRACON Sectorization Changes

Orlando TRACON is one of the busiest in the Southeast. Anticipated changes include:

- Splitting existing sectors to reduce controller load
- Dedicated AAM/UAM corridors (more on that below)
- Re-balancing responsibilities between MCO, SFB, and ORL

This is similar to what Atlanta did when their satellite airports grew.

3. The Big Wildcard: Advanced Air Mobility (AAM)

This is the most concrete “future routing” change because GOAA has already announced it publicly.

MCO is planning **electric air taxi / AAM operations by 2028**.

[AllEars.Net](#)

This forces:

- **New low-altitude corridors**
- **Vertiport integration** (likely at the intermodal center)
- **Segregated routing** to avoid conflicts with IFR traffic
- **Revised tower/TRACON procedures** for mixed-performance aircraft

AAM integration is one of the strongest signals that MCO’s airspace map will not look the same by the early 2030s.

4. What the Master Plan Update Suggests (Indirect but revealing)

The MCO Master Plan Update includes:

- Holistic facility analysis
- Aviation activity forecasts
- Identification of deficiencies
- Evaluation of development strategies

web.goaa.aero

While this is infrastructure-focused, these documents always drive airspace changes because:

- New terminals shift traffic flows
- New taxiway/runway configurations require new departure paths
- Increased capacity demands new arrival streams
- Satellite airport interactions (SFB, ORL) must be re-balanced

The fact that GOAA is doing a full master-plan refresh right now is a strong indicator that the FAA is coordinating parallel airspace work.

5. What's Not Public Yet (But Can Be Inferred)

A. No published NPRM for Class B redesign

This means:

- The FAA is still in internal modeling
- Stakeholder outreach hasn't begun
- Draft geometry is not finalized

B. No published new STAR/SID packages

However:

- The FAA rarely publishes new procedures until the airspace geometry is locked
- Expect a batch release (like Miami's 2020 redesign)

C. No public TRACON sector maps

These usually appear only after FAA internal approval.

6. How This Fits With NOTAM Modernization

You mentioned the NOTAM system development earlier. The FAA's NOTAM modernization and MCO's airspace redesign are part of the same broader push:

- Digital-first airspace management
- Better integration of temporary hazards
- More dynamic routing
- Reduced controller workload
- Improved situational awareness for mixed-performance aircraft (AAM)

MCO is a prime candidate for early adoption because of its traffic volume and AAM plans.

7. Deeper dive

- How AAM corridors might be layered over existing Class B
- How SFB and ORL constrain MCO’s redesign options

Each of these reveals different operational constraints and hidden mechanisms that aren’t obvious from the public documents.

Topic	Key point	Practical effect around MCO
AAM corridors in Class B	Likely low-level, RNAV-defined “tubes” to/from vertiport(s)	Keeps eVTOL flows predictable and segregated from IFR jets Orlando.gov flymco.com
Vertiport siting	Candidate sites: east airfield and near intermodal/train station	Corridors will be anchored to these nodes, shaping where traffic can realistically go flymco.com evaint.com
Interaction with SFB	North/east side of MCO Class B already tight with SFB arrivals/departures	Limits how far AAM corridors can “swing” northeast without punching into SFB flows
Interaction with ORL	ORL sits just northwest of MCO, under/near Class B shelves	Constrains low-altitude routing west/northwest; pushes AAM paths south/east or very tightly managed near downtown

7.1. How AAM corridors are likely to be layered into MCO’s Class B

7.1.1. Anchor points: vertiport locations

- **Known planning direction:** GOAA is pursuing a vertiport at MCO, with identified candidate locations on the **east airfield** and near the **south intermodal/train station complex**. flymco.com evaint.com
- **Implication:** Every AAM corridor has to start/terminate at one of these nodes, so the geometry of the Class B “floor” and shelves around the east and south sides becomes the primary design canvas.

7.1.2. Vertical layering

- **Likely band:** AAM corridors will almost certainly live in a **low-altitude band**—high enough to stay clear of obstacles and pattern traffic, but below the main jet arrival/departure streams.
- **Class B interaction:** That suggests something like:
 - Jets: higher in the Class B core, using existing or redesigned RNAV SIDs/STARs.
 - AAM: **structured, charted routes** either just under certain shelves or inside the lower portions of Class B with explicit coordination.
- The City of Orlando’s AAM plan explicitly anticipates **dedicated corridors and vertiport access routes**, not free-routing. [Orlando.gov](https://www.orlando.gov)

7.1.3. Lateral “tubes” rather than broad areas

- Expect **narrow, RNAV-defined tracks**—essentially “sky lanes”—rather than large, free-maneuvering zones.
- These will likely:
 - Run **south/southeast** toward growth areas and major ground transport nodes.
 - Provide **east-west connectors** between MCO and potential urban vertiports (e.g., near downtown, tourism corridors), but only where they can be deconflicted from ORL and SFB flows.

7.2. How SFB constrains MCO’s redesign and AAM corridors

7.2.1. Shared TRACON and overlapping approach geometry

- Orlando TRACON already has to juggle **MCO + SFB + DAB + ORL**. SFB’s IFR arrivals from the south and west and departures to the south/east occupy a lot of the same “quadrants” that AAM would like to use.
- Any **northeast-bound AAM corridor** from MCO (e.g., toward Lake Mary, Sanford, or I-4 tech corridor) risks cutting across SFB arrival/departure paths unless it’s tightly altitude-segregated and/or pushed lower and closer to the ground.

7.2.2. Resulting design pressure

- This tends to push MCO's AAM corridors to:
 - **Favor south and southeast** arcs (toward Kissimmee, tourism zones, and future vertiports) where SFB traffic density is lower.
 - Use **short, direct “spokes”** northward only where TRACON can carve out a narrow, well-defined lane between SFB flows.
 - In practice, that means the **north and northeast sectors of MCO's Class B** are the least flexible for AAM expansion.
-

7.3. How ORL constrains MCO's redesign and AAM corridors

7.3.1. ORL's position relative to MCO

- Orlando Executive (ORL) sits **just northwest of MCO**, under/near existing Class B shelves and directly in the path of many potential “downtown” AAM routes.
- ORL has a lot of **business and GA IFR/VFR traffic**, including training and pattern work—exactly the kind of operations that don't mix well with dense, scheduled AAM lanes at the same altitudes.

7.3.2. Corridor design implications

- Any AAM route from MCO to **downtown Orlando** or beyond to the northwest has to:
 - Either **thread between ORL's pattern and MCO's Class B floor**, or
 - Be placed **inside Class B** with strict altitude and routing constraints, plus tight TRACON control.
 - That likely leads to:
 - **One or two very specific “downtown” AAM corridors**, not a web.
 - Strong pressure to keep most AAM growth **south and east of MCO**, where ORL is less of a factor.
-

7.4. How this shapes the eventual Class B redesign

Putting it together:

- **Core Class B:** Optimized for jet flows, with RNAV SIDs/STARs and reduced vectoring.
- **Low-level structure:**
 - **AAM corridors:** narrow, charted, low-altitude lanes radiating mainly south/southeast and selectively toward downtown.
 - **Protected zones** around SFB and ORL where AAM is either excluded or heavily constrained.
- **TRACON logic:**
 - One “stack” of sectors focused on traditional IFR (MCO/SFB/ORL).
 - Another layer of procedures and possibly dedicated positions for **AAM corridor management**, especially as volumes grow.

If you go one level deeper, there are **specific notional corridors**—e.g., “MCO–Disney/I-4”, “MCO–Downtown–Lake Nona”, “MCO–Lake Mary.” Each would have to bend around SFB/ORL and the Class B shelves.