**MSP NOISE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**
**MEETING MINUTES**
Wednesday, January 21, 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, January 21, 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 1:30 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; G. Fitzer, Target Corporation; C. Jacobson, Mendota Heights; K. Jansen, Sun Country Airlines; L. Moore, Bloomington; A. Moos, United Parcel Service (via Teams); G. Norling, Mendota Heights (via Teams); L. Olson, Minneapolis (via Teams); M. Pivec, At-Large, St. Louis Park (via Teams); M. Ray, Burnsville;

**Staff:** R. Anderson; K. Fisher (via Teams); B. Juffer (via Teams); M. Kilian (via Teams); J. Lewis; D. Nelson; M. Ross; J. Sonju (via Teams);

**Others:** T. Bergen, FAA; S. Doyle, FAA; S. Fortier, FAA; D. Lafferty (via Teams); T. Lopac, Eagan; J. Poyatos, Endeavor Air (via Teams); S. Rohr, Bloomington; J. Vossen, Bolton & Menk (via Teams); R. Ziegler, Recording Secretary.

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

**Community Members:** Alig, DesCamps, Jacobson, Moore, Olson, Ray
**User Members:** Benz, Bonner, Fitzer, Jansen, Moos

**Chair Jacobson** welcomed everyone, introduced herself, and explained meeting procedures. She gave information regarding the public comment period and confirmed that a quorum was present. She noted the agenda and meeting materials can be found at https://metroairports.org/noc.

**1. Consent**

**Chair Jacobson** introduced the consent agenda items and stated they would be reviewed individually and then a motion would be sought for them to be approved together.

**1.1. Approval of November 19, 2025 Meeting Minutes**

**Chair Jacobson** opened discussion of the November 19, 2025, meeting minutes. No comments were made, and no changes were requested.

**1.2. Reports**

**1.2.1. Monthly Operations Reports: November and December 2025**

**Ryan Anderson, Technical Advisor**, provided an overview of monthly operations and noise complaints, including total operations numbers, daytime and nighttime flight statistics, runway usage, fleet mix, complaint metrics, and comparisons to data from November and December 2024.

He noted the data show no major changes in nighttime operations and that some later flights in this time period reflect flights delayed or changed due to weather events. He stated runway usage was fairly evenly split in November between North and South Flow, with more South Flow usage in December, wind being a primary factor in flow usage. He pointed out that the flow split for 2025 was similar to 2024 and also reviewed basic information on carrier fleet mix at MSP in 2025, noting further information on that subject would be included in Item 4.2.

He reviewed complaint metrics for November and December 2025, noting a large increase compared to the same period in 2024. He said that since operations and flow utilization was largely unchanged, other factors are driving complaints, including operational changes that occurred due to construction. He noted that an in-depth report of 2025 complaints would be presented in Item 4.3. He provided information about the location and concentration of complaining households. He stated the Top 10 complaining households accounted for 47% of all complaints and that 5 of those 10 were also in the Top 10 for previous months as well. He pointed out one complaint concentration area in Mendota Heights which experienced a significant increase in complaints since summer construction.

He provided sound monitoring data, including that both time above 65 decibels and events above 65 decibels were down from the same period in 2024. He reported that adherence to noise abatement metrics was very strong, with Runway 17 at 98.8% adherence for both November and December.

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

**Chair Jacobson** thanked **Anderson** and asked if there were any questions or thoughts from Members, and there were none at this time.

> **Member Moore moved to approve the consent agenda items. Member Ray seconded the motion. There was a call for any further discussion, and none was held at this time.**
>
> **The motion carried by unanimous vote.**

**2. Public Comment Period**

**Chair Jacobson** introduced the public comment period. She 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 Jacobson** stated there were no business items on the agenda.

**4. Information**

**4.1. FAA Update on MSP VOR-MON and RNAV Procedure Development**

**Anderson** introduced Deputy Regional Administrator for the FAA Great Lakes Region **Sean Doyle** and FAA local traffic management officer **Sean Fortier**.

**Doyle** gave an overview regarding the proposed RNAV procedures and the history of the procedure development. He discussed a potential safety issue that was discovered related to when aircraft departing to the north needed to be vectored off procedures due to weather or other operational considerations. Because of the potential safety issue, he stated that the proposed departure procedures could not be published as currently designed. Arrival procedures are not affected by the safety concerns, and they will be published as scheduled on March 19th. The FAA needs to reevaluate and revise the departure procedures. Existing departure procedures will remain in place, delaying the decommissioning of the MSP VOR. An initial work group meeting is scheduled for February. The goal is to publish revised departure procedures by early 2027. The environmental analysis published in January 2025 addresses and continues to address all environmental review requirements for the updated arrival procedures. The reevaluated departure procedures may require additional environmental review once designed.

**Doyle** stated the discovered safety issue was unanticipated. As a safety-forward organization, the FAA has multiple steps and processes to catch all possible safety implications. While the procedures themselves were fully vetted to be safe as designed, the issue was caught in a subsequent step of the procedure. He highlighted that the process will not start from scratch but will use what has already been done while finding a different technique to address safety concerns and revise the departure procedures.

**Chair Jacobson** thanked **Doyle** and asked him to review the publication timeline again.

**Doyle** stated all procedures were scheduled for publication on March 19, 2026. The arrivals procedures will proceed to publication as scheduled. A publication date for departure procedures has not yet been determined, but the FAA goal is early 2027. The procedures, once revised, will go through a full review process and then be scheduled back through the publication requirements to get to a final date.

**Chair Jacobson** thanked **Doyle** and asked if there were any further questions or comments.

**Member Ray** sought confirmation that the issue relates to aircraft taking off north toward downtown Minneapolis.

**Doyle** said the specific headings designed as part of the procedures were tailored to climb gradients, so within each procedure, all obstacles would be avoided. The issue relates to aircraft vectored away from the procedure, where then obstruction avoidance can no longer be guaranteed.

**Member Ray** reiterated that the concern was with regard to aircraft heading north toward the buildings in downtown Minneapolis and not to headings to the south or east.

**Doyle** and **Fortier** confirmed that that is correct.

**Member Ray** brought up that **Doyle** had noted vectoring is a common occurrence. He stated his understanding of the point of RNAV was to try to reduce radio transmissions and asked how vectoring fit into the RNAV procedures and goals.

**Doyle** said vectoring is generally how air traffic controllers manage situations where weather and other conditions require flexibility to deviate from procedures. Air traffic controllers rely on technology to the maximum extent possible to increase efficiency and safety. Use of prevalidated procedures creates less workload for air traffic controllers, but sometimes manual vectoring is needed. Both techniques need to work together to adapt safely to all circumstances. He added that, in a perfect world, 100 percent of flights would follow the procedures, but that is not always possible.

**Member Ray** expressed his understanding that RNAV would allow aircraft to gain altitude faster, but if vectoring is common and procedures are not always used, the potential benefit of the RNAV procedures may not be as effective as expected in noise abatement. He discussed wanting to set a realistic expectation in his community of potential noise reduction due to the RNAV procedures.

**Fortier** said the FAA wants to harness all beneficial technological aspects of the RNAV procedures while maintaining flexibility to vector aircraft if needed to ensure that airspace constraints are met. He stated the FAA will work to create procedures that satisfy both the desire to get aircraft up and away as quickly as possible as well as flexibility with the guarantee of obstacle clearance and proper traffic management.

**Member Ray** asked whether or not RNAV departure procedures for the south and east could be implemented while waiting for the northern procedures to be reworked.

**Fortier** stated that the procedures are designed to give the flexibility to assign aircraft to any runway and that the procedures are not generally delineated with a directional designation, so partial publication of departure procedures is not possible.

**Member Fitzer** asked, with regard to the arrivals, if the new procedures are a clean-sheet design or if they mimic existing procedures. He asked whether arrival procedures would still end at a certain point and then have controllers take over for vectors to the runway.

**Fortier** said the design of the arrival procedures was just a simple up-numbering with some minimal changes to the altitudes to make them work with the new RNAV procedures.

**Member Fitzer** asked if the arrival procedures will have new names.

**Fortier** answered that they will not, although he added that some rarely used arrival procedures will be discontinued because they are tied to the MSP VOR.

**Member Fitzer** asked if vectoring from the end of the arrival to the approach will still be controller vectoring.

**Fortier** said that is correct. He added there are RNAV required navigation performance (RNP) arrivals that require some crew and equipment on the aircraft. Those procedures already exist and could be given an

RNAV RNP arrival that would tie directly from the arrival into the airport, which is the same procedure as used today. This would just be an up-level procedure that would have the altitude requirements to be able to work with RNAV departure procedures once in place.

**Chair Jacobson** asked if there were any further questions or comments.

**Member Olson** asked for further clarification that the safety issue relates to a single heading toward downtown Minneapolis and that all other headings will be held off while they get it resolved. She asked if they would explain again why the heading is a problem.

**Fortier** said proposed procedures as developed had a fix that aircraft would need to cross at a 7-mile point. The 7-mile fixes replaced the 7-mile distance monitoring equipment (DME) arc that would no longer exist concurrent to the VOR shutdown. The fix was specific for the departure procedure to be able to intercept that fix and fly over that fix and join the RNAV portion of the departure procedure. However, should the aircraft need to be vectored away from that fix, the climb gradient that is required to cross that fix is no longer a requirement for the air crew, and that was the ultimate issue that was discovered. The issue existed for Runway 30R, for instance, from about 311 degrees off of the end of 30R to about 345 degrees, which is the area that needed to be missed because of the buildings in downtown Minneapolis.

**Member Olson** asked if moving that fix point could potentially solve the problem.

**Fortier** said that the work group needs to be reconvened to talk through possible solutions. They desire to have flexibility to provide vectors within climb gradient requirements to achieve needed results, with the result being utilization of RNAV technology with retained flexibility to turn aircraft away from RNAV procedure to clear either traffic, obstacles, weather, or other constraints and then rejoin the procedure with dispersion similar to as is done presently.

**Member Olson** asked if the headings are all still separated by about 20 degrees.

**Fortier** confirmed that, as developed, they were still separated by 20 degrees.

**Member Olson** noted that a NOC Subcommittee had met to get an understanding of the proposed procedures and provide feedback and that it should be reconvened to discuss this issue. She thanked the FAA for their presentation and stated she looks forward to working with them on this topic.

**Doyle** reiterated that it is very early in the process and that the first step will be to find solutions. It is a complicated and highly technical issue. He said the FAA is committed to finding solutions and that they will brief the Committee to keep them up to date as things progress.

**Chair Jacobson** asked which work group would be meeting in February, the FAA group or the NOC group.

**Doyle** indicated he was speaking about an FAA work group that could involve subject matter experts as a first step to identify possible solutions. This is an FAA technical work group to figure out available tools.

He stated this is in the very early steps and that this issue was caught recently and that they are working to address it as quickly as possible.

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

**4.2. 2025 Fleet Mix and Nighttime Operations Assessment**

**Anderson** gave detailed information regarding 2025's fleet mix and nighttime operations. His report covered total operations; passengers per flight; operations fleet mix; and nighttime operations data broken out by hour, runway use, and airline and aircraft metrics. He also presented data comparisons to prior years, some as far back as 1990. The full report is available at https://metroairports.org/noc.

With regard to operations, he pointed to steady growth since pandemic impacts but relatively flat overall numbers from 2024 to 2025, indicating they are still about 16% below pre-2020 averages. Passengers per flight also stayed relatively flat in year-over-year comparisons, although he added that differences in fleet mix (more regional jet use versus narrowbody) can result in more operations with fewer passengers. He discussed current fleet mix, comparing the last five years of data, and again noted an increase in regional jet use and slight decline in narrowbody jet use. He detailed nighttime operational numbers, discussing timing of flights, nighttime runway usage and patterns, and construction impacts within the data.

He noted that Delta has announced that MSP will be a pilot base for the A220 Airbus aircraft type. An increase in that use of aircraft, which has a higher noise level certification, could lead to decreased overall noise impacts. He expressed a hope that Delta could come to a future NOC meeting to discuss aircraft changes that could have a positive noise impact in the future. He reviewed nighttime flights by hour as compared to the historical average and discussed weather and other unscheduled events sometimes causing flights to move into nighttime hours.

He then concluded the 2025 Fleet Mix and Nighttime Operations Assessment and said he would be happy to answer any questions.

**Chair Jacobson** thanked **Anderson** for his report and asked if there were any questions or comments, and there were none.

**4.3 2005 Complaint Data Assessment**

**Anderson** gave full-year complaint data looking at location, volume, and nature of complaints. He showed total complaints for 2023, 2024, and 2025 and number of households complaining. He reviewed data concerning the Top 10 households lodging complaints.

**Chair Jacobson** asked what a complaint looks like and how complaints are received.

**Anderson** said that MAC tracks all nature of complaints. People can file complaints via the MAC website, email, or phone. The data in the presentation reflects all complaints received, with each complaint correlated to specific flight data whenever possible.

He discussed that, while overall complaints were slightly down from 2024, the number of complaining households was close to the same as 2024. He reviewed the location of received complaints and discussed the effects of construction on noise patterns and complaints received. He highlighted Mendota Heights as a newer complaint concentration area. He showed comparisons of complaints by city from 2024 to 2025 and how complaints received have changed over that time period within those city limits, noting big upticks in complaints in St. Paul and Mendota Heights and decreases in areas such as St. Louis Park. Looking at numbers of households complaining in each city also helped illustrate changes in noise complaints due to construction, with areas like Eagan showing a decrease in number of complaining homes, while St. Paul had a large increase in the same metric. He also reviewed information regarding households filing complaints by home purchase year.

He then presented on 2021-2025 operations to complaints ratios, complaints to operations ratio by hour, complaints received by aircraft category and by aircraft type, the Top 10 flights generating complaints in 2025, and complaint numbers broken down by flow usage and temperature. In analyzing the Top 10 complained-about operations, November 14th had three flights generating significant levels of complaints. He noted that data reveals nothing unusual about flight operations that morning but that there was unusually nice weather, likely leading to higher levels of noise exposure to people who were outside or had open windows. The complaints by flow showed a large increase in the "unlabeled" category, reflecting that air traffic control was using nontypical procedures, largely due to the construction. Complaints by temperature indicated that the highest numbers of complaints are received when the weather is between 60-79 degrees.

He then concluded the 2025 Complaint Data Assessment and said he would be happy to answer any questions.

**Chair Jacobson** thanked **Anderson** for the report and asked if there were any questions or comments.

**Member DesCamps** asked if complaints are tracked by time or by flight.

**Anderson** stated that the time the complaint is received is logged as well as the time the noise event occurred. The MAC always tries to connect the complaint to the actual operation involved.

**Member DesCamps** said she was curious about the data of flights by hour and thanked **Anderson** for the clarification.

**Member Olson** thanked **Anderson** for the thorough report and expressed appreciation for MAC's work. She noted that warmer weather leads not only to people having open windows and being outside more but also to aircraft having lower altitudes on departure, which can add to noise impacts.

**Chair Jacobson** thanked **Anderson** for his report and asked if there were any further questions or comments, and there were none at this time.

She acknowledged that Mendota Heights has seen a large increase in noise impacts. She stated that they are working with staff to better understand the increase to see what can be done to help residents.

**Anderson** added that analysis of the Mendota Heights corridor, especially for departures, is on the 2026 work plan so that better understanding can be gained of the increase in noise concerns in that area.

**5. Announcements**
**Chair Jacobson** introduced the agenda item and invited **Anderson** to give MAC announcements.

**Anderson** stated the next meeting is scheduled for March 18, 2026, at 1:30 p.m. and that the Winter Listening Session is scheduled for January 28, 2026, also at the MAC General Offices. He encouraged all to participate.

**Chair Jacobson** inquired if any Members had announcements. There were no further announcements at this time.

**Adjourn**
**Chair Jacobson** thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

March NOC Meeting:
Wednesday, March 18, 2026 @ 1:30 p.m.
Location: MAC General Offices, Legends conference room + Teams
NOC Meetings

NOC Winter Listening Session:
Wednesday, January 28, 2026 @ 6:00 p.m.
Location: MAC General Offices, Legends conference room
Listening Session website