

O'HARE NOISE COMPATIBILITY COMMISSION

Fly Quiet Committee

December 11, 2018

Café la Cave

2777 S. Mannheim Road, Des Plaines, IL

Approved Meeting Minutes

The O'Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC) Fly Quiet Committee met on December 11, 2018 in Chicago, IL.

Committee Chair Joseph Annunzio called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. ONCC staff recorded the meeting minutes.

The following committee members/representatives were PRESENT:

Mr. Evan Summers, Designee, Village of Bensenville
Technical Committee Chair Catherine Dunlap, Member, Chicago Ward 41
Alderman Malcom Chester, Alternate, City of Des Plaines
Chairman Joseph Annunzio, Designee, Village of Niles
Technical Committee Vice-Chair Dennis Ryan, Village of River Grove
Ms. Karen Robles, Designee, Village of Schaumburg
Trustee Russell Klug, Alternate, Village of Schiller Park
Mayor Nunzio Pulice, Member, City of Wood Dale
Alderman Bob Dunn, Alternate, City of Elmhurst

The following invited guests were also present:

Mr. Dan Dwyer, FAiR
Mr. Ron Seymour, Avion
Mr. Craig Burzych, JDA
Aaron Frame, CDA
Jeffrey Jackson, Landrum & Brown
Ryan Anderson, Landrum & Brown

The following members were absent:

Chicago 45th Ward
Harwood Heights

Meeting Minutes Approval – November 15, 2018

Mayor Pulice requested the minutes be corrected to reflect his statement that the "sound insulation program and contour didn't make sense."

Mr. Ryan moved to approve the November 15, 2018 meeting minutes. Ms. Robles seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by a unanimous voice vote.

ONCC Member Comments

None

FAA Presentation: Performance Based Navigation

FAA representatives were in attendance to present a report entitled, *An Overview of Departure Procedures to Consider for Noise Abatement*.

Guest speakers included: Beth White, FAA Senior Strategist for Public and Industry Engagement, and Bill Tracy, Air Traffic Manager—Chicago District, who is responsible for air traffic from Green Bay to South Bend to Champaign.

Ms. White began by stating that to develop and enhance community engagement, the FAA is focusing on lessons learned, and looking at what is working. She said ONCC is an example that they would like other roundtables to follow because it is well established and has worked successfully for many years. She mentioned inviting other airport community groups to observe how ONCC conducts itself because, as she said, it is the “gold standard.”

Ms. White highlighted the FAA’s process and practices used to modernize the use of the airspace to meet demands and changing technologies.

She compared airspace to a network of highways, but explained it was further complicated by factors such as wind, weather, obstacles in terrain and other air traffic. She described four types of procedures:

- Conventional - spreads traffic. Good for airports with a lot of demand and allows for dispersal for heavy departures
- Open Standard Instrument Departure (SID) - Uses an initial RNAV track, controller guidance for a portion of the flight path (dispersed area), paths become concentrated farther away from the airport
- RNAV – off the ground navigation - very precise immediately and can skip a waypoint. This is “the rail” which is very precise and very predictable.
- RNAV Vector SID - planes are giving heading, vector to join procedure farther in the distance.

Not every procedure works in every place. The terrain, weather, fleet mix and so many other factors come into play. Every different element is analyzed when deciding which procedure to use.

Safety is the priority taken when developing a new procedure.

- Safety
- Feasibility
- o Technical
- o Operational – airspace, demand

- o Environmental
- Airspace complexity
- Efficiency – how the aircraft can fly – depending on what the mix is, equipment
- Environmental - review
- Public Engagement – focus on enhancing this piece. Part of entire thought process of how to develop procedures and airspace changes.

The Design and Implementation Process is a well-defined, multi-step process that can take several years to complete depending on the complexity of the proposal and the level of environmental review required.

FAA representatives explained they could not rule out any options – they could only respond to a proposal.

Mayor Pulice asked if some options were not feasible could we know ahead of time. Mr. Tracy said if we put airplanes over places where they aren't flying today, we have to study that. But nothing is off the table. Ms. White said it is better for the FAA to react to a recommendation rather than answer ahead of time. Importance is discussing beforehand. Changing flight paths is a very big environmental lift, and the FAA would not speed through the process. Back and forth dialog is most important.

Mr. Summers asked if noise contours have been shrinking. If we are talking nighttime rotation, the noise contour would likely shift as concentration is diluted over more people. Where is the FAA on expanding noise contour vs. concentrating it?

Ms. White answered she could not comment on environmental analysis. Mr. Tracy replied that if the Commission came to them with a proposal, they would study it. They need feedback or a proposal to make comments. They cannot comment on hypotheticals.

Chairman Annunzio stated that if we do disperse the sound more, we will be shrinking the noise contour because it won't reach 65 DNL within such a large area.

Mr. Dwyer asked if any of the options reduced noise, or if any were more likely to create significant impacts.

Mr. Tracy replied that none would reduce noise because we won't be reducing flights. It may be more concentrated, but they would have to look at it. Mr. Dwyer asked if the Fly Quiet Committee did create an RNAV procedure, they would be creating a significant impact. Mr. Tracy replied that if you create an RNAV off the ground, the noise would be over the same spot all the time. Ms. White said to be careful of the terms – significant impact triggers certain types of environmental review. Just because something is an RNAV doesn't make it significant.

Ms. Robles asked Ms. White to elaborate on successes in Detroit and Cleveland.

Ms. Drouet responded. She said these situations involved the Metroplex concept, focusing on modernizing airspace over older airspace designs to bring safety and efficiency enhancements to the airspace. Some of the initial efforts did not go very well due to concerns from the public. Later initiatives focused much more on extensive community outreach, public meetings, workshops, meetings with community elected officials and staff and to see if anything they could do differently as they approached the design process. It is an important part of the process, because you can learn more about what might be a better solution; however, it does add to the timeframe.

Mr. Dwyer asked about the procedure. Are they expecting interim submittals throughout the process so we can have a better idea of what the end result might be? His concern was that if they pushed the plan forward without knowing the impacts, there are no brakes on the two-plus year review process.

Mr. Tracy replied that there is interaction, and he expects there to be back and forth dialog, but the FAA can't start the process until it receives a concrete proposal. Mr. Dwyer asked if an interim review was possible, where there may be room for alterations, but Mr. Tracy stated that depending on what the alterations were, it could trigger the process to start all over from the beginning.

Chairman Annunzio replied that that was why the Committee was so critical – only when we are informed can we make good decisions, to make sure what we are proposing will work.

Ms. Dunlap stated that in relation to Cleveland and Detroit, ONCC is in a very different situation. What we are doing is a smaller piece of what they accomplished there. Our shift was in 2005.

Ms. White responded that the difference isn't whether it is a Metroplex or PBN - it would be approached in very similar manner:

- All stakeholders at table,
- very deep dive conversations,
- technical groups,
- full understanding of need and purpose, and that drives design.

The engagement should be driven by what is the need and purpose, what are we trying to design, how do we work together to communicate that in the best way possible, that it is understood by all important people in the community so that in the end, we have success. The more informed we are, the more we have dialog, the better decisions we can make.

Ms. Robles asked about the FAA process behind the scenes to determine priority and how many other processes they are studying currently.

Ms. White replied that anyone can submit proposals to Gateway. There are currently 40,000 requests. They are currently going through each one to determine priorities –

one thing that would move a request up in priority is a proposal that is put forth by the ONCC, supported by the CDA and that has the support of the member communities. That will go farther and faster than most other requests – unified pieces with consensus would change how it is viewed.

Ms. Robles asked for airport examples of the procedures that the Committee could look at – ex RNAV, Vector SID, or SID – Ms. White said that the FAA would return with a response.

Follow Up on Operational Questions

Jeffrey Jackson of Landrum and Brown updated two operational questions posed by the Committee: How many runways can be open during Fly Quiet, and How many operations require a 13,000-ft. runway?

Mr. Jackson reviewed existing and future runway use and length. He presented data from January – October 2018 on arrivals and departures by region to help members understand where flights were coming from and going to. Then he highlighted each region looking at the previous runway rotation tests (Test 2 and 3) to see which runways were used according to region during the weeks that the 4/22s were the primary configurations. When the 4/22s were used as a pair, there were quite a few requests for a longer runway. When these two were used together, 10L had to remain open as well. New north runways (9R, 9C) will offer additional options. Despite the misconception that many overnight flights are traveling to and from far distances, most departures (60%) were domestic, and almost all arrivals were also domestic (81%).

Mr. Jackson stated that based on the data, a north runway could be included in the configuration. Runway 10L would still need to be available by special request. Regarding runway usage, as many as four runways could be open, if the 4/22s are in use. If 9C and 9R are both open, 10L would likely not be needed, so that configuration would only require three runways.

Mr. Dwyer asked about usage of north runways when the 4/22s are in use due to intersecting runways. Mr. Jackson replied that it could work if it was only open by special request but would have to be reviewed by FAA.

Mr. Summers clarified that pilots were not necessarily requesting 10L – it was the primary directed runway. They were directed to use 10L.

Ms. Robles said that the data provides significant opportunities for outreach. The data shows that a lot of aircraft can use the 10,000-ft. runway. There were cases where the 10L runway was not available due to construction or maintenance; they were able to make that work. With this data we can go to the airline, review the data and encourage them to partner with us to get better compliance.

Mr. Jackson stated that CDA has good contacts with airlines, airline representatives, but ONCC bringing the case will have better results.

Alderman Dunn stated that with the majority of departures and arrivals being domestic, the expectation of better compliance is valid. He asked if there was any data on fleet mix. Mr. Jackson said that the quarterly Fly Quiet reports presented at the Technical Committee meetings include a summary of flights on the most used arrival and departure runways based on air carrier, which indicates whether a flight is passenger or cargo. He said that there was a misconception that arrivals are coming from far distances, but the majority are more local, and they don't always need the longest runway. Even arrivals from Asia can land on a 10,000-ft. runway. Most arrivals would be able to land on the north runways. Departures are trickier, a lot of times we do get requests for the 13,000-ft. runway. The average of cargo flights to Asia during Fly Quiet was around three to six departures.

Ald. Chester asked if there were any restrictions on the age of the aircraft. Mr. Jackson said the restrictions were not based on age but on stage. Stage 1 and Stage 2 are no longer flying or have been hush-kitted. But we don't really have any still operating here. Everything we have operating here is originally manufactured at least as Stage 3 or above.

Ms. Dunlap said she was interested in figuring out if there was a way of delving into the thorny point of people wanting the longer runway, but not really needing it.

Mr. Jackson said it needs to be handled with the carrier through the Fly Quiet Committee. If the Committee sees an airline consistently asking for the 13,000-ft. runway and would outreach to the carrier to remind them of the program and follow up with them. Ms. Dunlap would like to pursue with the FAA to determine what kind of interaction they are having in these cases.

Mr. Jackson explained that requests come to the City and they make the determination if the airline can use the runway. They are communicating with the FAA, but the City makes the decision.

Mayor Pulice, as a member of SOC, requested that JDA be allowed to present an alternative at the February meeting.

Mr. Ryan asked about using north and south airfields at night, and if it was determined to be an issue at night because they were not visible from the main tower, and it was not expected that the north and south towers would be operational during overnight hours. Mr. Jackson replied that only the farthest north and farthest south runways were not visible – runways 9C and 9R were able to be used.

Mr. Dwyer said it was important to bring demand into the conversation. Even at 60 percent on the 4/22s, it really restricts the capacity of that configuration as is and taking into consideration how future demand will impact that configuration since it intersects two of the other runways you are trying to use. He said it would be a good idea to get a better grasp on this long term.

Comments from the Audience

Mr. Rapp said when the Fly Quiet program was first formed, it started with Fly Quiet I, Fly Quiet II, Fly Quiet III. The shoulder hours (I and III) when factored in, include almost 300 operations. These configurations are thrown out the window once you have an additional runway in the morning or in the evening. They talked about opportunities with departure procedures, He didn't see same opportunities with arrivals. With slightly more arrivals, you really need to look at that. Those are what wake people up in the shoulder hours. He said he hopes the FAA would be more forthright in what the limitations are with these flight procedures. There are some real restrictions and the FAA knows more than they are telling us right now. He also mentioned the north airfield and converging runway configurations will restrict some of the configurations that are being discussed. The Committee is advancing the noise footprint over communities that have not had noise at night. There is an environmental impact that is not being considered. There is a health impact to interrupted sleep patterns. He mentioned the federal study on climate change impact, and how airplane emissions impact climate change, how the excess of emissions over the airport. Nighttime emissions impact climate more than daytime. FAA is doing a disservice by distancing itself from the federal environmental report to satisfy the customer

Next Meeting

The next Fly Quiet Committee Meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 22 at the Chicago Department of Aviation Administration Building.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Robles and seconded by Mr. Evans.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:51 a.m.