

O'HARE NOISE COMPATIBILITY COMMISSION
Fly Quiet Committee
February 25, 2020
Chicago Department of Aviation Administration Building
10510 W. Zemke Road, Chicago, IL
Approved Meeting Minutes

The O'Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC) Fly Quiet Committee met on February 25, 2020 at Chicago Department of Aviation Administration Building 10510 W. Zemke Road, Chicago, IL.

Call to Order

Committee Chair Joe Annunzio called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. ONCC staff recorded the meeting minutes.

Members Present:

Mr. Joe Annunzio, Fly Quiet Committee Chair, Designee, Village of Niles
Ms. Karyn Robles, Fly Quiet Committee Vice-Chair, Designee, Village of Schaumburg
Mr. Evan Summers, Alternate, Village of Bensenville
Mr. James Grabowski, Alternate, City of Elmhurst
Mayor Arlene Jezierny, Member, Village of Harwood Heights
Trustee Russell Klug, Alternate, Village of Schiller Park
Mr. Ernie Kosower, Alternate, City of Park Ridge
Mr. Jeffrey Mermuys, Alternate, City of Wood Dale
Mr. Dennis Ryan, Designee, Village of River Grove

The following invited guests were also present:

Mr. Dan Dwyer, FAiR
Mr. Ron Seymour, Avion
Cynthia Schultz, JDA

Members Absent:

Absent: Des Plaines

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Ryan moved, seconded by Ms. Robles to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2020 Fly Quiet Committee Meeting. Motion carried.

Opening Statement from Chair

Committee Chair Joe Annunzio encouraged the Committee to continue making progress towards the FQ 21 plan, and urged them to begin to coalesce around solutions. He reviewed that there are 3 main elements under consideration for FQ21: Runway Configurations, Departure Headings, and determining RNAV v Vector Headings.

Chairman Annunzio announced that after several months of examining departure concepts, the Committee would be re-engaging in discussions regarding runway rotation configurations. He explained that determining runway configurations has been the missing puzzle piece of the Fly Quiet 21 plan. He said that the Committee needed to determine what configurations they will be using before they can make decisions regarding departure concepts.

Interim Fly Quiet Reports - Weeks 12-15

CDA consultants reviewed IFQ Reports for weeks 12-15. Mr. Anderson stated that the reports are posted weekly to the O'Hare website, flychicago.com.

- Week 12 (January 19, 2020) a diagonal week. There was poor utilization of the diagonal runways (21 percent) due to weather issues. Winds were predominantly in west flow that week.
- Week 13 (January 26, 2020) a parallel week. Arrivals on 27L, Departures on 28C. Fifty-two percent of operations used designated runways.
- Week 14 (February 2, 2020) a diagonal week – Thirty percent utilization due to weather and FAA maintenance on navigational aids. Evenly split on winds, east flow v west flow.
- Week 15 (February 9, 2020) a parallel week – Arrivals 28C, Departures 28R. Sixty-six percent utilization of designated runways. Weather and construction activities that took place impacting usage.

Mr. Summers asked about the low usage on the parallel runways.

Mr. Anderson replied that if there was snow, runways would have to be closed for snow removal and traffic pushed to another runway. Typically, they will be moved to 27L for arrivals, departures on 22L or 28C.

Mr. Summers asked if any progress had been made in communicating with the tower to determine the reason for low usage of diagonal runways the weeks they are in rotation. He asked if it was all related to weather.

Mr. Jackson noted that if the airlines know the long runway is open, they request to use it and FAA will not turn down pilot requests.

Mr. Summers asked what is being done to improve this.

Mr. Jackson replied that ONCC could do outreach to the airlines. He suggested compiling a list of airlines who are not complying with the preferred runways and communicating with them.

Mr. Summers requested that the outreach be conducted as soon as possible.

Chairman Annunzio suggested that the matter could be taken up by the Technical Committee.

Mr. Anderson said that a report was being prepared for the next Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Dwyer asked if compliance is less on arrivals or departures.

Mr. Jackson replied that Landrum & Brown (L & B) would compile that information.

Mr. Kosower asked for the data regarding how many planes are landing and departing from Runway 10C/28C.

Mr. Anderson reported that L & B would be providing a summer construction update at the next ONCC General Meeting. The Interim Fly Quiet program will pause during this time for construction on 4R/22L. IFQ will return in the fall.

Fly Quiet 21

Process Review

Mr. Anderson reviewed where the Committee stands in the process, which is at the *Developing Alternatives* stage. Thus far the Committee has discussed runway configurations and departure procedures. The Committee has reached a point in departure procedures where they need to pivot back

to runway configurations. The Committee needs to determine which runways will be used before they can decide on departure procedures. L & B has rough alternatives ready to present at the next FQ meeting, but needs to get feedback on RNAV departures, and whether or not to pursue this alternative. The Committee needs to determine if they want RNAV departure procedures included in alternatives.

RNAV Departure Procedures

All aircraft are flying the same procedure the same way so there is a much higher concentration of aircraft flights over a specific line. The “pro” is that it can be developed so that the line is over a compatible land area – river, road, highway, forest preserve, industrial area. The “con” is that there are still residents in the area that will be impacted, and it is a much higher concentration of air traffic than dispersion.

Mr. Anderson reviewed examples of airports that have implemented RNAV procedures. These included Boston Logan International Airport and Denver International Airport. He shared with the Committee what an RNAV departure concept would look like for 4L departures and 22L departures.

Mayor Jezierny asked at what altitude the plane in the model begins to turn.

Mr. Anderson replied that it would be 2,000 feet or higher.

Mr. Dwyer asked what happens at the end of the track – do the planes revert to vector headings?

Mr. Anderson said it depends on how the procedure is developed. Typically, once the aircraft reaches the desired altitude, Air Traffic gives them a heading or waypoint.

Mr. Dwyer asked if the turning point would also be concentrated.

Mr. Jackson replied that they needed feedback from the Committee if they want to pursue this option further to develop the concept and be able to answer some of these questions.

Ms. Robles referred back to a previous airport example and asked what their experience has been, wondering if the impact is just being moved further down the path.

Mr. Anderson responded that generally RNAV is implemented more for efficiency purposes rather than noise abatement. He said he was aware of a flight track at Boston Logan being implemented for noise, but was not sure what the community’s reaction was. He is aware in these examples of concern from people farther out having increased concentration of aircraft they had not previously experienced, and it was a negative experience for those communities.

Mr. Summers asked if any community had a positive experience with RNAV. In his research, it seemed that the response was generally negative.

Mr. Jackson said that many airports are using RNAV, but he was not certain of overall community sentiment.

Mr. Summers stated that O’Hare was a unique situation in that the area around the airport is very densely populated. He stated that it is a dangerous thing that the Committee is about to consider.

Mr. Seymour asked about the difference between RNAV and PBN, and what were the examples.

Mr. Anderson said that both examples provided were RNAV.

Mr. Jackson explained that they are similar types of procedures that are done or implemented in different ways. He said that how it would be done at O’Hare doesn’t have to look like either example.

Mr. Seymour said that within PBN you can get down to within 100 feet of the spread.

Mr. Jackson said they are not certain at this point, they could try one, but it may not meet FAA standards, so we would have to go down a different path. That is why they are asking the Committee whether or not they support pursuing this option further with the FAA.

Mr. Kosower asked if in the examples RNAV is used only at night or if it is used during the day as well.

Mr. Jackson said it is generally used during the day.

Mr. Kosower asked for confirmation that utilizing RNAV during the day would bring O'Hare to a crawl.

Mr. Anderson confirmed this but said this is not what is being proposed – it is being proposed for use at night.

Mr. Dwyer asked what the RNAV discussion would consider. Would it just be operational or would it consider noise the impacts.

Mr. Jackson said that CDA is trying to develop a suite of ideas for the Committee to consider. They just need to know if the Committee wants RNAV included as an option in the alternatives.

Mr. Summers asked who initiated the effort to implement RNAV in the examples from other airports.

Mr. Jackson replied that it was usually initiated by the airport, FAA, and airlines; it was usually for efficiency purposes.

Mr. Summers asked if anyone has discussed this with the airlines and if they had any interest.

Mr. Jackson replied no.

Mr. Summers asked if including RNAV would increase the length of review time by the FAA.

Mr. Jackson replied that it was very difficult to determine, but could not say if it could be extended and for how much time.

Mr. Kosower asked if the intent was to look at RNAV just on the diagonals? CDA consultants replied that was up to the Committee.

Mr. Kosower asked if it made sense to determine first if the diagonals were going to be used?

Mr. Anderson stated that it was in the Committee's criteria that all available runways should be used.

Trustee Klug asked how many other airports across the country have Fly Quiet programs at night?

CDA consultants replied that many airports have a nighttime noise abatement program. But very few have RNAV nighttime departure procedure. Even fewer (maybe none) have implementation of RNAV procedure initiated by community group. Trustee Klug suggested determining what other airports are using that works.

Mayor Jezierny asked if FAA would allow a testing period.

Mr. Jackson said it was not something they had envisioned as part of the process, but they could ask.

Mr. Summers stated that Mr. Kosower's point was important. The diagonal runways are not working as intended. Does it make sense to go down this path if those runways can't be reliably used? Especially if including the procedure could potentially slow down the approval process. He said that before the Committee can consider, it needs to be determined whether or not the diagonal runways can realistically be used. He said that 21 percent utilization is unacceptable.

Ms. Robles agreed to some extent, but asked at what point is 21 percent not on parallels better than 0 percent.

Mr. Summers said that was why he wanted to see which runways those flights were going to. If they are being equally distributed to other runways, that's one thing, but if burden is all being shifted to one runway then that is not a solution.

Ms. Robles stated that she had concerns about RNAV and felt that it deviates from the initial goal of spreading noise out geographically; concentrated noise could have unintended consequences in the future. She stated that she doesn't think there are compatible land uses on any of the parallel runways that would merit further discussion of using RNAV on those runways.

Ms. Robles made a motion that the Committee request that the CDA continue to investigate and provide additional in-depth information on implementation, or RNAV on the diagonal runways only.

Mr. Ryan seconded the motion.

Mr. Summers made a motion to table the motion until the Technical Committee has the opportunity to investigate the use of diagonal runways.

Mr. Kosower seconded that motion.

Ms. Schultz asked about tabling the motion then moving the discussion to the Technical Committee. She stated that her understanding of the goals of the committee was to use all of the available runways.

Mr. Summers clarified that the intent of the Technical Committee discussion was to ensure that the diagonals are better utilized.

Ms. Schultz stated that JDA's recommendation was to also use a long parallel runway when the diagonals are in use.

Roll Call vote to table the motion

Bensenville – yes

39th Ward – yes

Des Plaines – absent

Elmhurst – No

Harwood Heights – No

Niles – No

Park Ridge – yes

River Grove – yes

Schaumburg - yes

Schiller Park - yes

Wood Dale – yes

Motion carried. The motion was tabled.

Chairman Annunzio asked Mr. Summers to provide a report on the Technical Committee meeting and their discussion on IFQ runway utilization at the next Fly Quiet Committee meeting.

Preferential Runway Configurations

CDA consultants had previously presented a series of runway configurations to the Committee for consideration. Now that north airfield operations have been determined to be allowed by the FAA, it is now possible to move forward with making decisions on runways.

The Committee reviewed configurations currently in use for the Interim Fly Quiet program.

Mr. Anderson showed examples for split airfield – rotating between north and south airfields.

The Committee reviewed Preferential Runway Configurations.

Mr. Anderson indicated that the FAA expressed concern with hybrids (combination of diagonal and parallel) which may require further analysis with regard to jet blast because the departure runway is close to the arrival runway. Some configurations were visual only – weather conditions have to be good for these certain configuration – missed approach may be issue. The idea is to find which configurations would be suitable for preferential runways for a new Fly Quiet program, considering how they may work if we are still pursuing a runway rotation schedule.

Chairman Annunzio suggested that if members have specific questions about configurations, they should schedule one-on-one meetings with CDA.

Mr. Dwyer asked if removal of intersecting departure constraint is finalized. Mr. Jackson responded they are still waiting for additional feedback from FAA.

Mayor Jezierny asked why 4L/22R is being utilized but 4R/22L is not.

Mr. Anderson explained that the second diagonal fully intersects the two parallel runways, so its use is constrained. If it was included as an option with a north parallel runway, that would be a problem.

Ms. Schultz recommended a simple rotation plan as opposed to a more complex plan. She said once the north and south airfields are open and there are arrivals on one runway and departures on another runway, pilots are going to request the arrivals on the departure runway because they will know it is open. This may be eliminating the relief we are trying to gain if we try to use both sides of the airfield at the same time. Rather, by coupling the parallels and using them in the manner they were designed to be used, split between north and south airfield, may be more likely to gain complete relief for certain populations in certain weeks.

Chairman Annunzio noted that there were some clear decisions that needed to be made by the Committee. Should diagonals be used, and should the plan include a split airfield concept (north/south).

Mr. Dwyer noted that utilization of 22L as an arrival runway would be the only circumstance where there would be crossing arrival paths (27L or 27C).

Ms. Robles noted that the probability of successful use of the “visual only” options was probably low. She asked if that was a viable option.

Mr. Anderson explained that “visual only” is viable a good portion of the time. The fact that it is a diagonal, drives down utilization further.

Mr. Seymour asked about diagonal use with an intersecting parallel runway. If departing off north diagonal, can a northern parallel not be an option?

Mr. Jackson replied that they were not sure. Mr. Anderson stated the third runway option is something they can get to, but first need to determine primary and secondary.

Mr. Anderson explained that these concepts were for the Committee to consider. If anyone was interested, they were encouraged to schedule meetings for further discussion. Technical Committee will further investigate use of the diagonal runways and bring that information back to the next Fly Quiet Committee, and possibly have a vote at the next meeting.

Mayor Jezierny stated if that was the case, and the diagonals were ruled out, the Committee could move to north/south airfield split.

Ms. Schultz said it was important to remember that the diagonals are only going to be used for the fleet mix they are designed to be used for. She said that JDA was an advocate for using a third runway with the diagonals so you can direct where that traffic goes. JDA also advocates using all available runways.

The next meeting of the Fly Quiet Committee is scheduled for March 24, 2020, 9:30am.

Comments from the Audience

Mr. Frank Icuss suggested that the CDA limit the number of nighttime flights during Fly Quiet hours. He said there was nothing predictable with any of these concepts – cannot predict a certain amount of noise or uninterrupted sleep. If the flights were limited, it wouldn't matter which runways were used.

Mr. Jackson offered to meet with Mr. Icuss to discuss further.

Mr. Anderson explained that what Mr. Icuss was recommending was against a federal act. The city is not permitted to restrict demand at night.

Adjournment

Mr. Ryan moved, seconded by Mr. Summers to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 a.m. Motion carried.