

**O’HARE NOISE COMPATIBILITY COMMISSION**

**Fly Quiet Committee**

**June 23, 2020**

**Zoom Teleconference**

**Approved Meeting Minutes**

The O’Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC) Fly Quiet Committee met via Zoom teleconferencing on Tuesday, June 23, 2020.

**Call to Order**

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

**Committee 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

Alderman Robert Dunn, Alternate, City of Elmhurst

Mr. Peter Bialek, Member, City of Chicago 39<sup>th</sup> Ward

Mayor Arlene Jezierny, Member, Village of Harwood Heights

Trustee Russell Klug, Alternate, Village of Schiller Park

Mr. Ernie Kosower, Alternate, City of Park Ridge

Mayor Nunzio Pulice, Alternate, City of Wood Dale

Mr. Dennis Ryan, Designee, Village of River Grove (Joined later)

Alderman Malcolm Chester, Designee, City of Des Plaines

**Invited Guests:**

Mr. Dan Dwyer, FAiR

Mr. Ron Seymour, Avion

Cynthia Schultz, JDA

**Staff and Consultants:**

O’Hare Noise Compatibility Commission Executive Director Jeanette Camacho; Chicago Department of Aviation Staff, Mr. Aaron Frame; Landrum & Brown Consultant, Ryan Anderson; ONCC Consultants Maura El Metennani and Fran Guziel

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Summers moved, seconded by Mr. Kosower to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2020 Fly Quiet Committee Meeting. Motion carried by a roll call vote.

**Member Comments**

Mr. Icuss asked if the CDA had contacted the airlines regarding a shift in flight schedule for Fly Quiet shoulder hours.

Chair Annunzio said the committee did not have the answers to that question.

### **Alternative B Feedback Review**

CDA consultant Mr. Anderson reviewed committee member comments received on Fly Quiet Alternative B. CDA consultants and staff met with committee members to obtain their feedback on this alternative. The alternative included comments received thus far in the meetings. The plan features a 12-week rotation schedule with departure vector headings only, utilizing full airfield, 2 departure headings per configuration with 8 parallel weeks and 4 diagonal weeks. Comments received included:

- Generally in favor of alternating north and south airfield
- Generally in favor of 2 departure headings per runway
- Request that Full Length departures be the default and use Intersection Departures if there is an operational need
- Revise configuration schedule to avoid consecutive impacts
- Some say include RNAV; others say do not
- Concerns with departure impacts overlapping arrival impacts
- Concerns with utilization of crosswind runways
  - Less predictability
  - More operations on east/west runways
  - Long runway issue
    - Will a north airfield runway suffice?
    - Will the CDA be willing to close south airfield to force north airfield runway usage?
- Request to develop an alternative without the crosswind runways. He indicated this must be requested by the Committee as a whole due to the fact that one of the established criteria for the Committee, those runways are specifically identified to be included.

### **Fly Quiet 21 Potential Runway Configurations**

Mr. Anderson reviewed the 30 potential runway configurations that could be feasible for the future Fly Quiet program. There are 6 configurations used in Alternative B. The remaining 24 configurations included hybrids, which means they would have operations on both the north and south airfield. They also include the use of diagonal and parallel runways.

Configurations GG and HH were designated as visual only which would be an instrument landing for the pilot, but the tower would have to see the aircraft's approach because of converging flight paths. This would be a problem if the pilot wanted a go around or a missed approach. Weather conditions would allow the tower to see approaching aircraft.

In configurations JJ and MM were designated for a jet blast analysis which on departure might interfere with arriving aircraft. If the committee wants to include those configurations, a jet blast analysis would be required. A sample showed the blast speed contour and what mph speed would determine the

conflict. The analysis is not labor intensive, but would need FAA review if the Committee is interested in either of these configurations.

### **Discussion**

Ms. Schultz commented on Alternative B feedback and wanted to know if closing the south airfield when the north airfield is active, will the same be true for north runways when south runways are active.

Mr. Frame said he was waiting to hear from the FAA to learn if the north runways would be considered “long” runways.

Ms. Schultz said the hybrid configurations will need a long runway and it would be good to identify the appropriate long runway.

Mr. Dwyer and Mr. Kosower both expressed concern with the visual only approach and wanted to know if the primary consideration would be to the long runway. Again, the question of whether the north airfield runways would be considered as a long runway was raised.

Mr. Anderson responded that the FAA would not necessarily provide a definitive response, but would provide feedback and comments

Mr. Kosower felt it would be difficult for the committee to make decisions, especially with the diagonal runways, if the two north runways were used as long runways. He expressed concern that there would be traffic issues on the ground.

Ms. Robles thought that visual only would not be likely because of weather constraints and the committee should focus on predictability. GG and HH were problematic. She was also conflicted on jet blast issues and looked to CDA for guidance. In some cases, it would work but the preference should be full length runway. She referenced a previous presentation to the committee that looked at examples of other airports that used shorter runways comparable to the length of the north runways at O’Hare. If the aircraft can use those runways that aren’t as long as O’Hare’s north runways she doesn’t see why those couldn’t be used at O’Hare.

Alderman Dunn had reservations regarding intersection departures and configurations using visual only and jet blast.

Mayor Jezierny reminded members that safety is the number one criterion. Incorporating the diagonal runways with configurations with visual only and jet blast issues may not be safe.

### **Renaming Runway Configurations**

Mr. Frame recommended renaming runway configurations to use terminology that is accepted by industry standards. He referred to the proposed runway configurations and used for an example on the screen that “Q” is called “parallel west” but now would be called the “27s” which is specific to what is happening. “O” is called “parallel west” but should be called the “28s” while “P” is called “parallel east”

to the “9s” and “M” also called “parallel east to the “10s”. He said moving forward he would like the committee to adopt this nomenclature.

Mr. Anderson suggested as the committee moves forward to continue the momentum, CDA would like to introduce one or two new alternates. So, at a future meeting, CDA will be presenting an Alternative C and perhaps an Alternative D to the members for discussion with the intent of narrowing things down to a preferred alternative. He encouraged members to reach out with any ideas or feedback.

### **Discussion**

Mr. Dwyer pointed out the renaming of configurations may not apply to all configurations.

Mr. Frame explained the goal will be to refine the names as they get closer to the final roll out.

Mr. Kosower asked if the committee needed to take any formal action to receive determination from the FAA regarding the use of the north airfield runways as long runways.

Mr. Frame replied that the CDA would reengage the FAA on this subject and no action was needed by the committee.

Mr. Kosower asked what the process would be if the committee elects to eliminate the diagonal runways, would that require a formal vote?

Mr. Frame said that the committee would have to revise the committee’s Fly Quiet 21 criteria, specifically #2 which states that the plan should incorporate all available runways into a rotation schedule.

Chair Annunzio asked if the committee did elect to change the criteria, would it have to go back to the full membership for a vote? It was determined that it would require just a committee vote, since just the committee (not the full membership) voted on the criteria originally.

Mr. Kosower asked if the committee could take up this issue at another time.

Ms. Robles stated that it would be better to revisit the criteria sooner rather than later so the committee can move forward accordingly.

Mr. Summers supported tweaking Alternative B and pushing it forward because it works. He felt that the committee needed to resolve use of the north runways as long runways by getting a response from the FAA.

Mr. Frame stated that it would involve a joint discussion with the FAA, the CDA, and the airline partners.

Mr. Summers wanted to ensure that the ONCC would be at the table or involved in that discussion.

Ms. Schultz concurred with Mr. Summers and requested that if the CDA does create Alternates C and D, the committee should see them before the August meeting. It should be discussed before it happens. She stated that Alternative B is simple, fair, and efficient and brings the most relief to residents.

Chair Annunzio observed that most members are on board with Alternative B, but he does not want to rush to a decision and does not want to leave any stone unturned. He wants to ensure that the process examines all of the potential options at our disposal, and provides opportunity for members to ask questions and make sure everything is fully vetted.

Mr. Summers said we can analyze all we want, but we are not giving residents relief.

Mr. Seymour said the airlines will make the final decision about use of the north runways not the FAA, and suggested that the CDA talk to them. If they can make an 11,000-ft. runway work and the FAA wants to keep the 13,000-ft. runway open just in case, then go to the airlines.

Mayor Pulice disagreed with removing diagonals; talk of eliminating runways now would be moving backwards. He said it should be a collaborative effort to disperse the noise throughout the entire area. The discussion continued on regarding safety issues with the diagonal runways and if diagonals are eliminated it should be a collaborative effort.

Chair Annunzio recommended members talk to each other to discuss their positions.

Mr. Summers reminded the committee that Alternative B was presented two years ago, and expressed frustration with the timeframe. He wanted the committee to move toward a decision.

Mr. Seymour said O'Hare is not the only airport with crossing runways, there are airports all over the world with crossing runways and it works fine. He said you can't go into this thinking that just because there are crossing runways it's not going to work.

Mr. Frame said O'Hare has had diagonal runways since 1940s . While the OMP looks to reduce the number of intersecting runways, it is not eliminating them – some weather conditions necessitate the use of crosswind runways.

### **Audience Comments**

Mr. Icuss observed that Alternative B looks good except for visual only and jet blast. He was concerned about offline meetings and felt it appeared as backroom deals to which Chair Annunzio said there was nothing wrong with two members discussing their views.

Trustee Klug stated that Schiller Park likes Alternative B but thought it was important to continue to look at options. thought that more options were good for everyone.

The next Fly Quiet Committee meeting will be held on August 20, 2020. The location TBD.

Mr. Kosower moved, and Mr. Summers seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried with a roll call vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:38 a.m.