

O’HARE NOISE COMPATIBILITY COMMISSION
Fly Quiet Committee
August 20, 2020
Zoom Teleconference
Approved Meeting Minutes

The O’Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC) Fly Quiet Committee met via Zoom teleconferencing on Thursday August 20, 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
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
Mr. Peter Bialek, Chicago Ward 39

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

MS. Robles moved, seconded by Mr. Kosower to approve the minutes of the June 23, 2020 Fly Quiet Committee Meeting. Motion carried by a roll call vote.

Member comments

None

Interim Fly Quiet

Mr. Anderson announced that the IFQ restarts in September.

Mr. Frame said it begins on Sunday, September 13 and the CDA is working on a draft calendar for weeks 29 through 48. It is circulating now within the CDA, and CDA will coordinate with the FAA there is no planned work. The calendar should be finished within a week. He will release the approved calendar to the ONCC. The IFQ is scheduled to run until the end of January 2021.

FAA Response to Long Runways

The FAA responded in writing to a request from the ONCC regarding use of Runway 9C/27C or extended Runway 9R/27L as a long runway when the crosswind runway configurations are in use for FQ21.

Mr. Anderson told members that he would like to discuss the letter from the FAA in more detail, including how the FAA recommendation would affect configurations and how to make them fit in the alternatives at the next Committee meeting to be held in September..

Chairman Annunzio said it was okay to wait until the next meeting and wanted to know if the CDA had talked to the airlines.

Mr. Anderson said the CDA intends to reach out to the airlines.

Mr. Summers thought the letter did not say no, but that the FAA wants restrictions.

Mr. Anderson said one crosswind runway would cause complications for the 9C runways. There were some safety concerns.

Chairman Annunzio wanted to remind them it was not a no answer but did not want to wait six to eight weeks to get another request.

Mr. Anderson said they have to work within limits. The CDA is the landlord working a safe and efficient way is the perspective of air traffic control it is not all on the FAA there are many involved.

Mr. Summers said that he believed the FAA response was more positive than past letters.

Mr. Anderson said there is active communication going on behind the scenes and when there is more feedback he will get back to the committee.

Fly Quiet Alternatives

Mr. Anderson said CDA is expanding the alternatives, based on member feedback, to deliberate the pros and cons of different scenarios. He reviewed the process to develop alternates phase, and said the committee was close to reviewing and revising alternatives. This will lead to the committee

recommending alternatives to the full commission and the CDA to forwarding the plan to the FAA for approval and implementation.

He reviewed the pyramid chart and said that the committee should take the process one step at a time. RNAV is still a consideration and they would develop those procedures. It meets the needs of what committee members want to accomplish; they are working with the FAA on those procedures.

Fly Quiet Components

Mr. Anderson reviewed the Fly Quiet Components which include: configurations, arrival runways, departure procedures, departure profiles, ground movement and stakeholder coordination. How well is the program able to be communicated to all stakeholders? Is it easily understood and accepted by all parties as feasible?

Mr. Anderson reviewed Fly Quiet Assumptions in the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT). It is in LMAX noise contour for visual aid. The aircraft used is a 737-800 which is the most frequently used aircraft during Fly Quiet mode at O'Hare. He presented LMAX contours for three aircraft: 747-800, 737-800, and the CRJ200. The 737-800 is the most common aircraft type, is middle of the road and is a good model. We are not quantifying any impacts at this point with any of these procedures; we are deliberating the concepts as a whole. Quantifying impacts is something we will do at a later time in much more detail the model. We will have more consideration of what types of aircraft will be used and impacts in the model.

Alternative B

Mr. Anderson said this alternative was well received and there were five major characteristics on the chart. It was a 12-week runway rotation with 6 configurations; the north and south airfields would run independently of each other from week to week. This alternative features vector headings only; there are two vector headings per configuration. There were eight east/ west weeks and four crosswind weeks.

Alternative C

Mr. Anderson reminded the committee that Alternative A was to revert back to the current Fly Quiet runway plan and do nothing when the modernization of runways was completed.

Mr. Anderson reviewed Alt. C, a new alternative that incorporates the RNAV procedure for departures in configurations L or I on crosswind runways. The configuration schedule would remain the same as Alt. B, except that on the crosswind weeks, RNAV procedures would be in place for departures. Again, it was a six-week schedule the departures would fly over land-use areas such as the tollways and industrial parks. He repeated it was the same as Alt. B only introducing RNAV at cross wind runways.

Mr. Summers asked if Alternatives B and C could be adopted on the same timeline or if the addition of added time to the adoption.

Mr. Frame explained that more complexity requires more review, so yes it would likely take longer to gain approval for RNAV due to the increased complexity. Mr. Summers asked if RNAV could be added at a later date?

Mr. Frame said it would have to be included in the plan – they could not do separate environmental reviews and would add a different kind of complexity.

Mr. Dwyer asked about the runway heading departure shown in the Alt. C summary slide.

Mr. Anderson responded that was an error and they would revise.

Mr. Dwyer recommended that all 0 and 10 degree headings be eliminated to avoid overlap with arrivals. He hopes the committee will consider overlapping with arrivals.

Mr. Frame said he believed there was room for cleanup in the next stage of the process.

Mr. Seymour said he did not think Alt. C needs its own separate alternative He said the committee should first decide which runways would be used go from there.

Alternative D

Mr. Anderson explained that both Alternatives B and C are more predicable. Alt. D is “more spread out” ...it is more complex and difficult to explain. There are ten configurations; eight are new and not used in B and C. . All ten configurations are rotated in a 12-week period, with the crosswind configurations being used twice with different headings. This alternative uses the full airfield; it uses runways on both the north and south airfields.. The headings make the largest turn at 25 degrees while other alternatives use 10 to 20 degrees using maximum turns. Since this alternative does not alternate north/south it alternates east/west. Mr. Anderson reviewed the rotation schedule.

Mr. Frame said in this alternative there would be the use of crosswind runways every third week.

Chairman Annunzio asked Mr. Summers how much relief his residents would get with this configuration.

Mr. Summers thought there could be relief with Runway 10L flying over the industrial area, as opposed to 10C. Mr. Summers asked if missed approaches with these configurations would interfere with Runway 28R departures?

Mr. Anderson thought it might interfere; it would have to be vetted. He looked at existing configurations at five degrees. In slide eight aircraft fly heading procedures which means it turns at the runway threshold and does not deviate.

Mr. Frame explained that if the procedure is used the departure cannot turn at runway threshold, they will have to go out straight before they make the turn. It may have to be tweaked.

Mr. Dwyer thought that Alt D from east/west could end up going in the wrong direction. Alt B gives the best predictability. In Alt. D, you are left breadcrumbs for the full length of runway departures. He would like to see full and split continue as part of the comparison.

Mr. Seymour said members should take into account that with the alternative D, depending on the wind, some people would be impacted on consecutive weeks. They would get relief in the crosswind weeks.

Ms. Schultz saw no relief to the north or south communities with this alternative. She said there are air traffic implications with this alternative are counterproductive. She said when we split the airfield, it requires one air traffic controller to be focused on the north airfield and one on the south. We limit their ability to use other procedures to manage noise. Another issue is missed approach. If they have to add delays, that add to air traffic controllers' workload. She strongly discourages use of the split airfield concept – it does not provide relief.

Alderman Dunn likes the split airfield concept for the relieve that it provides. He asked about missed approach during the day vs. night. Is it more of an issue at night?

Mr. Anderson said there have not been issue with missed approach up to this point. The FAA will let us know if any of these configurations paired with headings present an issue. At this point, we do not have that information. During the day there are many runways being used for arrivals and departures with departures turning to various headings, but he will leave it to air traffic and the FAA to determine if there is a missed approach concern.

Alderman Dunn concurred with Ms. Schultz that the split airfield keeps air traffic better focused.

Mr. Anderson said that is how the airfield works today and it is not a foreign concept.

Mr. Dwyer clarified that he is not recommending Alt. D specifically, that they want the concepts to continue. We are making assumptions about what the FAA has determined with split vs. full airfield - they wouldn't have given us the configurations if they didn't think it was a possibility. It is still important to advance concepts with an analysis of configurations to compare, not settle in to Alt. B without any alternatives to compare.

Trustee Klug said he did not see much relief for Schiller Park. Out of the 12 weeks, they would get four weeks of relief.

Mr. Frame asked what the difference was between 28R and 28C.

Trustee Klug stated that both runways went over schools and residential – the land use is essentially the same. They don't have a specific industrial only area.

Mayor Jezierny said she appreciated the multiple alternatives and liked the split airfield concept. She asked about tower operations and how that factors into the airfield use. She asked if the crosswind

runways are not sufficient for larger aircraft, will they use a longer runway on the north airfield or do they have to use a long runway on the south the airfield.

Mr. Anderson clarified that air traffic control is operating out of the central control tower, the north and south towers would not be staffed at night. They will have to see if a long runway can be paired with a crosswind runway on the north or south airfield. Based on the FAA's response, we may be able to do something like that. This topic will be discussed in more detail along with the intersection departure question at the next meeting. Hopefully based on those discussions, the committee can make some decisions to fit into a more refined alternative

Mayor Jezierny said she likes the RNAV alternatives that they would effect the least amount of people.

Ms. Schultz said it is big difference in manpower in the tower between day and night – there are only two controllers in the tower at night. There is a lot more going on at night, like maintenance and snow removal. This takes concentration away from the controllers. In the daytime there is more manpower. We shouldn't compare day to night in tower operations.

Mr. Icuss asked if there was a legal reason for the FAA to take a large portion of the 360 degrees potential direction use that are not used – to the northwest and southeast. He said a lot of areas overlap, and other areas that get no impact. Is there a reason they can't be used?

Chairman Annunzio stated that Mr. Icuss is not a member of the committee, his question will be addressed at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Dwyer said the alternating east/west flow puts some people in consecutive flight path.

Alternative E

Alternative E is the same as Alternative D, but incorporates the RNAV procedure on the crosswind departure runways.

Ms. Robles asked about RNAV in relationship to multiple alternatives going forward, with a preference for a preferred, but multiple alternatives will be recommended. She asked if we could refer to the same configurations until the RNAV procedures are approved or do we have to commit to RNAV and see how things go through the analysis?

Mr. Frame said she was asking for a phased approach on the initial phase. We could request this from the FAA but it would have to be built into the environmental review, and we would have to say how long we would use the initial phase. He did not think the FAA would do two environmental reviews. He did think it was practical to finish the environmental, approve it and still RNAV being analyzed. He does believe that RNAV will add time to the air traffic review, but he did not see an outcome where the plan is approved and then RNAV is phased in at a later date. He thinks the difference would be weeks or months. We can ask for phased approach, but it would have to go in the document.

Ms. Robles said she hated to have a longer more complex alternative to build in and take a fallback position so we don't end up with significant delays we did not anticipate. We can build in with the hope we will not need. Does not want to see something like a six-month delay that was not anticipated.

Mr. Frame said he would discuss with the FAA. He said it takes months to conduct the environmental review and air traffic review with RNAV, the goal would be to do it concurrently. The question is what is total review time for Alt. B vs. Alt. C – not sure at this point, it is something he can discuss with the FAA.

Mayor Pulice said looking at Alt. D and E, taking off to north going south and vice versa, it doesn't feel like we are giving the same relief if we were just using the north/ south airfield. He is leaning towards B and C vs. D and E.

Mr. Seymour clarified that there are multiple alternatives being submitted to the FAA to do their analysis. Does the FAA have to do complete environmental review on multiple alternatives? Just submit the preferred on multiple alternatives.

Mr. Frame said that the Commission needs to choose one alternative and a fallback. We need to narrow down all these alternatives down to two plans. He will ask the FAA offline what the outcome is that they need. Mr. Anderson said that they would come back to the Committee with clarification.

Mr. Frame said in presenting alternatives there are deliberations; these discussions will form the narrative for each alternative. This will be documented and included in the project record.

Mr. Annunzio suggested that if members had additional feedback or questions they can contact Ms. Camacho before the next meeting and schedule a one-on-one discussion.

Mr. Anderson said that he is happy to discuss with members individually.

Mr. Dwyer asked if there was still opportunity for additional alternatives.

Mr. Frame said they will look at additional alternatives if the committee wanted to pursue that but they would need clear direction. He believes this level of options is sufficient, but if the committee wants additional considerations, they will have to step up and be very specific on what components they would like to see.

Mr. Annunzio we have the basic outlines, they could be tweaked.

Mr. Dwyer said he wanted to know if there was an opportunity to combine alternatives.

Alderman Dunn believes that RNAV has merit and he favors that alternative at this point. Although it may require additional review, it's worth it to get it right.

Mayor Jezierny asked if the committee could ask FAA what kind of delay would be involved in the RNAV review since it is only be considered for two runways not all runways.

Mr. Frame encouraged the members not to use the term delay. RNAV will require additional analysis, there is an additional level of effort, more time is needed. RNAV is an additional feature and comes with additional analysis. If that is what the Commission wants, then more time is needed for research.

Mayor Pulice referred back to Alt B. he asked if two vector headings and an RNAV procedure could be included for the crosswind runways in one alternative. He wondered about the impact on the homes near RNAV and what the impact would be. He said the communities may prefer to have the headings.

Mr. Ryan reviewed the criteria and the evaluation matrix. For the September Meeting, he would like to focus on the intersection departure concept - what it means, the location and the comparisons. He would also like to discuss and the long runway considerations and feedback from FAA, as well as starting to discuss outreach to the airlines, their feedback and how do we incorporate a long runway consideration on those configurations where we have shorter runways like the crosswind configurations. Also, if CDA can get additional feedback on alternatives by October, so they can present more refined alternatives from feedback. The goal is to present the most feasible alternatives and refine them to get to a place where the committee is comfortable with an alternative we can move forward.

Audience Comments

Mr. Annunzio reminded participants that Commission members can ask questions at the beginning of the meeting during member comments. Commission members who are not committee members cannot ask questions during the meeting – only during member comments or audience comments.

Mr. Icuss asked about aircraft not taking off in certain directions and if there was a reason for this?

Mr. Anderson replied there are a number of restrictions and layers of air space, other considerations, conflicts - there are certain windows we can use to turn aircraft. The headings are starting points – we will get into much more refinement on. We can turn them in different areas, try to spread them out more, these are not set in stone.

Mr. Icuss said that the goal of the committee is to minimize overwhelming noise for any particular area at one time. He asked if flights go back to what they were normally, relief can come if the flights are spread out as if the flights are spread out as if the airport was open 25 hours without any runway prohibitions for maintenance or construction so not any one community will be exposed to all flights in any given night.

Mr. Annunzio reminded the committee members to contact Ms. Camacho with any questions they may have.

Next Meeting

The next Fly Quiet Committee Meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 22, 2020 via Zoom.

Adjournment

Ms. Ryan moved, and Mr. Kosower seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried with a roll call vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.