

O’HARE NOISE COMPATIBILITY COMMISSION
Fly Quiet Committee
October 27, 2020
Zoom Teleconference
Approved Meeting Minutes

The O’Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC) Fly Quiet Committee met via Zoom teleconferencing on Tuesday, October 27 , 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

Committee Chair Joe Annunzio, 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
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
Alderman Malcolm Chester, Designee, City of Des Plaines
Mr. Peter Bialek, Member, Chicago Ward 39

Absent

Mayor Arlene Jezierny, Member, Village of Harwood Heights

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. Ryan moved, seconded by Mr. Summers to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2020 Fly Quiet Committee Meeting. Motion carried by a roll call vote.

Interim Fly Quiet Report—Weeks 29 through 33

Mr. Anderson reviewed the Interim Fly Quiet reports for weeks 29 through 33.

- **Week 29:** (east/west flow), 30 percent of operations in IFQ, start time 10:02 pm and stop time 6:40 am, 8:38 hours in Fly Quiet time. West wind 24 percent/east wind 76 percent.

- **Week 30:** (crosswind), 25 percent of operations in IFQ, start time 10:17pm and stop time 6:38 am, 8:21 hours in Fly Quiet time. West wind 100 percent.
- **Week 31:** (east/west flow), 86 percent of operations in IFQ, start time 10:02 pm and stop time 6:54 am, 8:52 hours in Fly Quiet time. West wind 93 percent/east wind 7 percent.
- **Week 32:** (crosswind), 36 percent of operations in IFQ, start time 10 pm and stop time 6:57 am, 8:57 hours in Fly Quiet time. West wind 58 percent/east wind 42 percent.
- **Week 33:** (east/west flow), 49 percent of operations in IFQ, start time 10 pm and stop time 6:49 am, 8:49 hours in Fly Quiet time. West wind 99 percent/east wind 1 percent. Crosswind runway used one day.

Discussion

Mr. Dwyer wanted to know how often the favorable winds were for crosswind runways and would that cause the committee not to use the crosswind runway.

Mr. Anderson said he will give the committee some feedback in the future.

Fly Quiet 21 Process

Mr. Anderson told the committee that the members were still in the Developing and Approving Alternatives stage of the process. He thought that today, the group could move on to the next step of the process which would be revise and review. The goal of the meeting today was to look at all the alternatives and try to narrow down to a preferred alternative.

Mr. Summers wanted to know if they were looking to achieve consensus to approve one or more alternatives today to which Mr. Annunzio thought that it might not be possible.

Mr. Summers wanted to know if the committee would be voting today.

Mr. Annunzio repeated that he thought it may not be possible, but he would ask for a motion followed by a discussion.

Mr. Frame recommended that the committee not vote on alternatives today because they would be seeing some of the alternatives for the first time.

Mr. Annunzio said the committee would leave the option open if the committee so chooses. He said if someone makes a motion and no one seconds the motion there is no vote.

Mr. Dwyer agreed with Mr. Frame to take the time to define the process by which alternatives would be selected. A matrix could be developed based on key priorities, and the committee could eliminate those alternatives that don't meet the priorities as opposed to making a quick decision on any of the alternatives.

Alderman Chester said he would be willing to make a motion at the appropriate time.

Mr. Summers said he thought the committee would be in a position today to eliminate some of the alternatives.

Mr. Anderson continued with what he envisioned was the path forward – for the committee to review the alternatives, and narrow them down to one, two, or three. From there, the committee can refine the preferred alternatives – through preferred headings, schedules, and review of feedback. Once refined, the committee can then select one preferred alternative to bring to the full commission for a vote.

Fly Quiet 21 Alternatives

Mr. Anderson continued the review by stating that since the last meeting there had been feedback from members to submit modifications to the existing alternatives presented in past meetings which were Alternatives A, B, C, D, E. The new submitted alternatives were named F, G, and H. One submission was rejected because it did not meet the criteria established by the Fly Quiet Committee.

Mr. Anderson reviewed Alternative B and said if it moves forward it will include refinements. It is a 12-week schedule with six runway rotation configurations. This alternative isolates the usage of the north or south airfield and features two vector headings per configuration. There are eight east/west runways and four crosswind runway configurations. The revised Alternative B added a designated long runway pairing based on the feedback from the FAA. The CDA color coded the configurations to better identify where they come up in the schedule. He noted some changes that had been made to the runway rotation schedule – naming each configuration and identifying the long runway for crosswind weeks.

Mr. Dwyer indicated his concern about weeks 3 and 6, that they switch airfields, and questioned how that would affect predictability.

Mr. Summers wanted to know if the CDA had a discussion with the airlines regarding the possibility of nighttime runway closures.

Mr. Anderson reported the CDA did have positive discussions internally and with airlines, and that they were making good progress. He said a vast majority of the operations could be accommodated on the north or south airfields. He said the discussions need to continue. If the program had weeks where the south airfield was closed, that could be supported, but they still need more discussions. He said that the initial discussions were positive.

Mr. Seymour asked for clarification with the long runway usage. He said committee discussion had focused on using the long runway for departures, he asked if arrivals would use the same or adjacent runway.

Mr. Anderson replied that there are not many operations and they did not see the need for arrivals or departures on different runways.

Mr. Seymour asked if the long runway would have the appropriate equipment for all conditions to which

Mr. Anderson said he was not sure if they would for all operations, it would be specific to the airline and equipment type, but that he could look into it.

Mr. Anderson continued with Alternative C, which was the same as Alternative B except it utilizes RNAV departure procedures for the crosswind runway configurations. He continued with Alternative D and said the major difference in this alternative is that it has arrivals on both the north and south airfield. It features a 12-week rotation schedule with 10 configurations using the full airfield with vector headings only. Alternative E would add RNAV for crosswind runway usage.

Mr. Anderson introduced the new Alternative F which had 6 configurations in a 6-week schedule. It used the full airfield and was vector headings only. There were four east/west runways and two crosswind runway weeks.

Mr. Summers said alternative F was a good candidate to reject.

Alternative F discussion followed with Mr. Dwyer explaining that there isn't any constraint for full runway departures for the south airfield, where all the prior alternatives featured alternating north and south airfields. He noted that although it is our hope to be able to use the airfield in this manner, the FAA language is "only when operationally necessary." Another consideration was minimizing population overlap, particularly with the south airfield, which does tend to get overutilized. Having full length runway will be important in future discussions not only with respect to altitude of departures, but where the planes will actually fly. He thinks it is important to keep full airfield in the discussion at least until we drill down deeper into headings.

Ms. Robles said that based on the Interim Fly Quiet reports, we know the winds are unpredictable. In this alternative, week one and week 2 are each other's alternatives, which could mean two weeks of noise impacts. She said the alternative looked good on paper, but in reality, significant weather impacts could result in two consecutive weeks of noise impacts given the limited rotation.

Mr. Dwyer argued that the secondary of week 1 is actually week 4, which does not change quadrants in the same way. They have not yet determined secondary configurations. The parallel runways mirror each other and if you strip out the headings you actually have Alternative F.

Ms. Robles replied that that was a departure from how secondary configurations had been handled previously, that it had been easy for air traffic to flip east/west, changing that would add to the workload for air traffic.

Mr. Anderson added to that to avoid the workload for the air traffic controllers, ideally you would have the same runway and not show the secondary. It may be too much to digest to get into as a refinement.

MOTION: Mr. Summers moved, and Ms. Robles seconded a motion to eliminate Alternative F.

Discussion: Mr. Seymour said that Alternative F builds on consecutive weeks, Weeks 4 and 5 are on the same parallel runways in the opposite direction which is too close. There will be a large portion of the population that will hear both of the operations because they are so close together. Week 4 and week 5 are consecutive impacts for two weeks.

Mr. Kosower concurred with Mr. Seymour and agreed with eliminating Alternative F.

Ms. Schultz echoed these reasons and said the alternative was unacceptable because it would not give relief to residents. They are not in support of north airfield weeks and south airfield weeks. They prefer isolating operations either to the north or the south.

Alderman Dunn said if you reduce the departures it would assist in removing the consecutive impact. He agrees that separating the north airfield and the south airfield is a benefit with consecutive impacts.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out the consecutive impacts from week 1 to week 2, and the proximity of runways – and noted Alternative B has the same situation. The alternative has the same impact on the north, south or full airfield usage. The long runway pairings in week 1 and 2 are good examples. If the runway is out of service, you have an adjacent runway in the same quadrant and can maintain predictability on arrivals. On 9C the adjacent runway is in the same quadrant. How you handle departure headings on the alternate runway which would also go back to the same quadrant. The key point is predictability, equity, and sustainability. He thinks there are key points on predictability that are being missed.

Mr. Kosower said it would be a benefit to know where the new proposals are coming from.

Mr. Anderson replied that they were not submitted by any single member; they were based on feedback from multiple sources.

Ms. Schultz said she wanted to comment on Mr. Dwyer's comments on Alternatives B and C. She recommended switching weeks 4 and 5 and weeks 10 and 11 to eliminate a consecutive impact to which

Mr. Dwyer said it should be drawn for simplicity to make it as clear as possible.

Mr. Summers said there was a motion on the floor.

Mr. Dunn asked how many new alternatives were going to be discussed. He thought it was premature to throw out any alternative until all are reviewed and wanted to vote against the motion.

Mr. Annunzio asked him if he wanted to table the motion to which Mr. Dunn said yes.

MOTION: Mr. Dunn moved, and Mr. Chester seconded the motion to table the motion on the floor to eliminate Alternative F until the other alternatives are discussed.

Roll Call:

Bensenville: No

City of Chicago 39th Ward: Yes

Des Plaines: Yes

Elmhurst: Yes

Harwood Heights: Absent

Niles: Yes

Park Ridge: No

River Grove: Yes

Schaumburg: No

Schiller Park: Yes

Wood Dale: No

Motion carried with six yes votes, four no votes and one absent.

Mr. Anderson continued with Alternative G which was a 12-week schedule with 8 runway configurations. It encompasses the full airfield; it is a hybrid alternative that rotates crosswind runways with east/west runways. It features vector headings only with eight east/west runways and four hybrid runways rotating east with west then alternate with hybrid rotating north to south. The hybrid may be limited.

Mr. Dwyer commented saying that the key point to all prior configurations is the crosswind weeks are not a mirror image of each other. In a twelve-week rotation, every third week you lose predictability. Residents want to see predictability in all weather conditions without having to know the wind direction. With GG, FF, and II, the crosswind weeks are mirror images, long runway designation does not change. What is the plan to handle the crosswind weeks given the low usage of the 4/22s to provide predictability?

Ms. Robles agreed and said Mr. Dwyer had a good point. What long runway would be used? We have to bear in mind that the solution should not be worse than the problem. She said that Bensenville, Wood Dale, and Park Ridge would have flight paths overlapping and the configurations do not accomplish geographic dispersion as well as some other alternatives. This would be problematic for some communities which would bear the brunt of consecutive impacts.

Mr. Dwyer said that visual does change since we have taken some of the long runway pairings and made them primary configurations. We and we are going to see same impacts in Alternative B. It is a valid discussion how we weight long runway usage in crosswind weeks. It weights things to the southwest and northeast quadrants. We should graphically show both primary or alternate requests.

Mr. Summers disagreed with Mr. Dwyer, saying that we are going to review and refine in the next steps.

Chairman Annunzio said it was Mr. Dwyer's opinion.

Alderman Chester said he would like to see the new alternatives tested because of low usage of the crosswind runways. He wants to see how it works for utilization; it could have an impact on Des Plaines.

Ms. Schultz said weeks 3 -6 the southern parallel communities will have 4 weeks of consistent use of 10L/28R which is unacceptable. Plus, the hybrids are complex and make more work for air traffic control and have converging runways. This is back stepping. These issues should have been put to bed a long time ago. Testing would take another year, a test rotation and another environmental study. From the SOC viewpoint, Alternatives F and G do not work.

Ms. Robles agreed. More tests are not an option - we have already tested a lot of this. It is time to take the information we learned and move forward. She said she understood that more refinement could be beneficial but it could make it more difficult to explain to the public. It should be easy to explain what we did and why we did it.

Mr. Dwyer, with regard to consecutive impact, said that the order of configurations is not intended to be finalized in this iteration. Just as Alternative B has gone through refinements, any of these configurations could benefit from the same process. Alternative G is getting hung up on lobes – Alternative B has the same issues it just hasn't been shown in this manner. Hybrid configurations received some of the highest utilization Test 1 had ground conflicts. There are issues with Alternative B that have not been resolved, as to what ground conflicts mean for utilization. The intent was not to have modeling and tests of all of these, but to allow L&B to follow their plan. Right now the process is backwards.

Mr. Anderson continued with Alternative H, a 16 -week schedule with 6 configurations isolating the north and the south airfields. It is vector headings only—two headings for crosswind runways and one heading for east-west weeks. There are eight east/west weeks and eight crosswind weeks.

Ms. Schultz said that in SOC's opinion, Alternative H it is the only configuration that meets all the criteria the committee voted on. Predictability is the most important factor. This keeps things simple. It alternates between north/south and east/west. It offers isolated operations on one side of the airfield when maintenance occurs throughout the night. It has one vector heading to offset the arrival stream. The alternate long runway rotates from north to south in consecutive weeks giving complete relief. CDA is not recognizing consecutive week impacts over arrivals , so if it is not a consideration in Alternatives D and E, it should not be considered a consecutive impact here..

Mr. Dwyer wanted to know why weeks are repeated twice.

Mr. Anderson said that by pulling out to 16 weeks it allowed for more dispersion with east/west flow and the crosswinds.

Mr. Dwyer said there would be consecutive impacts without enough separation between the two airfields occurs in weeks 1 and 2 as well as in some of the others. When you duplicate the crosswind weeks, you are loading up the southwest and northeast quadrant in consecutive weeks and have lost predictability. Every time the wind shifts and so does the predictability. This alternative is unacceptable from the standpoint of overutilization of single corridors. This does not take advantage of departure dispersion. A 10- degree turn as opposed to a 25 degree does not disperse the noise. This is concentrating noise over multiple areas – he sees this as a complete step backwards.

Alderman Chester said the problem is that this is going backwards. You have four long and two crosswind runways. We want 50 percent on two runways. It seems like an east/west attempt and does not make any sense. He is strongly opposed to this alternative.

Mr. Seymour said that weeks 11 and 12 have consecutive impacts with people being under arrival and departure streams – he said these could be rearranged to avoid that but then it becomes Alternative B or C.

Ms. Schultz said the second eight weeks would employ a second heading.

Alderman Dunn, following up on Alderman Chester's comment, that this is consistent with the premise of Fly Quiet premise of not having consecutive impacts. This falls well short of that.

Ms. Schultz said she sensed strong negativity for this alternative – from a point of fairness – the north and south parallel communities have the same consecutive impact over arrivals exists in Alternatives D and E. If H is eliminated on that basis, she would also recommend eliminating Alternatives D and E.

Mr. Anderson reviewed the Fly Quiet 21 criteria and evaluation matrix. He asked how the committee wished to go forward – they could continue to pare down the alternatives to better meet the criteria.

Mr. Dwyer thought that would be a good launching point to determine which alternatives move forward. Everything meets the criteria, just to different extents. He thought it would be helpful to defines key benchmarks and move on from there. One example is the quadrant rotation if that is the preference – look at each alternative to see if it meets that priority. Only D and E are not quadrant rotations. The comments expressed today are valid, but there is a process to get to narrowing down the alternatives. It would be premature to vote anything down before we go through that process.

MOTION: Mr. Summers moved, and Ms. Robles seconded the motion to eliminate Alternatives D, E, F and G from consideration and future discussion.

Discussion

Mr. Frame requested a clarification as to why the committee was voting to eliminate Alternatives D, E, F, and G so he would be able to submit the reasoning to the FAA. He asked that before the vote is taken, it be clearly delineated why these alternatives are being eliminated.

Mr. Summers replied that Alternatives D and E utilize a split airfield which he does not support as they create inherent confusion. Alternatives F and G do not have enough dispersion and he does not sense they have support from the committee members.

Mr. Dwyer agreed with elimination of D and E as they did not support the quadrant rotation. He did not feel that there was enough consideration on F and G, and that they were not allowed to go to the next level of analysis by L & B. If we are eliminating these alternatives based on this meeting, then he would also eliminate Alternative H because it achieved the least amount of noise dispersion.

Roll Call to Eliminate Alternatives D, E, F and G:

Bensenville: Yes

City of Chicago 39th Ward: No

Des Plaines: No

Elmhurst: No

Harwood Heights: Absent

Niles: Yes

Park Ridge: Yes

River Grove: No

Schaumburg: Yes

Schiller Park: Yes

Wood Dale: Yes

The motion carried by six yes votes, four no votes, one absent.

After the vote Mr. Summers asked if Alternatives B, C and H be refined and approved.

Mr. Dwyer said he agreed in all but thought it was unfortunate that this vote created unnecessary division among the members of the committee. He was encouraged by the plan of L&B to get to a decision point, he thinks this was premature, and this division reflects poorly to put a plan in place. He does not see anything that was gained on the timeline by eliminating these alternatives. It is not encouraging for the FAA as far as community buy-in when they see this number of no votes. We should be looking at the nuances of the alternatives. What will take more time is if we have to revisit things we have eliminated.

Alderman Dunn agreed with Mr. Dwyer because it was the first time the committee saw all the alternatives and to weigh, evaluate, and be diligent to see for just 30 minutes and throw out four options, is not good practice. He questioned members who would agree to do that.

Mr. Annunzio announced the next Fly Quiet Committee Meeting would be held on Tuesday, December 8, 2020 at 9:30 am via Zoom teleconferencing.

Member Comments

Mr. Icuss said at a prior Technical Committee Meeting, airfield changes indicated that Runway 22R/4L would not be used for departures to which Mr. Anderson explained that in Alternative H no arrivals are coming from the southwest or departures to the southwest. The prohibition is on overflying the airfield, which for safety was never really done, the FAA put it on paper that the runway would not be used for arrivals in that manner. No configurations would utilize that runway in that manner.

Mr. Icuss continued to push for the CDA to require assertive management and change the amount of operations at night since during COVID 19 operations are down and it is quiet.

Mr. Seymour had a question regarding documentation that goes to the FAA. He asked if the documents would reflect when the packets were sent out to the members. He noted that committee members had several days to review and discuss the materials. He does not want the record to reflect that members only had a few minutes to make a judgement.

Audience Comments

Ms. Suzanne Carbon said she was angry about how the meeting was railroaded. Alternative C, which includes RNAV, there needs to be extensive outreach to affected residents. The corridors on Alternative C have a large population. She does not feel that the City or the alderman have stood up for the population. The east-west runways are bearing the brunt. The corridors are sensitive to environmental justice considerations. She wishes that we would have had a more thorough discussion. If we cannot afford to discuss right now how are we going to afford to do it twice.

Mr. Dwyer in response to Mr. Seymour said that while materials were available, the discussion is essential to understanding the materials. Not everyone has the aviation expertise to review materials prior to the meeting and the ability to ask questions. This was a rushed process, putting specific communities at a disadvantage, agreeing with Alderman Dunn that it was inappropriate.

Adjournment

Ms. Ryan moved, and Ms. Robles seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried with a roll call vote. The meeting adjourned at 11:18 a.m.