

O’HARE NOISE COMPATIBILITY COMMISSION
Fly Quiet Committee
February 25, 2021
Zoom Teleconference
Approved Meeting Minutes

The O’Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC) Fly Quiet Committee met via Zoom teleconferencing on Thursday, February 25, 2021.

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

Mr. Mermuys, Alternate, City of Wood Dale

Mr. Dennis Ryan, Designee, Village of River Grove

Alderman Malcolm Chester, Designee, City of Des Plaines

Absent:

Mr. Bialek, Member, 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

MOTION: Trustee Klug moved, and Mr. Kosower seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2020 Fly Quiet Committee Meeting. The motion carried by a roll call vote.

Opening Remarks

Before he asked for comments from ONCC members, Chairman Annunzio thanked the Chicago Department of Aviation and their consultants Landrum & Brown for their guidance and expertise leading up to the advancement of Alternatives B and H.

He commended L&B's easy-to-follow charts and illustrations of a complicated process and said that the graphics have been an invaluable working tool for committee members to weigh their options.

He thanked the consultants and said that they had been helpful. He also thanked the committee and recognized their commitment to all citizens who have been affected by nighttime aircraft noise.

He said that the selected alternatives will need refinements and said to remember that There are still alternatives in our "shopping cart" and we have not pushed the "purchase button" just yet.

He reminded members to be patient. Do not listen to third party and let speculation get in our way. Work with the facts going forward and hear each other out as we work on the final steps of the Fly Quiet 21 program. Nothing is going to get pushed through and we will be looking at environmental justice in addition to:

- Vector departure headings
- Scheduled configurations
- Consecutive impacts
- Altitude

While we are analyzing each alternative, all members will have a chance to discuss the pros and cons. However, when there is a motion on the floor, we will follow the format we followed during the last two meetings and adhere to Roberts Rules of Order.

ONCC Member Comments

Mr. Icuss, Chicago Ward 41, said that he would like the committee to remember his request to actively manage the nighttime traffic, not eliminate it, or close the airport. He said that with COVID 19 we have seen a reduction of flights by 50 percent. It has shown that we can all get a good night's sleep regardless of where one lives.

Michelle House, Village of Glenview, said that her community is concerned about consecutive impacts and the elimination of RNAV from the alternatives chosen. RNAV should work with Alternative B. There should be a reduction of flights at night. The diagonal runways are moved more often. She was concerned about the safety management and how much of an impact moving west will be when the terminal expansion plan is a reality.

Review of Alternatives

Mr. Anderson said there was good news, the committee was now on the section to review and revise alternatives with the advancement of alternatives B and H. Before he started with the review, he listed all the alternatives and why some were not acceptable to the committee.

- Alt. B had the most potential for noise relief. It alternated the north and south airfields. Vector headings on at least two runways.
- Alt. C had the biggest stopping point because of RNAV on the crosswind runways. The committee was not sure of the complexities of RNAV
- Alt. D had the full airfield inclusion and did not offer a balance of noise relief. The committee wanted more than one vector heading on east/west runways.
- Alt. E had the same RNAV problems.
- Alt. G had the hybrid configurations for visual only and was less predictable. It incorporated the full airfield with a single vector heading and it was less effective for the balance of noise.
- Alt. H had a viable schedule but was complex with the back-to-back configurations. It needs adjustments with the crosswind configurations and move the vector headings.

Mr. Anderson continued with the additional components to refine and listed the following:

- The primary schedule—needed feedback on how to use in secondary configurations
- Departure headings—vector headings can be adjusted
- Departure proceeding altitudes—the current 3,000 ft. before turning with the preferred headings
- Some adjustments may be made
- Secondary configurations—incorporate full understanding
- Ground movement
- Outreach—Runway 9C using full-bodied aircraft and will have a proposal to provide to the FAA

Mr. Anderson put up a screen of Alternative B and showed vector departure headings overlaid on population density maps. He said the arrows were not meant to represent actual dispersion and asked the members not to assume that aircraft would stay within the arrows depicted on the screen. He split up the map into four quadrants. The arrows added the weeks and the degree of the vector headings. He asked the committee for feedback on the refinements to be presented for the next meeting to get closer to consensus of balancing the noise distribution. He told the members that he wanted to start the discussion with what components they thought would work. He thought they could submit their comments and revisions for the next meeting.

Chairman Annunzio told the members to start thinking about what they would like and asked

Mr. Ryan to start at the top of the list, to which Mr. Anderson asked the members what they wanted to add to the primary configuration of Alt. B.

Alderman Chester commented on the vector heading cutting straight through Des Plaines and said that would be of great concern to his community. He was not happy with that vector heading.

Mr. Dwyer suggested that the committee consider the primary and secondary configurations as a whole. He said just looking at primary configurations is not enough to make a valid decision. He said his concern of consecutive impacts lines up for three weeks when one considers secondary configurations. He asked what can we consider when we incorporate B and H alternatives?

Mr. Anderson responded yes to his question.

Mr. Summers said he heard a proposal to swap weeks and could Mr. Anderson elaborate on that statement, to which Mr. Anderson replied he could.

Chairman Annunzio said that the committee should have refinements for the next meeting and information reintroduced to consider this month.

Mr. Frame said that the purpose of this meeting was to highlight what had been discussed and what to consider further but not to act on these at today's meeting.

Chairman Annunzio asked Mr. Ryan to modify the alternatives and to compile a list to review all at once.

Mr. Anderson went over the suggested modifications leading up to the advancement of Alternative B:

- Limit the vector heading to no more than 20 degrees off center
- Swap weeks 4 and 5 and weeks 10 and 11 to avoid consecutive impacts
- Include more than two departure headings for configurations
- Examine further refinements for departure headings

Ms. Schultz said that when looking at the schedule to take note of the alternative long runways for consecutive impacts in weeks 3 and 4 which are two weeks in a row. She said that is significant and the same is true for weeks 5 and 6. She said to consider the long runway, which is used 40 to 50 percent.

Mr. Anderson said that was not true, and the designated long runway would be used only as necessary and it may not be able to at all especially at 45 percent. He said it was not true especially Runway 9C/27C, which opened this year with plenty of wide-bodied aircraft using it going to Europe and Asia. It is the long runway only if necessary.

Ms. Schultz said to dig into that. The test results demonstrate use of alternative long runway and she expected that to continue. She said she would like to see the data. The decision should be backed up by data. The majority of the test results show that the aircraft defaulted to the

long runway. There are many conditions. She said if we analyze consecutive impacts, it can be backed up with data.

Mr. Seymour said that when the diagonal runway is used, the long runway was used more often. He said that we should consider that regarding the parallel runways, we should see a 99.9 percent use with the north runways open. In Alt. B we have six configurations that are repeated in 12 weeks.

Mr. Seymour asked if different vector headings are used.

Mr. Anderson answered yes. The number only using a single vector heading and will use diagonals more in the schedule.

Ms. Schultz said we have always advocated two vector headings and it is the same in Alt. B., which would use two vector headings on north and south parallel runways used in second configuration.

Mr. Seymour said that the second week there were additional headings on one or two of the runways on those configurations.

Mr. Anderson said that the arrows show the weeks that the headings occur. It shows the diagram and explains. The map includes the population density. The color corresponds to the density, the lighter color is less population while the darker color is more concentrated.

Chairman Annunzio commented that the map can be confusing, and can the experts have a consensus that is appropriate or know what is the majority opinion. There would be different thoughts from the experts, and he felt that the CDA was asking the committee to choose beyond its ability. Can we narrow these options so the committee can remain focused?

Mr. Frame asked if Alt. B is okay the way it is or is Alt H. okay the way it is presented? We are canvassing the committee members to compile a list of considerations.

Chairman Annunzio said a discussion by the experts may help the members.

Mr. Frame suggested to take those discussions offline, advance the graphics, add the vector headings. He thought seeing the graphics with the primary and secondary configurations would help the members. He wanted to know what variables were good to go and what variables needed to be edited.

Mr. Anderson felt the committee was talking about two different things. He asked if there were any more comments regarding the schedule to help the committee make the refinements. Those are the two pieces with the biggest changes to the schedule and to add the secondary configuration. The departure headings needed more information to discuss.

Mr. Dwyer said he struggled with departure headings. The concept of how steep drives the dispersion of the aircraft. Is 20 degrees more than 0 degrees and overlapping arrival corridors. The committee has to consider arrival corridors and dispersion. He suggested showing arrival paths and dispersion departures. He mentioned a heading that follows an arrival corridor. He said the population impact on 49 degrees is more significant than 21 degrees.

Mr. Anderson said that as an example 40-degree dispersion when taking off the runway heading is overlapping an arrival.

Mr. Dwyer said that the committee could use the current Fly Quiet data. He said he did not know an easy way.

Mr. Anderson said that he can come up with a better way to depict the arrival/dispersion dilemma.

Ms. Schultz said that the arrows vary at length and wanted to know if they were correlating to various degrees.

Mr. Anderson repeated again that the arrows were just used as direction and nothing more.

Ms. Schultz said that she recommends as an analysis of vector headings, impacted communities should be included because they know what is best for their town and what is underneath them rather than placing that decision on the committee members. Communities should play a very strong role in developing these headings. We have lost the nomenclature and we need to clarify by calling them balance rather than calling them northeast and southeast flow.

Mr. Anderson said he did not recall that terminology, but that the committee can use that going forward. He will show the next refinements and requests. He would be happy to work with individual committee members with suggested refinements prior to the next meeting.

Alderman Dunn requested a discussion on RNAV as a major exercise before the next meeting. He said that they need to know steps for the evaluation of RNAV proposals for any runway. The timeline is a giant undertaking, and it would be good for the committee to have this information for a better understanding.

Mr. Frame raised a concern with that request. He said there is no RNAV on the table. It was voted down and the recommendation by the committee was to advance alternatives B and H.

Chairman Annunzio said that if the alternatives would work better with RNAV and if two members want to flush that out, he would be okay with that.

Mr. Frame said he understood Alderman Dunn's request and wanted to know how to proceed.

Chairman Annunzio said that Glenview also had concerns and questions and wanted to know if CDA could include them in the conversation.

Mr. Frame said he was confused. He said he would go and explore and report back to the committee.

Mr. Dunn stated he did not want a deep evaluation but wanted to know what would be involved. There was no definition, and he did not know if it was complicated.

Mr. Frame said he would take the call offline and report back.

Chairman Annunzio said they can discuss with the committee next month.

Ms. Robles said that was fine if the committee wants to add information with CDA and L&B to request a refinement of alternatives B and H. Then she felt the committee needed a motion to move forward in that direction. She said she wants to progress and keep moving forward. We know the scope and thought the committee took the formal action to do that.

Chairman Annunzio asked is it a new alternative or just a refinement.

Mr. Frame said that RNAV is only part of alternatives C and E. He said that he will meet offline.

Chairman Annunzio thought that a call offline to different members would make them happy.

Mayor Jezierny thought the committee looked at vector headings to determine runway rotation. She said that the committee can look into RNAV for the future, but for right now switching weeks 4 and 5 and weeks 10 and 11 is a good refinement and there is no reason not to do that.

Mr. Kosower said that he had a concern with the primary and secondary configurations of some of the alternatives and the issue becomes the prevailing winds. He said that a majority of the time O'Hare is in west flow. In secondary configuration, there is a potential of consecutive impacts.

Mr. Ryan said that the committee decided on two alternatives and now it is dragging its feet. Pick the one we want to tweak. This conversation is nonsense.

Mr. Summers said that he agreed with Mr. Ryan. He said that this is a large discussion to create an alternative. He liked Mr. Dwyer's suggestion to look at the alternative side by side.

Alderman Dunn said that there are two alternatives and Alt. B is the simpler of the two. Looking at that one is a good move with a primary and secondary overlay.

Ms. Robles said it was a good conversation to review more closely. She said the committee represents a region around the airport, and she disagreed with Ms. Schultz allowing just the communities impacted by vector headings to make decisions. This is a committee approach we represent all communities not just ourselves.

Alderman Klug agreed with Mr. Dwyer and Mr. Ryan and the committee should not muddy the waters.

Alderman Chester said the issue we had threw off time plan. The issue with RNAV is not set-in stone for 18 months of work through evaluation and it did not support to eliminate. He said that 18 months is a long time to get to lower time.

Mr. Mermuys had no comment.

Mr. Annunzio said it may seem that the committee is not going as fast as it would like. There is only one chance to do it the right way.

Audience Comments

Mr. J. Hill, Elmhurst, said he was not familiar with speaking to the committee, but felt that Alt. B was the most equitable. He thought that Alt. H could be adjusted to avoid consecutive impacts. He thought that there could be a one-year review period.

Mr. Icuss, Chicago Ward 41, said that he wanted clarification of the vector headings and did not think that flights were limited under the depiction, to which Mr. Ryan said that the arrows were just a graphical representation.

Mr. Icuss said that even with the depictions, the committee should not vote with their eyes because everyone will hear noise. It is just like the noise monitors these are just depictions not reality. You still get noise over your homes.

Ms. Barbara Lonagan said that a letter had been sent to Transportation Secretary Buttigieg regarding NextGen. She referred to an article in *Atlantic* magazine on noise and the heightened effect of cardiovascular disease. She said there should be a nighttime flight ban and to remember that each Fly Quiet Committee member represented us.

MOTION: Mr. Ryan moved, and Ms. Robles seconded the motion to adjourn. Motion carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:44 a.m.

The next ONCC Fly Quiet Committee Meeting will be held on Thursday, April 22, 2021 via Zoom Teleconference at 9:30 a.m.