

headings. He reviewed Alternative H which has a 16-week rotation with six runway configurations. He said that there are eight East/West runway utilizations and eight crosswind runway utilizations.

He said that at the last meeting, the committee approved changes to some primary departure headings. He said that the committee looked at 27L departure headings at the last meeting which had a departure heading of 280 degrees with a single heading in weeks 2 and 10 and would not turn until 3,000 feet. It was different with most runways having two departure headings. He received three modification recommendations for 27L which he said he would walk through each suggestion and placed the recommendations side by side.

- (1) 275 degrees in both weeks 2 and 10
- (2) 275 degrees (week 2) and 285 degrees (week 10)
- (3) 295 degrees for both weeks 2 and 10

RUNWAY 27L—Discussion

Ms. Robles said she would change the discussion order and Mr. Summers wanted to know what three members made the recommendations. Ms. Robles said she would give the three members and consultants a chance to go first so members could consider the modifications.

Ms. Robles said she recommended 275-degree vector heading because it would fly over Interstate 390 and Alternative H was advanced to have a single heading.

Ms. Schultz said that SOC was recommending the 275/285 degree headings. She said SOC has always recommended two headings; they shifted down to 275 based on Schaumburg's recommendation in the previous meeting, agreeing that it is a compatible land corridor. She said they recommended a 10-degree heading change to give some degree of relief. She said that getting into 295 degree heading impacted more people at a higher decibel level. The SOC consensus was to balance at 275 and 285 degrees.

Mr. Dwyer of FAiR submitted the 295-degree heading and said that 9C arrivals for the long runway usage resulted in four weeks south and 9R all four weeks of consecutive impacts with 9C. This is a significantly arrival weighted quadrant, in that there would be six weeks of consecutive impacts as opposed to two weeks. The southwest quadrant in west flow has all arrival requests. You have to look at big picture – how many times residents are impacted in the schedule. Arrivals are 2/3 of operations. There is no compatible land use. He asked to see a slide on the dispersion of noise.

Mr. Anderson said that the slide of the dispersion of noise was actual flight tracks for existing preferential flight paths – 10L and 28R. The track ends at 3,000 feet. He said that the 28R preferential flight path at 290 degrees was the actual path of dispersion.

Mr. Dwyer said the south airfield move to the northwest was asymmetrical with the 20-degree concentration of a 15 -degree heading at the end of the runway. The south airfield will achieve this with two headings at the point of concentration. A 20-degree heading looks like a deviation where turns occur. This will happen whether it is 295 or 290 degrees. He fears with two headings we are creating a point of concentration. We should try to avoid adjacent quadrant impact as well as overlap with arrivals – single heading that considers all factors including the point at which aircraft turn.

Mr. Summers asked about the rotation with the 4/22s and designated long runways – what is the heading off of the long runway? Ms. Robles replied that for Alternative H, that has not been discussed. Mr. Andersons said that for Alternative B, the heading was the heading used for the parallels, which was

a 10-degree offset at the center line. Mr. Summers said he was intrigued and wanted to hear from the other members.

Mayor Pulice said that he supported SOC recommendation and opted for two headings, He said it should be consistent, everyone should share the noise.

Alderman Chester was not sure and thought that it did not affect Des Plaines. He was looking to the impacted communities but he did not have a clear picture as to consensus.

Alderman Dunn said that was good to hear and he preferred a single heading for departures for simplicity. However, he could support the two headings to what SOC was proposing to get off the arrival path and spread departures.

Mr. Kosower concurred and said to stick to the criteria. Two departure headings did that. If not, it opens up for other questioning as to methodology. As for specific headings, he would leave the decision up to the impacted communities.

Mr. Ryan said that he would concur with SOC.

Mr. Annunzio said that because Niles was not affected, the two headings made sense to him and he too would defer to what the impacted communities could come to consensus on. because he did not live there, but they understand in real life.

Mr. Kryska deferred to the impacted communities. Mr. Bialek agreed, and echoed Bensenville's comment that Mr. Dwyer's points were compelling. He said for consistency the two runway headings make sense. He said would wait for consensus among impacted communities before reaching his final decision.

Mayor Jezierny said the 295-degree heading appeared to be too far north, competing with other arrivals and flights. She too agreed with SOC that two vector headings would not have the same impact as with one heading. She would support the 275/285 degree heading.

Mr. Seymour asked why Schaumburg proposed the 275-degree heading when 270 was a straight heading. He said that 275 goes right over the arrival corridor for 9C; 270 would still hit the compatible land use but not overlap the arrival corridor for 9C. He agreed with using two different departure headings headings, 275 and 285 were too close together – why not 275 and 295? The further north the better, to go over Busse Woods. He said that most of the aircraft can make the 295-degree heading and the 90-degree heading would be over the industrial area.

Mayor Pulice said if we went down to 270, it would push fights more to the south. Trying to to keep north departures north, and south departures south. The more we push it down, the more the south is impacted. He had concerns that 295 would impact runways to the north.

Ms. Robles said that 275 heading was to hit the 390 corridor and consider the arrival path. It's not much difference, but any difference is better than no difference. The area around 390 has developed to more industrial/warehouse uses. Two departure headings – Schaumburg would prefer 275 and 295. She added that you hit Busse Woods and Woodfield Shopping Center, and would avoid some of the more densely populated areas.

Ms. Schultz said she appreciated the opportunity to speak and appreciated members being willing to defer to impacted communities. SOC goes to great length to involve members in this decision. Nine mayors come together to discuss impacts to their communities and take time to come to a consensus. If there are similar processes out there to positions being represented whether they are consensus decisions or individual positions that did not receive the same scrutiny, debated and agreed upon by public officials. The SOC membership does not want the excessive heading – does not consider increased impact at higher decibel level. Concern is with heavier aircraft. The goal is to be reasonable in sharing noise and not excessive in noise putting on the ground. You will still be impacting people at 295 as 285 but at higher level. It is the consistent position of 5 of 7 impacted communities through public meetings that their preference is 275 and 285; these are the headings to best disperse noise fairly while not impacting people at higher decibel. This will grow the contour and will not be helpful for the FAA approval of program.

Mr. Dwyer said 27L is never used as an alternate long runway in Alternative H. The headings we have to worry about in the northwest quadrant are the two headings about which we are discussing. Part of the inequity in Alternative H is that the quadrants are not fairly weighted. This is weighted to arrivals, southwest to departures. The highest level of impact is when you overlap arrival corridors. One of the issues we struggle with for the north-south airfield concept is the inboard departure concept. You must consider that you have to cross the 1,600-foot separation at 5 degrees that takes 3.5 miles – that is departure track, not actual noise dispersion. With the north to north and south to south concept – with the 275 heading a proximity to the south, the majority of aircraft turn south. We must make a tough decision to impact fewer people more, more people to a lesser extent or keep the quadrants separated for equity and predictability. You can't achieve all of these objectives. With 275 you lose predictability and equity in west flow departures.

Mr. Summers said he liked what Mr. Dwyer was saying. It is hard to ignore the industrial park. Land developed under Runway 15/33 as compatible land use. He said he would borrow from SOC and from FAiR - supporting 275/295 are viable options. Mayor Pulice said he would stick with SOC.

Alderman Chester said he preferred 275/295.

Alderman Dunn said that Alternative B rotations are better than H with 10-degrees and 25 degrees off arrival path. He would make an exception for the 275 heading, that it flies over the highway, and would stick with 295 because it is consistent with the other considerations; 285 is fine as well. He preferred 275/295.

Mr. Kosower and Mr. Ryan had no comments.

Mr. Annunzio 275/295 makes sense but that SOC got together proposed something else. He asked if he could inquire why they do not favor 295.

Ms. Robles said to hear the rest of the comments and then give an opportunity.

Mr. Kryska had no comment while Mr. Bialek preferred 275/295.

Mayor Jezierny said for Alternative B the committee approved 280 and 295, as long as 295 does not go too far north to interfere with arrivals. She wanted to hear what Ms. Schultz had to say.

Mr. Summers said while SOC has discussions, it does not mean that SOC speaks for individual member communities.

Whether it is 295/285/275, the 25 degree the point of dispersion heavy aircraft by impact because of the agility to turn.

Ms. Schultz said that 295 heading vs 285 or 275 – when we get into aggressive headings of 25 degrees, as dispersion grows, it is the heavy weighted aircraft that have the impact on that. Their agility impacts their ability to turn and have difficulty making that turn as opposed to lighter aircraft. The thrust increases and it causes a higher decibel level on the ground with the heavy and fully loaded aircraft. They want to look at the impact on the population. The 290- 290 heading, it violates north to north and south to south concept. Communities are getting impacts south of arrival stream on populations that should be getting relief that week. Arrow does not represent actual contour area on the ground. Bensenville at 295 affects additional 4,385 people; Itasca, decreases and Wood Dale also has increase at 295.

Mr. Summers asked how his community would get more impact if the flight track does not go over his community. Ms. Schultz replied that the contour is spilling over to the south and grows by 57 percent for heavy fleet vs lighter fleet. Residents are being impacted -not visible on these charts but will be heard – this is a new departure runway.

Mr. Summers said there are two tones of colors on the JDA chart; he asked what the colors represent. The light blue is the heavier fleet mix, dark blue represents 737-800, the lighter fleet. The departure stream area for heavier aircraft grows with heading change. Mr. Summers asked if SOC analyzed 295 and Ms. Schultz said it was represented in the chart.

MOTION: Mr. Summers moved, and Mr. Ryan seconded the motion to have two vector headings for Runway 27L which would be 275-degree heading for week 10 and 295-degree heading for week 2. Motion carried by a roll call vote with Wood Dale, Niles and Harwood Heights voting no.

DISCUSSION prior to the vote: Mayor Jezierny asked if a 295 heading would affect Bensenville, would the committee consider 290 heading?

Mr. Dwyer said that the spill over applies to all the quadrants, no matter which runway is being used, it is not specific to this heading. The noise off the large aircraft whether it is 295/290/285 there is no requirement that aircraft turn at a steeper angle to achieve those headings. Some would bank an angle; the thrust was no change and to refine the procedures. He said to focus on the optimizing the one with the least dispersion and least overlap. Pilots will not to apply full thrust just to hit the center line of heading. The bulk of the fleet mix are the small aircraft which can achieve the heading, can turn within compatible land use and achieve dispersion. The heavies will be closer to center line regardless of heading.

Mr. Seymour said that there was a lot of focus on the heavy aircraft, they are not the majority of operations at night, during Fly Quiet. Most of the mix is narrow body and they make a 90-degree turns all day long. Large industrial area is where you want the noise. He did not understand the hesitation for SOC with turning to the north.

Ms. Schultz wanted to review conjecture versus a data-based analysis. We can talk about majority of operations at night not being heavy aircraft, but that 26 aircraft at night that were heavy, and these are

the flights would wake people up with an impact over 65 DNL. They are the subject of interest. SOC's reason for not liking the 295 heading – they have been through a process, sat down, discussed, looked at flight tracks. Fleet is complying with to 290 heading, want to do it in a manner not counteractive to goals. Aggressive headings (25 degree) it will wake people up, new people who have not had heavies over their heads before. SOC communities respected impacted communities in other direction – asked members to respect SOC process and decision to put forward 275/285.

Mr. Annunzio asked Ms. Schultz to explain her statement that the FAA may not approve 295 heading. She said that the 295 degree heading would grow the contour. If the contour is excessive it could cause problems in approving the program. The goal of the program is to shrink the contour now grow it.

Ms. Robles said that the committee did not want to get into conjecture of what the FAA would or would not do; the committee had to make decisions based on knowledge of communities and information available. Trying to make decisions based on FAA approval would complicate things as they have a much broader scope of things they need to evaluate.

Mr. Annunzio said the ultimate approval was in the hands of the FAA it concerns him if they could say no for some reason. As JDA is considered experts and he is not, he wanted to hear what they had to say.

Mr. Seymour said the FAA does not make the decision on the contour increasing. The OMP contour changed always mitigate noise with sound insulation.

Mr. Summers said that we are so far beyond shrinking the contours; the objective is to disperse the noise.

Mr. Dwyer said that the 295 heading is what the FAA provided to the committee as an acceptable heading achievable by all aircraft. The FAA would not have provided this as an acceptable heading if there was an issue with it.

Ms. Schultz requested that the committee stick to the 275/285 headings and asked the committee to respect the OMP contour shrinking over time. It is an FAA issue that they will work through. They try to err on the side of shrinking the contour.

Mayor Jezierny asked if we could reach a compromise with a 290-degree heading.

Mr. Bialek said he would bow to the will of the committee, but he felt that the impacted communities had not reached consensus and was confused about what that consensus would be. He asked if impacted communities could vote first.

Ms. Robles asked if the vote had to be in a certain order to which Mr. Frame said the vote did not have to be taken in a certain order; it was her choice and it could be roll call or secret ballot.

Mr. Frame asked if she was tabling the original motion to which Ms. Robles said that speaking for Schaumburg, she said that SOC does a lot of work and contributes a lot to the Committee but is not a member of the committee; she thought that it was important to note that SOC does not speak for the west side of the airport. Mayor Jezierny said rather than vote, could the affected communities give their recommendation on headings and put majority to a vote.

Ms. Robles called for a roll call vote on the motion on the floor of two departure headings—275/295 for Runway 27L.

Bensenville – Yes
Wood Dale - No
Schaumburg – Yes
Des Plaines – Yes
Elmhurst - Yes
Park Ridge – Yes
River Grove – Yes
Niles – No
Schiller Park – Yes
Ward 39 – Yes
Harwood Heights – No

Motion Carries.

SECONDARY CONFIGURATIONS

Mr. Anderson announced that he would now look at the current assigned secondary configurations in Alternative H schedule. Secondary configurations are used when the wind condition does not allow primary configurations; there is a direct reciprocal configuration for each primary configuration. The pattern continues for the entire 16 weeks of Alternative H. He reminded the committee when there were discussions on Alternative B there were concerns for consecutive impacts. This is the opportunity to discuss any concerns with secondary configurations assigned in Alternative H. He said that no suggested changes had been submitted. With that comment, Ms. Robles pointed out the time and said everyone would have an opportunity to share questions, concerns or comments at this time; final action on this item and long runways would be taken at the December meeting.

Both Mr. Summers and Ms. Robles said they were not prepared to discuss the secondary configurations and asked members to come prepared next month.

She asked if any members did wish to comment. Mr. Kosower commented on consecutive impacts on four separate times for 9R. Mr. Dwyer referred to the IFQ where there were consecutive impacts when in west flow 80 percent of the time primary configurations are 4 out of 5 times and 1 out of 4 times in east flow. He said it was a significant risk and Alternative H prefers in west flow while there is a high probability of three consecutive weeks. He said that it all goes back to structural issues with Alternative H, and he was not aware of a fix to the problem. He can't say how residents will respond to rotation, but they will hold everyone accountable for consecutive impacts. They should be avoided at all costs.

Alderman Dunn said the Committee discussed primary configuration patterns and the secondary configurations mirror those. He said that he did not know what the committee could do once it settled on the primary configurations; the secondary configurations were a default.

Ms. Schultz said that consecutive impacts on the alternative long runways were a result to eliminate consecutive impacts on the diagonals - that was the outcome. The alternate long runways wreak havoc with the consecutive impact rule – they have to be employed when the diagonals are in play. She said at the time it was the least consecutive impacts they could produce with the reordering of the schedule.

Ms. Robles asked members to review material and because any feedback would help advance discussions and to keep the process moving. She asked for suggestions to improve secondary configurations or establish departure headings for the long runways.

Ms. Robles announced the next Fly Quiet Committee Meeting would be held on Thursday, December 16, at 9:30 a.m. via Zoom.

Audience Comments

Ms. Suzanne Carboni thought it was a good conversation today. She was confused and it seemed like the committee keeps trying to change the criteria of Fly Quiet. She understood some members are concerned about their areas, but seems like we are setting aside predictability equity in favor of NIMBY *Not in My Back Yard*. She said that she is in a heavily populated area between two long. She referred to SOC's materials and inquired about population numbers. She said the SOC letter referred 57 percent more dispersion; she asked if the heavies were the cargo planes – not sure if they are heavies. She said she is getting hit both ways – not thinking of big view, everyone is looking at their own fiefdoms.

Mayor Jezierny asked for Alternate H configurations.

MOTION: Mr. Ryan moved, and Mayor Jezierny seconded the motion the motion to adjourn. Motion carried by roll call vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.