

O’HARE NOISE COMPATIBILITY COMMISSION
Fly Quiet Committee
December 8, 2020
Zoom Teleconference
Approved Meeting Minutes

The O’Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC) Fly Quiet Committee met via Zoom teleconferencing on Tuesday, December 8, 2020.

Call to Order

Committee Chair Joe Annunzio called the meeting to order at 9:31 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. Jeff Mermuys, Alternate, City of Wood Dale
Mr. Dennis Ryan, Designee, Village of River Grove
Mr. Bialek, Member, Chicago Ward 39
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

MOTION: Mr. Ryan moved, seconded by Mr. Kosower to approve the minutes of the October 27, 2020 Fly Quiet Committee Meeting. Motion carried by a roll call vote.

ONC Member Comment

None

Interim Fly Quiet Report—Weeks 34 through 39

Mr. Anderson reviewed the Interim Fly Quiet reports for weeks 34 through 39.

Week 34: (22R and 22L) 23 percent of operations in IFQ, start time 10:09 pm and stop time 6:45 am, 8 hours and 36 minutes in Fly Quiet time. He noted there were several nights of inclement weather during this week.

Week 35: (28C and 28R), 89 percent use of designated runways in IFQ, start time 10:23 pm and stop time 6:48 am, average time in Fly Quiet being 8 hours and 25 minutes. West flow 79 percent of the time.

Week 36: (22R and 22L) 16 percent utilization of preferred runways of operations in IFQ, start time 10:02 pm and stop time 6:54 am, 8 hours and 37 minutes in Fly Quiet time. West wind 95 percent. New runway opens, flight checks on runways and activity on north airfield.

Week 37: (9R and 10L) 29 percent of operations in IFQ, start time 10: 37 pm and stop time 6:36 am, 7 hours and 59 minutes in Fly Quiet time. There were several nights of construction, flight checks and inclement weather.

Week 38: (4L and 4R) 27 percent of operations in IFQ, start time 10:22 pm and stop time 6:33 am, 8 hours and 11 minutes in Fly Quiet time. West flow 75%. Crosswind runway used one day.

Week 39: (10C and 10L), 89 percent of operations in IFQ, start time 10:05 pm and stop time 6:43 am, 8 hours and 38 minutes in Fly Quiet time.

Fly Quiet 21 Process

Mr. Anderson showed the committee the Fly Quiet Process chart and explained the steps to meet the goal of the committee. They are still at the “Develop Alternatives” stage and are working towards the approval of the alternatives. Today there are still seven alternatives that were submitted by the CDA or members. There are still committee discussions needed to arrive at the review and revise step of the process. He said that to be comfortable with the decision, the Committee had to filter down the seven alternatives to arrive at a handful. He said it is up to the committee. They can spend time where they are now or more time in the review and revise step. They are looking for alternatives with merits and at the last meeting there was a vote to remove a handful of alternatives from consideration to focus review on the remaining to get to consensus. He said that the committee is going to look at reconsidering the alternatives that were removed from consideration from the last meeting.

Mr. Summers said that at the last meeting, in an effort to move the process along, he made a motion to remove Alternatives D, E, F, and G from consideration and the motion carried. He said he understood that there was some concern that the options were not allowed sufficient consideration or analysis. He proposed reconsidering alternatives D, E, F and G separately.

MOTION: Alderman Chester moved, and Trustee Klug seconded a motion to reconsider Alts. D, E, F, and G. Motion carried by a roll call vote.

Chairman Annunzio asked for a motion to reinstate each alternative individually and look at each alternative separately.

MOTION: Mr. Summers moved, and Ms. Robles seconded the motion to reinstate each alternative individually.

to which Mr. Frame asked for clarification of the motion.

Chairman Annunzio said the intent was to vote on and discuss each alternative. Mr. Summers withdrew the motion.

Mr. Frame indicated he did not think it was necessary for the committee to vote on Alternative A which is the existing Fly Quiet, which the City has to submit regardless of the Committee recommendation.

Mr. Summers inquired about plotting a path forward, having a framework of what will be done at the next several meetings.

Chairman Annunzio said the committee has to pare down the alternatives and have serious discussions about which alternatives do not meet the committee's needs. Members may need to allow for additional time for meetings or meet more frequently.

Ms. Robles commented on Mr. Summers' statement to go three alternatives. She said she had concerns if there was anything precluding the committee from eliminating an alternative at this meeting if the discussion was leading in that direction.

Mr. Frame recommended it was possible to make a motion but not take a vote today. He said that the members do not want to repeat what occurred at the last meeting. We can have an active discussion but take votes hastily.

Chairman Annunzio said the committee has to start prioritizing and some of the alternatives could likely be eliminated rather quickly. Do we have to treat each alternative equally?

Mr. Anderson said there are seven alternatives to refine and at the next meeting the members should be looking at the refinement of all seven alternatives. At any step of the way, committee members can make a motion to eliminate. Right now, we have seven to move forward. There is not a higher priority on one over another.

Chairman Annunzio indicated that at the last meeting the committee discussed and characterized more favorable alternatives over the others.

Mr. Dwyer said he thought it was better to move forward with departure headings and not only alternatives, but departures are waiting for an answer from the FAA and if the airlines agree to use the long runways.

Mr. Anderson said the CDA continues discussions with the FAA and airlines. No one has said no. It is entirely feasible there are no serious objections.

Mr. Dwyer said the committee needed a commitment for the next 30-40 years which would be translated into an assurance.

Chairman Annunzio said that anything could change.

Mr. Anderson added that he could not tell the committee if the FQ21 will last 40 years. The Commission has been participating in how the airport operates in the overnight hours and will continue to do so. If there are changes in technology or other factors, it will warrant another look.

Mr. Frame said that the CDA will continue conversation with the airlines so they know the committee's preferences. He will continue to brief the airlines and provide feedback to the committee.

Ms. Robles said that the committee is bogged down in analysis/paralysis. It would be too cumbersome to move forward with all the seven alternatives. There will be analysis on all seven. We will be stuck in unending cycle of review and consideration. Committee needs to decide if there are things that are of higher priority it will bring some of these alternatives to the forefront. The FAA and the airlines are important stakeholders, the committee will benefit from sharing recommendations as opposed to asking permission and direction from them. The committee needs to ask them to react and share significant concerns that they have with the preferred alternative so the commission is driving the process. The FAA has said that they will not conduct analysis in advance. It is important that we are driving the process; the FAA can shed light on anything we might have missed or not considered fully. It is important to keep the committee moving forward.

Mr. Frame agreed and said the CDA can get the feedback from the FAA and the airlines to help us get to the right direction. The CDA would like to continue conversations with the FAA, so we are all on the right track. The FAA will not give definitive answers prior to the formal review stage.

Chairman Annunzio said when we get to alternatives, we are not set in stone but at least we can decide on a direction and continue to discuss and revise.

Mr. Kosower suggested that based on the IFQ reports and those before construction season, the committee consider modifying criteria #2 – use all available runways. We do not get compliance with crosswind runways – even with COVID impact.

Ms. Schultz, in an effort to refocus the group said that some concepts lend credibility to alternatives that do not uphold the committee's mission – to minimize and equally distribute aircraft noise at night. If we get into headings – severe headings increase noise to those who live within the flight path under 3,000 feet. The dispersion of noise is the goal – the appropriate way is to equally distribute runway use among runways available to use at night. Nine communities live around the airport's long runways. We ask the committee to consider those communities when considering alternatives. Every community benefits from the airport, and all have to share the burden. Silent quadrant week concept to give communities a period of relief with the need of alternate long runways. Some alternatives outperform the others in achieving silent quadrant weeks.

Mr. Seymour said the committee is not only looking at the new nighttime program but the program will also include implementation and how it will be monitored. Current IFQ is not really monitored to explain why things that happen the way they do. This program will include a way to monitor and question why things happen. There are things that can be done to increase use of certain runway configurations if someone is watching and asking questions Chairman Annunzio replied that the committee will not be dissolved and will be monitoring.

Mr. Seymour also noted the role of the Technical committee.

Mr. Summers said that SOC submitted a letter and that it was a good read for the committee. It analyzed the four alternatives and made solid points about some configurations and highlighted some of the negative externalities. He asked Mr. Annunzio to circulate it to the committee.

Chairman Annunzio agreed that he would do so and planned to reference the letter at the end of the meeting. He asked Mr. Anderson to review alternatives D and G again.

Mr. Anderson reminded the members that they have the same materials from the last meeting to which

Chairman Annunzio said that someone may have a concern but has not raised it. He wanted to take a quick look at the alternatives since there wasn't much discussion on them.

Mr. Anderson reviewed Alt. D which features a 12-week rotation with 10 configurations. It incorporates the full airfield concept – using one runway on north airfield and one runway on south airfield – different from B, C and H where operations are segregated to either north airfield or south airfield week to week. It has vector headings only, one heading per week for the east-west configurations, the crosswind runways have two headings.

Mr. Kosower said that he thought one of the criteria was to have no repetitive weeks. Since the airport operates mostly in west flow which would mean that weeks one and two as well as weeks 4 and 5 are repetitive to which Mr. Summers asked for a clarification of the criteria.

Mr. Frame reviewed the criteria and stated that that the criterion is not an absolute – it is to the extent practical. Mr. Kosower said if that was the case, he would ask the committee to revisit criteria #2 to use all available runways, and consider his submitted proposal.

Mr. Kosower said if that was the rule for #2, then we need to modify the criteria and not be hamstrung and have the use to all available runways.

Chairman Annunzio said #2 the way it is written is an absolute.

Mr. Frame said the question with regard to consecutive weeks is valid – #4 says to the extent possible but #5 does not include that language. Mr. Annunzio said the way it is written #5 is not an absolute.

Ms. Robles said that there was significant conversation about criteria #2. It is never 100 percent on every runway. The committee did take a vote on the criteria and said that 12 percent on a crosswind runway is still fewer operations than on a north/south runway. If you take crosswinds out there is 100 percent on the east-west runways – crosswinds provide some level of relief, even if minimal, for the communities that surround the east-west runways.

Mr. Kosower said he was not on the committee for that discussion on the criteria. He thought Ms. Dunlap and Alderman Chester dissented on that vote. No matter how you use the runways, the airport is still using the crosswind runways 12 to 15 flights per evening. He said he was not sure it saves noise. It is not efficient.

Mr. Dwyer said those were good points on consecutive impacts, further criteria was needed for consecutive impacts to determine what a balanced plan would be. What is consecutive, what is wind-driven rotation; we need some criteria on consecutive impact.

Mr. Frame pointed out that #5 says same type of arrivals/departures two periods in a row. It does not say east/west two periods in a row. If rotation shows impact one week with arrivals and one week departures. It is “or” not “and” if you want to discuss further. May be confusion with wording of criteria.

Mr. Anderson said criteria apply to primary configurations – not secondary. #4 and #5 were used in test 1, 2 and 3 and IFQ. It was not always the exact reciprocal configuration.

Mr. Dwyer had some concern with that due to the fact that the airfield operates 80 percent in west flow – secondary criteria should be factored in to minimize consecutive impacts.

Ms. Schultz said the Fly Quiet criteria have withstood the test of time. With crosswind runways, there is misunderstanding the measure of their ability to provide relief due to the fact that every time we utilize 10L/28R with crosswinds in play, makes them appear performing poorly, but there is actually very good performance. Configurations in the current interim program have not acknowledged the need for an alternative runway. 10L/28R is being used for alternate long runway both northeast and southwest crosswind flow. Runway 9R is the preferred long runway in northeast flow. Runway 10L/28R has had safety issues and we have seen a default to Runway 10L/28R configuration for aircraft that need the alternative long runway in the north airfield. With regard to consecutive impacts, criteria #5 is critical in being able to eliminate some of the alternatives, to identify which minimize consecutive impacts to the extent possible, some are overburdening long-runway communities with regular consecutive impact. Those are the heavy aircraft which are 10x louder than, regular fleet. Several alternatives barely have consecutive impact on either primary or alternate configuration – that is a critical criteria to differentiate which alternatives should move forward, and which should not.

Alderman Dunn said we are designing rotation plan with primary flow configurations. Configurations are based on prevailing winds. The secondary configuration is Plan b. More operations at night are arrivals v

departures. Criterion #5 is wrapped around the primary arrival /departure configurations and does not include the secondary.

Mr. Seymour said to keep in mind the existing airfield is not what the airfield will be in 1 year. When there is a long runway needed, it defaults to the south airfield. That will not be the case, there will be options on the north airfield. It can handle the nighttime operations and give the community a week of relief. If you don't want arrival or departure in consecutive weeks – criteria #5 should be that you don't want to hit the community two times over the two-week period. Predictability is the big thing – it's operations for two periods in a row.

Mr. Kosower said he appreciated the comments but we have run an EIS and two rounds of the IFQ. Once 9C/27C opens and 9R/27L opens everything will be different all the modeling a waste of time.

Mr. Seymour said the EIS looked at if a rotation could work and if we can give interim relief until a full airfield and new program can be designed. If 9R is the long alternate runway on east flow nights and the crosswind runways are in use, what part of the northeastern quadrant does not get noise? Mr. Seymour said that would mean one week – another 2 or three weeks that quadrant would not get any flights.

Ms. Schultz said she thought Mr. Kosower was describing the for the northeast quadrant the same is true of the southeast quadrants. The concept that diagonals are not being used are flawed. They are critical and valid. The Fly Quiet departures have been forever and do have a role for a reasonable load.

Mr. Anderson reviewed Alt. G which is also a full airfield concept with 12 configurations – it is similar to Alt. F only it uses hybrid configurations and incorporates the crosswind runways. This is the only alternative that uses hybrid configurations. There are some restrictions due to converging runway concerns, but they are usable.

Chairman Annunzio asked the members to review all the configurations over the Christmas break.

Mr. Summers asked if there were any members advocating for the full airfield concept.

Mr. Dwyer thought that it was the wrong way to determine alternatives (north v south) and said the committee needed to look at the headings. He wanted assurance for the runway closures from the FAA to come to some conclusion.

Chairman Annunzio said that if someone makes a motion to eliminate D or G at the next meeting there will be a full discussion as to what using the full airfield means.

Mr. Ryan said in summary, the committee recently had two successful IFQ trials. For our final decision, we will have to look at our successes and our failures to have a better idea going forward what to plan for.

Ms. Schultz said that the full airfield is really three quadrants of airfield. 12 configurations out of the full airfield is 25 percent silence in their respective quadrants. Split airfield configurations were flagged by the FAA because those configurations have issues – that is a lesser quality product to move forward. Full airfield concept is unequal impact to both north and south parallel communities.

Mr. Dwyer said the full airfield does not impact three quadrants - it has the same quadrant predictability. The difference is what is happening east/west is split between the north and south.

Mr. Anderson said that alternatives D,E,F and G incorporate the full-airfield characteristic. In discussions, when committee members were asked to submit alternatives, they submitted those as well as modifications that could be incorporated into the alternatives. These included:

Alt. B

- limit departure vector headings to no more than 20 degrees from centerline
- swap weeks 4 and 5 and weeks 10 and 11 to avoid consecutive impacts
- More than 2 departure headings per configuration
- Examine further refinements to departure vector headings

Alt. C

- limit departure vector headings to no more than 20 degrees from centerline
- swap weeks 4 and 5 and weeks 10 and 11 to avoid consecutive impacts
- Examine further refinements to departure vector headings

Alt. E

- limit to one departure vector heading per runway
- keep 295 degree vector heading for Runway 27L departures and 245 vector heading for Runway 28R departures
- Examine further refinements to departure vector headings

Ms. Schultz asked if Craig Burzych could speak on the full airfield concept. It is important to consider air traffic's impact. Mr. Burzych said that with a split airfield concept the controller is constantly looking back and forth. The split field is not user friendly to controllers.

Mr. Kosower noted that he had the terms confused regarding split and full airfield.

Mr. Dwyer asked if in conversations with FAA, Mr. Frame or Mr. Anderson knew what their position is on this. Mr. Anderson replied there was some merit for efficiency and attention being isolated to north or south airfield, however the airport today operates as a full airfield airport. Mr. Dwyer asked if the FAA has approved all 28 configurations for air traffic feasibility.

Mr. Anderson replied that they had, with some caveats noted.

Chairman Annunzio announced the next Fly Quiet Meeting would be held on January 28, 2021.

Audience Comments

Ms. Susanne Carbon said that as the committee looks at all the alternatives, she agreed with Ms. Robles that the committee is getting lost in the weeds. She suggested the committee come up with benchmarks such as predictability, equity or sustainability and the committee rate these priorities on a rating system of one to five. If everyone wants that then vote based on the benchmarks. She said with too many details, people's eyes get glazed over and we are lost in the weeds. She thought 13 percent utilization could be better. She said ONCC can set the standards and has the power to do this.

Mr. Summers asked about what will be on the agenda for the next committee meeting.

Chairman Annunzio said that agenda will reflect elimination of alternatives.

Mr. Summers asked if we could eliminate at the next meeting'

Chairman Annunzio responded yes, with compromise.

Mr. Icuss said that as a member of ONCC he wanted to mention that true relief is not possible living around an airport. The minimum disturbance with every iteration impacts someone. It is devolving into "not in my back yard" (NIMBY) If the CDA can find a way to minimize nighttime flights—not eliminate—now everyone is getting relief. It is quieter now; it is tolerable. Keep operations at the same level they are today.

Adjournment

MOTION: Mr. Ryan moved, and Mr. Kosower seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried with a roll call vote. The meeting adjourned at 11:04 a.m.