

**O’HARE NOISE COMPATIBILITY COMMISSION**  
**Fly Quiet Committee**  
**January 19, 2021**  
**Zoom Teleconference**  
**Approved Meeting Minutes**

The O’Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC) Fly Quiet Committee met via Zoom teleconferencing on Tuesday, January 19, 2021.

Committee Chair Joe Annunzio called the meeting to order at 9:33 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 Jeziorny, 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  
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, and Trustee Klug seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the December 8, 2020 Fly Quiet Committee Meeting. Mr. Kosower corrected his statement in the minutes. The motion carried by a roll call vote.**

**Opening Remarks**

Chairman Annunzio said that before the committee continues with the rest of the agenda, he would like to go over the game plan for today and for the rest of the meetings going forward. He said that he touched upon this at the ONCC meeting on January 15, 2021, but he wanted his statement in the

minutes for the record. He said basically the committee would be following Robert's Rules of Order. He continued with the format of the meeting.

**First**, comments from ONCC members.

**Second**, he'd **non-voting** members on the committee to summarize their latest position and submission in three minutes. This gave an opportunity for all members to be on the record.

**Third**, he'd called for a motion, and a second to advance a FQ21 Alternative.

- Mr. Anderson summarized the alternative on the floor for approval.
- Once completed with the summary,
- Chairman Annunzio called on each **voting** member to state his or her position for the approval or rejection of the alternative on the floor.
- Each member had three minutes to state his or her case or yield to the next speaker.
- There was one rebuttal round for any **voting** member who wishes to speak limiting the time to three minutes.
- A roll call vote and then proceed to the next alternative.

### **ONCC Member Comments**

None

### **Opening Remarks from Non-Voting Members on the Committee**

#### **Mr. Dan Dwyer, FAiR**

"We agree there has been an overwhelming amount of analysis to date often focusing on parallel vs diagonal usage, but have we lost ground on the key objective of predictability?"

The answer is yes, and by a surprising amount. And what impacts predictability is wind. Wind does not follow the published schedule, and is the lived experience for residents.

So, we address wind by assigning a secondary configuration to each primary configuration. This secondary must only impact the same quadrants as the primary to be predictable. However, there are two proposed configurations that do not meet these criteria, I and L.

Reliance on these configurations eliminates any predictability in those weeks, but it is not just predictability that is impacted by configurations I and L because predictability and airfield balance go hand in hand.

The best analogy I can make is using buckets.

With Alternative H in West Flow, you have three buckets in the South Airfield, one in the North Airfield. You can see the problem already, understanding that the airfield is West Flow dominant. With Alternative H, this translates into a risk of 12 weeks of noise for the South Airfield.

This is just basic probability. If you have an airfield that is in West Flow 60-80 percent of the time, and three out of every four configurations utilize the South Airfield in West Flow, over-utilization of the South Airfield cannot be avoided.

What you need for balance is an equal number of buckets in each airfield. Then when in West Flow, the North and South airfields are balanced and the same is true for East Flow.

Therefore, we recommend that the committee advance alternatives representing contrasting core concepts:

- Full and North/South Airfields
- Crosswind and Hybrid Configurations

Alternatives B through G all have some elements of each worth considering.

This will provide an objective comparison of predictability and airfield balance.

Vector and RNAV are applicable to any configurations that advance.

We recommend that you do not advance Alternative H for failing to meet the criteria in two areas.

First, it is the only alternative putting primary and secondary configurations in consecutive weeks, which is something we have always avoided due to the certainty of consecutive impacts. Alternative H also puts this burden on only selected communities, not equally across all communities. This would devolve the process into a punitive system, which should be avoided.

Secondly, Alternative H did not meet the submission deadline. This deadline was a matter of public record on multiple occasions. Given the significance of these decisions, we need to be transparent and address this issue. If there is another opportunity for submissions, it could be reintroduced. As could all the alternatives that do not advance today.

In closing, we hope the committee will consider the significance of predictability and airfield balance. Failing to achieve these key objectives would be a critical oversight and lead to dissatisfaction with the plan. We must remember the FAA's role is to disclose the impacts of the proposed alternative, not to correct them.

It is our job to solve these issues here and we only get this one chance. Thank you.”

**Ms. Cynthia Schultz, JDA**

“The goal of this committee is to minimize and equally distribute aircraft noise at night; to give maximum relief to all communities through predictability. We should proceed with the first choice as Alternative H and the secondary choice should be Alternative B. It is the fairest across all runways and it is the fairest runway utilization. A split airfield is good for wind management . It would keep the other side of the airport quiet regardless of wind. It would full respect relief on four quadrants and keep both sides active. Additional information from the wind rose there is significant wind study. The wind was predicted early on by the FAA and there would be an equal burden of wind on all runways. There have been three tests and we learned to avoid minimum use, convergent runways. An alternative wind would equal a schedule burden. There are summary analysis to the committee we recommend Alternatives B and H. Alternative H provides 46 percent on the parallel runways and 15 percent on the crosswind runways. Alternatives B,C,D there is a 20 percent split on the parallel runways and 10 percent on the crosswind runways while alternative G is 22 percent on the parallel runways and just 5.5 percent on the crosswind runways. I recommend Alternative H as the primary alternative and Alternative B as the secondary Alternative. H offers the fairest balance of runway utilization; a simple proven configuration concept; and compliant with FAA guidance to date.”

Chairman Annunzio called on Glenview to comment. (Glenview had technical difficulty joining the call).

Ms. House stated that the Village of Glenview opposed Alternative H. She said with the shorter narrower runways would not be used for safety margins. She said that 50 percent would utilize the crosswind runways and that was not optimal in wind conditions. She said it was less safe than the previous Fly Quiet program with far less safety margins for the short length of the runway.

**Mr. Ron Seymour, Avion**

The goal was to impact the predictability for residents. It would be too simple for air traffic control. The utilization of the full runway concept would have the air traffic controllers split between the north and south airfield. There would be consecutive impacts on arrival and departure runways, and it would still be bad for residents. Lastly, noise is always going to change. It is not the end all be all. Noise can change overtime; it can change in ten years, 20 years or even two years. This period could just be the interim. The program needs to be flexible since things may change in the future.

Mr. Kosower asked if members could yield their time and said he would yield his time to Mr. Dwyer for 30 seconds the process started. Alderman Chester also said he was willing to yield time to FaiR.

**ADVANCEMENT OF FQ21 ALTERNATIVE B**

**MOTION: Ms. Robles moved, and Trustee Klug seconded the motion to advance Alternative B for further refinement Motion carried by a unanimous roll call vote.**

***Discussion***

**Committee Members Remarks**

***Bensenville:*** Mr. Summers said that he advocated to advance Alternative B. It was consistent with the IFQ. It does not rely on RNAV it can be improved by tweaking where needed and he favored moving it forward. He said it was easy to understand.

***Chicago Ward 39:*** Mr. Bialek agreed with Mr. Summers and thought the alternative should advance with it split vector headings. He said it distributes the noise equally and was sufficient relief for arrivals. He advocated to move forward.

***Des Plaines:*** Alderman Chester yielded 30 seconds of time to Mr. Dwyer who said that all alternatives have consecutive impacts. The full length on the south airfield conflicted with the north there was an imbalance to south airfield.

Alderman Chester said he would not vote to advance Alternative B for reasons stated by Mr. Dwyer at this time.

***Elmhurst:*** Alderman Dunn said that Elmhurst supports Alternative B. He said it had appealing characteristics. It was simple to review, easy to understand for pilots, air traffic control and the general public. It would move evenly and balance the east/west flow. He gave it his full support.

***Harwood Heights:*** Mayor Jezierny voted to advance Alternative B. She said it would be a good decision and maintenance could be scheduled in advance to accommodate the alternating of airfields. She said nothing is perfect and there would be exceptions, but wind and maintenance could be managed. It would spread quiet time for communities. She said it was the best alternative.

***Park Ridge:*** Mr. Kosower agreed that he too of all the alternatives, Alternative B was viable for advancement. It is simple and referred to the 45 weeks of the IFQ. He said that 74 percent of the IFQ time was in west flow and 26 percent of the time was in east flow. He thought issues of predictability if we have potential weeks of consecutive impacts the committee would be fooling

themselves because the concept works on prevailing winds. He referred to the ANMS reports which is a 24-hour period that west wind was 68 percent for 12 months ending in November. It is serious concerns that it includes crosswinds that do not fulfill the IFQ with only 40 percent compliance of crosswinds even with the issue of COVID all weeks in Phase two those numbers are 22 percent of compliance on crosswind runways and 73 percent compliance on parallel runways.

**River Grove:** Mr. Ryan agreed that the best alternative would be Alternative B.

**Schiller Park:** Trustee Klug yielded his time to JDA and he was moving forward with Alternative B. Ms. Schultz said that Alternative B was superior, but adjustments to improve the alternative needed to be made to weeks 4-5 and weeks 10-11. She believed that second split as for wind scenario superior when using the north airfield keep to the south it provides fair utilization for noise second for runway utilization.

**Wood Dale:** Mr. Mermuys yielded the floor to JDA.

Ms. Schultz said to need to look at the vector headings not to exceed 20 percent of the vectors, but she also said that this was a discussion for later this was for documentation now.

**Niles:** Chairman Annunzio agreed for all the reasons given.

**Schaumburg:** Ms. Robles agreed and said she was in favor of moving Alternative B forward for further refinements in the future.

Chairman Annunzio announced that he had failed to ask Mr. Anderson for a summary of Alternative B and would ask for summaries of other alternatives going forward.

### **Rebuttal**

Eleven members yielded the rebuttal.

### **Voting Record**

- Bensenville—Yea
- Chicago Ward 39—Yea
- Des Plaines—Yea
- Elmhurst—Yea
- Harwood Heights—Yea
- Niles—Yea
- Park Ridge—Yea
- River Grove—Yea
- Schaumburg—Yea
- Schiller Park—Yea
- Wood Dale—Yea

### **ADVANCEMENT OF FQ21 ALTERNATIVE C**

**MOTION: Alderman Dunn moved, and Alderman Chester seconded the motion to advance Alternative C. Motion failed by a roll call vote.**

### **Discussion**

Mr. Anderson summarized Alternative C and said it was the same as Alternative B with a 12-week rotation, six configurations, two vector headings except it incorporated RNAV for crosswind configurations. There were eight east/west parallel runways and two cross wind runways. He said

RNAV was complex and would need more environmental studies from the FAA. Impacts would be different than vector headings and isolate operations throughout the program.

### **Committee Members Remarks**

**Bensenville:** Mr. Summers said that RNAV should be considered by full commission. It could ruin lives and it was not under the purview of this committee. He was voting no.

**Chicago Ward 39:** Mr. Bialek said he had similar feelings and was not in favor of RNAV. He will vote no to approve.

**Des Plaines:** Alderman Chester thought RNAV would be beneficial to some of his residents and not to others. He thought he would vote to advance Alternative C, but he would yield the floor to Mr. Dwyer.

Mr. Dwyer said that this committee should vote, and we are not at the heading's discussion. It should exclude RNAV and should honor the committee's vote to include RNAV. He had some concerns.

**Elmhurst:** Alderman Dunn said it is the same as Alternative B with the addition of RNAV. He said we did not look at the graphic of B and one conflict with crosswind for departures has two different take off conflicts with the arrivals and impacts populated areas. RNAV could utilize and take advantage of unique situation of tollways and industrial areas. Just going north of the tollway could fly down that industrial area especially by O'Hare. Elmhurst is in support of Alternative C. He said that they vote to move forward with Alternative C with RNAV. He said he disagreed with the analysis can be done concurrently and not bogged down. There is a lot with the upside.

**Harwood Heights:** Mayor Jezierny said that impact due to the complexity of RNAV the committee would need to rely on the FAA and as of right now she is voting now to Alternative C.

**Park Ridge:** Mr. Kosower said that at this time Park Ridge would not be in favor of Alternative C. He concurs with the RNAV discussion that it would delay the process.

**River Grove:** Mr. Ryan concurred with Park Ridge and did not like Alternative C.

**Schaumburg:** Ms. Robles said that Schaumburg did not have a direct impact with Alternative C. She said those communities that would be impacted by RNAV no longer seemed to advocate for this alternative. The similar concentrated impact of noise is moderate relief offsetting the impact concentrated noise. Schaumburg is not in favor of Alternative C.

**Schiller Park:** Trustee Klug concurred and said that there would be too much of an impact on the northside of his community. He was not in favor.

**Wood Dale:** Mr. Mermuys said he was not in favor.

**Niles:** Chairman Annunzio said it was not appropriate pursuit of RNAV.

### **Rebuttal**

Bensenville and Chicago Ward 39 yielded. Des Plaines yielded the floor to Mr. Dwyer who said that he regretted that the committee never looked at it since a majority vote. He thought there needed to be some presentation by Landrum & Brown because we looked at what chose and why we are eliminating without doing analysis to apply to all concepts. Alderman Dunn of Elmhurst said he appreciated Schaumburg stating that RNAV is a diagonal community issue but thought it was premature to throw it out. The FAA can take a further look at more complex issues as a viable option as one of our objectives is to fairly distribute noise and look at it further to impact to fly over routes that are over the tollway that is a preferred route for aircraft at night. Harwood Heights, Park Ridge and River Grove yielded. Ms. Robles of Schaumburg said the committee did take a vote to include RNAV and got to this point which included what RNAV looked like. A vote not to advance was not a lack of analysis we heard from the experts. We do not have to look for information on analysis not to move forward. Schiller Park yielded time to JDA. Ms. Schultz said she thought it was wise consensus of the committee regarding RNAV. It would cause a significant delay. It would require a noise study

which is a lengthy process. As a whole, the committee may revisit RNAV if the FAA recommended a Metroplex for O'Hare. She said that Metroplex was recently released for Florida and in the future, it could be considered for all runways in Chicago. The cost would be on the FAA. Mr. Annunzio said that in the future the committee must take a look at RNAV, but today he would vote no.

#### **Voting Record**

- Bensenville—Nay
- Chicago Ward 39—Nay
- Des Plaines—Yea
- Elmhurst—Yea
- Harwood Heights—Nay
- Niles—Nay
- Park Ridge—Nay
- River Grove—Nay
- Schaumburg—Nay
- Schiller Park—Nay
- Wood Dale—Nay

#### **ADVANCEMENT OF FQ21 ALTERNATIVE D**

**MOTION: Ms. Robles moved, and Alderman Dunn seconded the motion to advance Alternative D. Motion failed by a unanimous roll call vote.**

#### ***Discussion***

Mr. Anderson summarized Alternative D and said it was a full airfield concept with a 12-week rotation and 10 configurations. Operations would be on both the north and south airfields during the same week. It was vector headings only with eight weeks of east/west parallel runways and four weeks of crosswind runways. The major difference was the full airfield concept.

#### **Committee Members Remarks**

***Bensenville:*** Mr. Summers thought it was interesting concept to spread out the noise but did not provide relief. There would be noise all of the time. Spreads out the noise but no relief. He votes no.

***Chicago Ward 39:*** Mr. Bialek said no. He said he was not a fan; there are a number of complications for air traffic control. He is in favor of a split airfield.

***Des Plaines:*** Alderman Chester who said he was undecided, yielded to Mr. Dwyer who said that the key concept to takeaway, the first example not constrained from a full departure runway. Still have the tendency to use the south airfield full flexibility of the full airfield. Departures have to fly over there are consecutive impacts not correctly structured crossover headings full-length departures crossover headings for overlapping.

***Elmhurst:*** Alderman Dunn said that Alternative D has some drawbacks weeks one and two along with 10 and 11 looks north south on same weeks. He said he was not supportive of Alternative D.

***Harwood Heights:*** Mayor Jezierny said that this alternative did not provide noise relief and she would vote no.

***Park Ridge:*** Mr. Kosower said that he was not in favor of this alternative dovetailing on comments from Bensenville for the primary need for safety, the issues of the full airfield would put the burden on air traffic control.

***River Grove:*** Mr. Ryan agreed 100 percent with Park Ridge. He would vote no.

**Schaumburg:** Ms. Robles said she was not supportive especially with the feedback from air traffic control. She agreed with Bensenville in terms of noise relief. North/south airfield provides greater relief.

**Schiller Park:** Trustee Klug agreed with Schaumburg and would vote no.

**Wood Dale:** Mr. Mermuys said he was not in favor.

**Niles:** Chairman Annunzio said that Mr. Dwyer's conceptual position on the alternative was valid, but not so in reality. The set up would be overhead or just 1,500 feet away and that is just not enough space. It would not bring relief.

### **Rebuttal**

Ten members yielded and Des Plaines yielded the floor to Mr. Dwyer.

Mr. Dwyer said that he was not opposed to D or E. He said that the attributes are worth considering reaching the final alternative. The full-length departures keep in the committee discussion on D or E. Consider the full-length crossover heading to mitigate noise impacts.

### **Voting Record**

- Bensenville—Nay
- Chicago Ward 39—Nay
- Des Plaines—Nay
- Elmhurst—Nay
- Harwood Heights—Nay
- Niles—Nay
- Park Ridge—Nay
- River Grove—Nay
- Schaumburg—Nay
- Schiller Park—Nay
- Wood Dale—Nay

### **ADVANCEMENT OF FQ21 ALTERNATIVE E**

**MOTION: Alderman Dunn moved, and Alderman Chester seconded the motion to advance Alternative E. Motion failed by a roll call vote.**

### **Discussion**

Mr. Anderson said that Alternative E was the same as Alternative B with ten configurations in a twelve-week rotation. It incorporated the full airfield it had one vector and one RNAV heading for the crosswind runways. There are eight east/west parallel runways and four crosswind runways.

### **Committee Members Remarks**

**Bensenville:** Mr. Summers said it was a slight improvement on a bad design again it spread the noise and RNAV could benefit Elmhurst, but not relief for his community He thought D and C were better.

**Chicago Ward 39:** Mr. Bialek said he did not have more to add. He is not in favor of RNAV and he favored the split airfield.

**Des Plaines:** Alderman Chester said he had some concerns, and it is not an improvement over previous submission. He would not support this alternative.

**Elmhurst:** Alderman Dunn thought it was a slight improvement over Alternative D. It gets rid of weak impacts, it rotates evenly, It is workable, and it is something Elmhurst would support.

**Harwood Heights:** Mayor Jezierny said that her comments on Alternative D would apply here . She is not in favor of RNAV and will vote no.

**Park Ridge:** Mr. Kosower said he would vote no for the same reasons. RNAV is not prudent.

**River Grove:** Mr. Ryan agreed with Park Ridge.

**Schaumburg:** Ms. Robles said it was the same as D and she would not support.

**Schiller Park:** Trustee Klug said he did not like the alternative.

**Wood Dale:** Mr. Mermuys said he would not support the alternative.

**Niles:** Chairman Annunzio agreed with the other members and said there was no value in the alternative.

### **Rebuttal**

Ten members yielded; Des Plaines yielded the floor to Mr. Dwyer.

Mr. Dwyer said this all ties back to RNAV and in the spirit of the vote the analysis could be applied to both vector and RNAV. He said we did the best analysis.

### **Voting Record**

- Bensenville—Nay
- Chicago Ward 39—Nay
- Des Plaines—Yea
- Elmhurst—Yea
- Harwood Heights—Nay
- Niles—Nay
- Park Ridge—Nay
- River Grove—Nay
- Schaumburg—Nay
- Schiller Park—Nay
- Wood Dale—Nay

### **ADVANCEMENT OF FQ21 ALTERNATIVE F**

**MOTION:** Alderman Dunn moved, and Ms. Robles seconded the motion to advance Alternative F.  
**Motion failed by a roll call vote.**

### **Discussion**

Mr. Anderson said that Alternative F had six configurations and a six-week period. It utilized the full airfield. There was one vector heading per configuration with four east/west parallel runways and two crosswind runways.

### **Committee Members Remarks**

**Bensenville:** Mr. Summers said that communities would receive noise every night. The 10/28 runways are so close there would be noise every night.

**Chicago Ward 39:** Mr. Bialek said no, the concept to the full airfield means multiple departure headings.

**Des Plaines:** Alderman Chester yielded to Mr. Dwyer who said that when we use the full airfield concept on the south airfield, we keep overlooking the north/south full-length long runway. Further regret what the south airfield burden. When we plug in wind it deconflicts with the north airfield. It is conflicted with ground movement and intersecting runways. He said he still thought that advancing a full airfield is a prudent idea. The committee has not done that analysis. Both those runways are not

open what we noticed the disruption was due to construction. When conflict introduced, utilization is sacrificed. Construction on the 48 weeks of the four years there was an impact on all four quadrants.

**Elmhurst:** Alderman Dunn said the Alternative F has merits. It is highly simple with a six-week rotation and east/west parallel runways equal traffic. Potentially used it has balance. We have to look at the departures and the arrivals. That impacts the least amount on residents. One especially on the parallels on departures the same heading as on arrivals. It takes advantage of the land use of the tollway. He said Elmhurst is supporting this alternative because it is a simple balanced approach.

**Harwood Heights:** Mayor Jezierny said it was the same concept with more relief to residents.

**Park Ridge:** Mr. Kosower said he was not in favor of this alternative because it advances operations on the full airfield and has safety concerns.

**River Grove:** Mr. Ryan agreed with Park Ridge.

**Schaumburg:** Ms. Robles said she agreed she appreciated its simplicity and she said she wanted to like this alternative. She said we know on the surface that the runways cannot be use 100 percent of the time and with the wind conditions there is not a way to minimize consecutive impacts. The special construction. She said she tried to figure out how to use the full airfield but again she has concerns for air traffic control and consecutive impacts.

**Schiller Park:** Trustee Klug said he was against going forward with Alternative F.

**Wood Dale:** Mr. Mermuys said he was not in favor of the alternative.

**Niles:** Chairman Annunzio said it was compelling again conceptually it sounds good, but he had reservations on the practicality of using the full airfield. He will vote no.

## **Rebuttal**

Bensenville, Chicago Ward 39, Des Plaines, Harwood Heights, Park Ridge, River Grove, and Wood Dale yielded the floor.

Alderman Dunn of Elmhurst said he thought the alternative had some advantages and thought the committee could move forward with more than one or two alternatives. He said that this is the only full airfield alternative to move forward.

Ms. Robles of Schaumburg said that Alderman Dunn brings up a point, and this would be the likely one to move forward.

Schiller Park yielded to JDA.

Ms. Schulz said that she is opposed to the alternative. It is ranked number four and has zero relief especially with wind management. She said all four quadrants will hear noise. She said JDA is opposed to this alternative. There would be splitting time for the air traffic controllers' attention and the FAA would allow full-length departures is manageable.

**Niles:** Mr. Annunzio said the purpose is to advance and two alternatives do not stop the group to go back and look at another alternative in the future. That is what he sees.

## **Voting Record**

- Bensenville—Nay
- Chicago Ward 39—Nay

- Des Plaines—Yea
- Elmhurst—Yea
- Harwood Heights—Nay
- Nilus—Nay
- Park Ridge—Nay
- River Grove—Nay
- Schaumburg—Nay
- Schiller Park—Nay
- Wood Dale—Nay

Chairman Annunzio announced that the meeting was at the one hour and 30 minutes timeframe and that he would call for a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION: Mr. Kosower moved, and Alderman Chester seconded the motion to adjourn. Motion carried by a unanimous roll call vote.**

There were no comments.

The next ONCC Fly Quiet Committee Meeting will be held on Thursday, January 28, 2021 Zoom Teleconference at 9:30 a.m.