

O’HARE NOISE COMPATIBILITY COMMISSION
Fly Quiet Committee
January 28, 2021
Zoom Teleconference
Approved Meeting Minutes

The O’Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC) Fly Quiet Committee met via Zoom teleconferencing on Tuesday, January 28, 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

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 January 19, 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 began the meeting with a short review of the meeting format that the committee followed during the last Fly Quiet meeting. He said the members would start with

Alternative G where Mr. Anderson would give a brief summary of the alternative first, then each voting member would state his or her position. There then would be a rebuttal round if necessary and then a vote to advance the alternative. A member could yield his or her time to a non-voting member.

ONCC Member Comments

Mr. Icuss, Chicago Ward 41, said the decision the committee makes affects the communities whether it is one month or years to come. He said SOC had said that aircraft noise relief is silence and our overnight goal. A no vote for all of the alternatives would still distribute noise somewhere. He said that he would like a voting member to make another motion along with another plan that would manage the nighttime traffic, not eliminate it, or close the airport. With COVID 19 there has been an opportunity to reduce aircraft noise. He said that we have seen a reduction of flights by 50 percent. If we followed that template it would help the entire O'Hare community with all vector headings flying out from O'Hare. The motion would be twofold with one plan for runway rotation configurations and one plan to manage nighttime flights.

ADVANCEMENT OF FQ21 ALTERNATIVE G

MOTION: Alderman Dunn moved, and Alderman Chester seconded the motion to advance Alternative G for further refinement. Motion failed by nine nay votes to two yea votes.

Discussion

Mr. Anderson reviewed Alternative G and said it ran a 12 week-rotation and had eight configurations. It incorporated the full airfield and had one vector heading per configuration. There were no runway headings. A runway would be used on the north and south airfields each week. There would be eight east/west runway weeks and four hybrid runway weeks with different parallel and crosswind runways utilized. There would be limitations on configurations GG and HH because they would be visual approach only. It is very restricted used in weather conditions and has efficiency and safety issues. Again, it incorporates the full airfield, hybrid configurations, and one vector heading for departure runways.

Committee Members Remarks

Wood Dale: Mr. Mermuys said he had nothing to add.

Schiller Park: Trustee Klug said he had nothing to add.

Schaumburg: Ms. Robles said she had concerns regarding Alternative G using the full airfield. and questioned how air traffic controllers would manage GG and HH if those configurations were visual only. The committee's core goal is to manage predictability, and this would weaken predictability. She said that we do not know the wind conditions and therefore she could not support this alternative.

River Grove: Mr. Ryan thought that he could see where departures would end up over River Grove again and fly right over Fullerton Avenue over his house. He was not supportive of Alternative G

Park Ridge: Mr. Kosower said that his comments were in line with Schaumburg.

Harwood Heights: Mayor Jezierny said she was not in favor of the utilization of the full airfield with this alternative because of safety issues with configurations GG and HH and she would vote against this alternative.

Des Plaines: Alderman Chester yielded the floor to FAiR and said he is 50/50 on his decision. Mr. Dwyer said that right now there is a deficiency with this alternative. A third of the weeks are not predictable and it depends on configurations I and L being over-burdened. He said look at arrivals and departures in Alternative B, there are four weeks of arrivals over Bensenville and departures over Schiller Park. There still is an imbalance if it is a matter of crosswinds versus hybrid. In configurations GG or HH it is the same as configurations I or L if there is a missed approach. It is identical. Runway 28 configurations prior to the long runway. We need answers to our questions from the FAA. Look at what the total in each configuration equals departures or arrivals. The visual approach does not go away with Alternative G. The parallel runway communities look at the trade-off of configurations I and L; the problem still exists.

Elmhurst: Alderman Dunn said that this alternative has favorable characteristics and there is a balanced utilization of the north and south airfields along with the diagonal runways. There are some differences with the visual approach only the full airfield is on the table. He thought that Alternative F was a better solution, but to keep this alternative in play and move this one forward.

Chicago Ward 39: Mr. Bialek said that his objections were stated by Schaumburg. He thought that the hybrid configuration was problematic regarding efficiency and safety. He said he did not like the multiple vector headings on departures and would not advance this alternative.

Bensenville: Mr. Summers said that he was staunchly opposed to this alternative and would not support a full airfield. He said that there would be noise over the entire region with this alternative. He questioned a single vector heading and wondered what would be accomplished. He would not support this alternative.

Niles: Chairman Annunzio agreed that the problems with the alternative far outweighed the things that were interesting. He said the committee can "lift some of the concepts" from other alternatives as the committee advances alternatives going forward.

Rebuttal

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

Ms. Schultz said that first, Alternative G is not efficient, and the safety of the hybrid configurations have not been tested. It is not consistent with air traffic standard procedures and viewed not to give relief to the north/south parallel runway communities. She said any week that there is a full airfield there is less period of relief for neighboring quadrants. It is an unproven configuration and has not been tested yet. The IFQ tests did go through the runway rotation program. This unusual configuration defaulted to the 10/28 runways. JDA would be opposed to this alternative because there are too many unknowns.

Schiller Park: Trustee Klug had no comment but opposes Alternative G.

Schaumburg: Ms. Robles said that Mr. Dwyer had an interesting point, but let us look to refine Alternative B. To touch on Mr. Dwyer's point, do only configurations end up as visual only. She said she was still a no vote.

River Grove: Mr. Ryan thought that the alternative was not safe. He did not care for it because safety is the utmost concern.

Park Ridge: Mr. Kosower yielded to FAiR.

Mr. Dwyer said that lifting ideas was good. He said that he saw the difference and the committee needs to advance this alternative. The differences are vector headings versus RNAV, north/south airfield versus full airfield, and crosswind runways versus hybrid. There is nothing to advance; talk about safety north/south versus crosswind runways. The FAA reviewed the 28 configurations and would not advance any of them if they were not safe. As for visual only, it is a consideration on any diagonal runway. Landrum and Brown gave a good presentation, and it is minimal at O'Hare.

Harwood Heights: Mayor Jezierny said she did not feel that Alternative G was the best Fly Quiet time for the communities. She said to divide the airport with the north/south split airfield is the best.

Des Plaines: Alderman Chester said that of the four quadrants the northwest quadrant is not a direct traffic pattern, but only a turn for aircraft. Therefore, there are really only three quadrants where this alternative comes into play.

Elmhurst: Alderman Dunn had no comment.

Chicago Ward 39: Mr. Bialek had no comment.

Bensenville: Mr. Summers said that he would love Runway 15/33 back online. He felt that they were trying to advance two alternatives out of revenge. The second alternative to analyze against Alternative B. He is opposed to Alternative G and the full airfield concept.

Niles: Chairman Annunzio had no comment.

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 H

MOTION: Alderman Dunn moved, and Trustee Klug seconded the motion to advance Alternative H for further refinement. Motion carried by eight yea votes to three nay votes.

Discussion

Mr. Anderson reviewed Alternative H and said it ran 16 weeks and had six configurations. It incorporated the split north/south airfield and was vector heading only for single east/west runways and two vector headings for crosswind runways. There were eight weeks of east/west runway configurations and eight weeks of crosswind runway configurations. It was a split

airfield week to week and had a single vector heading for the east/west runway configurations and two vector headings for the crosswind runway configurations.

Committee Members Remarks

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

Ms. Schultz said that this alternative offered the fairest balance of runway utilization and the reduction of aircraft noise. She said it ranks number one with SOC. There would be a period of relief for all communities, a lower workload for the tower, and it was simple to follow. The tower could utilize without defaulting to other configurations. It was safer and more efficient. It is compliant with the FAA to date and would result in the highest use of configurations. She said that the quadrant concept is misunderstood. This concept split the airport right down the middle. The 9/27 communities would disagree, but they would receive the equal burden to the south parallel communities. Relief would come for all communities with this alternative. It is predictable.

Schiller Park: Trustee Klug said he agreed, and communities would receive quality sleep.

River Grove: Mr. Ryan agreed with Schiller Park and thought this was a fair alternative.

Park Ridge: Mr. Kosower asked if we agreed to skip over Schaumburg. He said he was confused by one thing, the 16-week rotation. To him it was just an eight-week schedule run twice. It is a strong concern utilizing back-to-back weeks only a primary and secondary back-to-back. It is a toss of the dice what the wind is going to be that week. We do know it is 70 percent from the west. It is a fallacy to go to week three and four and hope that the wind will be from the east. He yielded to FAiR.

Mr. Dwyer said that Alternative H does not meet the criteria for consecutive impacts not done with any community. He said that this alternative should be declined because all submissions were to meet the deadline date and this submission did not meet that date and was two weeks late. He said he deferred for that reason and felt that this alternative could have been introduced later. He said that the deadline should be first and introduce alternatives later.

Schaumburg: Ms. Robles said she did not disagree with Mr. Dwyer and Mr. Kosower regarding the consecutive impacts statement but said refinements can occur later. The committee could reorder the configuration weeks when it got into headings. She said she would support that refinement. She said that there was in fact a deadline, and it was a goal to consider timely submissions, but she disagreed to throw out the alternate based on a technicality of a date. She said the committee was aware that the alternative came in late and was not the best process. She thought it would be disingenuous to what the committee is trying to accomplish, and it would be nice to consider the alternative with refinements.

Harwood Heights: Mayor Jezierny said that she agreed with JDA that Alternative H brought the best nighttime relief and was the fairest with Alternative B. She yielded her time to JDA.

Ms. Shultz said that she wanted to comment on consecutive impacts with weeks three and four and note that consecutive impacts the same type for arrivals and departures are different and an alternative to long runways. The diagonals assigned weeks are 40 percent on those communities. There is increased frequency on the diagonals no more than east/west experiences. In test 2 of the IFQ east/west flow diagonals east/west flow better concept than the quadrant concept. We lost three concepts to provide the fairest relief to all communities.

Elmhurst: Alderman Dunn said that he thought the committee should not be holding this meeting today. He said the Fly Quiet Committee meets more than any other ONCC committee. To have two critical meetings in a short time created a false sense of urgency. He said that these were important discussions and information and the committee needed time to address. Having this meeting was a mistake and he voiced his concerns to the chair a few weeks ago. He said that Alternative H was not fair, and the criteria was not to have consecutive impacts. This alternative has communities getting hit. It may be six configurations, but it is eight rotational patterns affecting northeast and northwest. It is an approach organized around long runway patterns. We see the north and south airfields with a rotation cobbled together against that. It is the tail wagging the dog and is not a reasonable rotation plan. He reviewed the percentages of the proposed configurations. The arrivals outnumber the departures need a long runway this is a factor that is being exaggerated. The result of this plan is that it is confusing, and it does not meet the criteria. He said he did not understand one vector heading departures on parallel runways and then two vector heading departures on diagonal runways. He said that regarding diagonal arrivals and departures there is a lot of overlapping. Having that second departure runway is not taking advantage of going over tollways and compatible land use. The consecutive impact configurations are not fair. Some eight weeks are repeated, and it is just more confusing. He said Elmhurst would not support this alternative.

Des Plaines: Alderman Chester said that we call this stick it to the north and south suburbs. They want more traffic on the shortest narrowest runways. The CDA has spent billions of dollars on the east/ west parallel runways. The diagonal runway on the north crosses two parallel runways. The CDA has focused on the modernization of the airport for over the last 5.5 years. We are better focused on Alternative B. He said that they supported that approach, and this is turning into a “not in my backyard” approach.

Chicago Ward 39: Mr. Bialek said that he favors this alternative with the caveat that a split airfield is good, but would like to see another vector heading on the north to give relief for both the east and west sides of the airport. He said he would advance Alternative H with refinements.

Bensenville: Mr. Summers said that the committee should have done this a long time ago. The acceptance of Alternative H but it does warrant analysis. He said he would vote to advance the alternative with analysis and wondered if the committee should vote to accept the late deadline since some questioned the legitimacy of the alternative.

Niles: Chairman Annunzio said he did not think there should be a vote to accept Alternative H and agreed that he would vote to advance the alternative with refinements.

Rebuttal

Bensenville: Mr. Summers yielded to Mr. Seymour.

Mr. Seymour said that consecutive impacts are like minded for configurations on going. Configurations for arrivals or departures still create an impact where those contours overlap. Whether it is an arrival or a departure, there is still an impact. Just moving two weeks in a row is interesting and the operation needs to be rearranged and further analysis. The diagonals are not back-to-back it may work but it still needs to be rearranged.

Niles: No comment

Wood Dale: Yielded the floor to JDA.

Ms. Schultz said that she agreed the alternative could be rearranged and that JDA would support a second vector heading to endorse north/south and east/west configurations. She said the main point going forward was calling diagonal runways in east/west flow and to look at the flows helping us to bring relief to all communities.

Schiller Park: no comment

Schaumburg: no comment

River Grove: no comment

Park Ridge: Mr. Kosower said he had two comments. He said back to the crosswind runways he concurred with Mr. Seymour. The impact was the prevailing winds in west flow. Given lower utilization on the crosswind runways most of the time in the IFQ. The long parallels runways there was still an impact with the wind. He yielded the floor to FAiR.

Mr. Dwyer said that each alternative warranted analysis and advancing one that did not meet the deadline precludes one that did meet the deadline. He thought that by advancing Alternative H disqualified another alternative that did meet the deadline.

Elmhurst: no comment

Harwood Heights: Mayor Jezierny said her community made advantages on Alternative H and it looks like Alternative B with adjustments.

Des Plaines: no comments and yielded the floor to FAiR.

Mr. Dwyer said to focus on balance. Loose the focus on balance and predictability on parallel runways most of the time. If you add up the weeks on the west side, it has two weeks in the northwest quadrant and six weeks on the southwest quadrant. That is an imbalance on the southwest quadrant. Equal amount of time for the east/west flow. He said that he hopes in analysis we delve into the north/south imbalance.

Ward 39: no comment

Bensenville: no comment

Niles: Chairman Annunzio said to delve into the consecutive runway issue and if it does not work out, he would vote no for this alternative.

Voting Record

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

Chairman Annunzio said that he thanked the committee in advance for their input and now it was time to move on to the next level. The committee narrowed down the advancement of two alternatives, B and H. He said the committee had the ability to look back to previous alternatives and concentrating on B and H does not mean that these two alternatives are the final choice the way they are presented.

He said the next Fly Quiet Meeting would be on Thursday, February 25, 2021 and he thanked everyone and said it had been a difficult job and now it was time to begin the next process.

Audience Comments

Ms. Barbara Lonegan said that she appreciated resident comments. She said she followed the committee's work and wondered why there were changes to the Fly Quiet rules to accommodate those who submitted their alternative after the deadline. Why would the committee consider their submission? It is flawed. JDA submitted data that revealed that shorter runways cannot accommodate large aircraft. The criteria calls for no consecutive impacts and yet there are two consecutive weeks in this alternative. You may argue that two consecutive weeks are devastating to communities that have been fighting aircraft noise for years. Why not use the tollways and utilize the land use compatibility? The make-up of communities where diagonals would never have a fair vote. Please ask the FAA to intervene in the proceedings that have gone awry.

Mr. Icuss had a question regarding the east flow/west flow time. He wondered what the FAA did when there was no wind and there is back-to-back noise. What do they do with no wind for visual landing? For arrivals there is a bright red line on the map, it sticks to the contour. For departures there is green line, but the contour is no reflection in reality. He said he was sure that there is jet noise over River Grove. Departures impact everyone. His opinion is based on the contour and there are planes taking off all over the airport which impact communities everywhere.

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:33 a.m.

The next ONCC Fly Quiet Committee Meeting will be held on Thursday, February 25, 2021 via Zoom Teleconference at 9:30 a.m.