

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, March 13, 2017 12:39 PM

To: Drouet, Christina (FAA); Cooper, Barry (FAA); Becker, Robert; Limjoco, Ann

Subject: Re: March 10th ONCC public comment

I am not going to let this one go.

You tested a plan for six months and found that that 15 / 33 is useful to provide relief at night...

That evidently is not what the city or the FAA wanted to see.

The FAA has not been neutral on this matter and is compromising safety by agreeing to test configurations that were passed on Friday.

If the FAA is advocating for the demise of 15 / 33 in a expedited manner, we would like to understand why?

It has to have something to do with Western Access which is in litigation.

The Fly Quiet Program as it was designed is going away. This will require a whole new EIS because none of this was in the original 2005 ROD

On Fri, Mar 10, 2017 at 12:46 PM, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Can FAiR get some answers to the following questions... I do not believe the ONCC is doing its job to best represent the communities.

The ONCC is not allowing adequate allotted time at the end of the meeting for community input.

If the FAA is advocating for the demise of 15 / 33 in a expedited manner, we would like to understand why?

My public comment was prepared to be read at 2 minutes and 40 seconds and had been shown to the chair before today meeting with approval.

I was told at the end of the meeting to condense my comment into 1 minute which simply cannot be done.

Please consider my comment as a formal request.

..

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

On Fri, Mar 10, 2017 at 12:39 PM, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Can FAiR get some answers to the following questions... I do not believe the ONCC is doing its job to best represent the communities.

The ONCC is not allowing adequate allotted time at the end of the meeting for community input.

If the FAA is advocating for the demise of 15 / 33 in a expedited manner, we would like to understand why?

My public comment was prepared to be read at 2 minutes and 40 seconds and had been shown to the chair before today meeting with approval.

I was told at the end of the meeting to condense my comment into

On Thu, Mar 9, 2017 at 10:49 PM, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Today's fly quiet plan passed with a simple majority vote, not the true community buy-in of a 2/3 super majority as required in the first six month plan.

Today's vote was a choice of short term gain weighed against long term pain.

In this second rotation, the city will start to under utilize runway 15/33 to pave the way for decommissioning next year.

It would be awkward to suddenly strip a runway out of the rotation when it is providing so much relief to communities east and west of the airport.

So, what you do is assign just one primary departure configuration off of 33 and some mixed use runway configurations that the FAA have expressed concern with and let it slip into extinction.

FAiR has disproved many of the city's arguments.

We now know that runway 15/33 is NOT fatally flawed and unsafe because through your own analysis it has been deemed a safe alternative to provide relief at night. But in the final analysis, the city contends that 15/33 must go away to make room for western access.

Therefore, FAiR is requesting that the ONCC obtain precise clarification from the Chicago Department of Aviation on the status of Western Access.

We have some very simple questions:

What is the city's position on the building of a Western Terminal as it was proposed in the 2005 record of decision?

Was the 300 foot easement on the Western edge of the airport, that is needed to build the ring toll road, leased or sold to the tollway commission?

Can the city disclose details of that airport property sale or lease?

Does the city have a vested interest in keeping the ring toll road on airport property?

And finally, why would the city and the tollway commission want to make a landlocked airport even smaller by building a toll road where it conflicts with the Canadian pacific railroad?

thank you