



SEA-TAC STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY ROUND TABLE

StART FACILITATOR'S MEETING SUMMARY

Tuesday, August 21, 2018

6:00–8:00 p.m., Conference Center Sea-Tac Airport

Member	Interest Represented		Member	Interest Represented	
John Parness	Burien	-	Tejvir Basra	SeaTac	-
Terry Plumb	Burien	X	Robert Akhtar	SeaTac	-
Brian Wilson	Burien	X	Joe Scorcio	SeaTac	X
Lisa Marshall (Alt)	Burien	-	Steve Pilcher (Alt)	SeaTac	X
John Resing	Federal Way	X	Katrina (Trina) Cook	Tukwila	-
Chris Hall	Federal Way	-	Joon (Thomas) Lee	Tukwila	-
Yarden Weidenfeld	Federal Way	X	Brandon Miles	Tukwila	-
Sheila Brush	Des Moines	X	Lance Lyttle (phone)	Port of Seattle	X
Ken Rogers	Des Moines	X	Mike Ehl	Port of Seattle	X
Michael Matthias	Des Moines	X	Clare Gallagher (Alt)	Port of Seattle	X
Eric Zimmerman	Normandy Park	-	Marco Milanese	Port of Seattle	X
Earnest Thompson	Normandy Park	X	Tony Gonchar	Delta Airlines	-
Mark Hoppen	Normandy Park	X	Scott Ingham (Alt)	Delta Airlines	-
Jennifer-Ferrer-Santa Ines (Alt)	Normandy Park	-	Scott Kennedy	Alaska Airlines	X
Laura Sanders	Lynden (air cargo)	X	Matt Shelby (Alt)	Alaska Airlines	X
Non-Member			Non-Member		
Randy Fiertz	Federal Aviation Agency	X	Joelle Briggs	Federal Aviation Agency	-

Additional Participants:

Steve Vale, FAA

Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle

Vince Mestre, Aviation Noise Consultant

Facilitator: Phyllis Shulman, Civic Alchemy

Note Taker: Megan King, Floyd Snider

Meeting Objectives

To review and discuss information from the initial meeting of the Aviation Noise Working Group. To develop shared understanding of Seattle region's airspace and flight paths.

Welcome

Lance Lyttle, Sea-Tac Airport Director

Lyttle reiterated the intent of the StART group is to bring together representatives from six neighboring communities along with representatives from the airlines, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and air cargo to brainstorm issues and to develop relevant actions that address these issues. StART is not intended to be a policy decision-making body, but the objective is to identify issues and develop recommendations to take to those bodies that have the responsibility and authority to make decisions. Lyttle stated that subject matter experts will be included as resources to StART and to StART subgroups. He expressed excitement that feedback from the first StART Aviation Noise Working Group was positive.

Member Introductions

StART Members

All members and participants introduced themselves and their affiliations.

Facilitator's Update

Phyllis Shulman, Civic Alchemy

The facilitator described the original intent of StART. It was established to provide a forum that fosters respect and goodwill, and improves working relationships while reaching tangible recommendations and solutions. In order to create a constructive environment that enhances cooperation, the facilitator stated that it is important that StART participants feel that their engagement is valued. StART members were asked to share what would help them to feel valued in this process. The range of answers included: seeing actual outcomes, providing for a range of perspectives to be heard, follow-up actions on issues, providing participants with an awareness of competing issues that may not match their own, the ability to have open dialogue among all parties, for all individuals to have a voice, and tangible operational improvements.

StART participants were also asked to identify the conditions that support a constructive working environment for the group. Answers included: trust, right expertise around the table, answers about what can be done and not what can't, patience, attitude and willingness to move toward "how," integrity, honesty, meaningful responses from both sides, active listening, willingness to walk in others' shoes, open communication, and evidence of progress.

An issue was raised regarding whether a StART community representative can designate an alternative when the representative cannot attend a StART meeting. The facilitator and Mr. Lyttle reviewed the operating procedures that state that community representatives are designated by their city and that there is no provision for a community representative to designate an

alternative. City staff representatives do have an alternate designee. This issue will be discussed outside of the formal meeting time.

Aviation Noise Working Group Briefing and Discussion

Earnest Thompson, StART Member; Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle; Vince Mestre, Consultant

The StART Aviation Noise Working Group (Working Group) reported on their first meeting and solicited feedback and questions from StART participants. Shepherd explained that the Port of Seattle (Port) hired Vince Mestre as a technical noise consultant to assist with the Working Group. Mestre's qualifications were shared with the group. Thompson provided the following summary of the first Working Group.

StART Aviation Noise Working Group Facilitator's Meeting Summary Thursday, August 16, 2018

Meeting Objectives:

- To establish the Working Group.
- To begin discussion and prioritization of a list of potential actions for StART to explore related to preventing, reducing, and/or mitigating aviation noise.
- To consider constructive next steps.

Meeting Summary: *The Working Group attendees included StART members, as well as resource representatives from the airlines, the FAA, and the Port. To assist the Working Group, the Port hired a technical consultant, Vince Mestre, who specializes in airport noise and has experience working with stakeholder groups. Vince introduced himself and shared information about his expertise.*

The meeting's main focus was to review, refine, and/or expand upon the initial list of near-term strategies identified by StART at the June 27 StART meeting. Long-term potential strategies could also be identified and considered as part of a future work plan. The Working Group suggested that it is important to clarify and identify who has authority to influence/make decisions for each specific potential action. Port staff and the consultant provided context for each of the initial strategies including identifying relevant history, opportunities, challenges, and examples from other airports (domestic and international), including best practices. Potential strategies discussed included:

- *Runway Use Agreement/Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)*
- *Nighttime voluntary curfew*
- *Glide slope & optimized profile descent analysis*
- *Airfield noise/reverse thrust assessment*

The Working Group members, as well as the resource representatives, reviewed the potential strategies and confirmed that these potential strategies are worthy of further exploration.

Next Steps: The Working Group decided to meet monthly for at least the next three months. Members identified additional information to be brought to the next meeting including statistics on night operations (including arrivals, departures, carriers, aircraft type, and seasonal data), clarification of what Port funds can be applied to noise mitigation, and examples of runway use agreements/MOUs. Suggested topics for the next meeting's agenda included:

- Review of a draft work program for the Working Group that identifies potential actions, additional analysis or information needed to evaluate each strategy, and who will follow up with each task.
- Suggestions for additional potential measures including best practices that the consultant may be aware of.

The Working Group members, Port staff, and Mestre reviewed the potential strategies with the StART participants. Shepherd and Mestre reviewed the initial potential strategies in more detail.

Runway Use Agreement/MOU: The Working Group will analyze 3rd runway use and identify if opportunities exist that can reduce the use of the 3rd runway during times of lower operation. Mestre gave examples of how MOUs are utilized for runway operations at other airports and explained that each airport is unique.

Voluntary Nighttime Curfew: The Working Group will analyze night flights and determine what the parameters might be and what steps could be taken to explore a voluntary nighttime curfew. Mestre gave examples of how Fly Quiet programs have been utilized at other airports to help incentivize the reduction of nighttime air traffic.

Glide Slope: The Working Group will expand their understanding of the airport's runway glide slopes and the implementation of Optimized Profile Descent and explore whether there are potential modifications that could help to reduce aviation noise.

Airfield Noise: The Working Group will explore and expand their understanding of the range of activities, including reverse thrust, that may contribute to airfield noise. They will consider the sources of noise including time of day, originating locations, airfield operations, and community impacts, and will consider potential noise reduction strategies.

StART members shared concerns, asked technical and operational questions, and discussed the information shared from the Working Group. There was general concurrence that these potential strategies are worthy of further exploration.

Presentation and Discussion: Air Traffic Overview

Steve Vale, Air Traffic Manager, FAA, StART Members

Vale gave a presentation and fielded questions on airspace and runway use at Sea-Tac Airport. The presentation can be found at <https://www.portseattle.org/sites/default/files/2018-08/Air-Traffic-Briefing-Presentation-180821.pdf>. His presentation covered a range of information.

Highlights included:

- At Sea-Tac Airport, the Seattle TRACON (Terminal Radar Approach Control) controls flights up to 15,000 feet and a radius of approximately 40 miles. The Seattle ATCT (Airport Traffic Control Tower) controls approximately 5 mile radius up to 2,000 feet.
- The primary reason for the direction aircraft arrive and depart is due to the direction of the primary winds and how they affect safety. Aircraft take off and land into the wind during each operation.
- Runway separation of 2,500 feet is required for simultaneous arrivals and departures.
- There is a single taxiway on the south end of the airport. This can lead to congestion and to limitations on where planes can wait.
- Sea-Tac Airport and Boeing Field (4 miles away) have to coordinate air traffic. Their proximity creates limitations. For example, when in north flow the air traffic controllers must visually separate arrivals and departures into and from both airports. When visibility is low due to weather or air quality, radar is utilized requiring a separation of 3 miles between airplanes.
- Sea-Tac is slotted to receive Wake Turbulence Recategorization in October 2018, but minimal changes are expected.
- Current formation, known as the four-post plan, is for airplane arrivals to enter from all four corners (SE, NE, SW, and NW) and departures to exit on the compass posts (N, S, E, and W).
- Over time there have been changes to the fleet mix. There has been a decline in smaller prop planes and an increase in larger heavy jets. Larger jets require greater separation.

Discussion and several questions followed his presentation regarding the Burien turn for turbo-props, missed approaches, air traffic control rules for freight-only flights, FAA consideration of community impacts, whether the FAA is involved in deciding when an airport has reached maximum capacity, who is involved in policy making, and the process for changing flight paths.

Public Comment

Compiled public comments are included here as Appendix A.

Meeting Wrap Up

Lance Lyttle & StART Members

Lyttle thanked the members and the public for attending, and continuing to work toward solutions. He reiterated that the intent of StART is to bring parties together to identify practical solutions to issues. He also encouraged StART participants to continue working towards that goal.

Next Meeting:
October 24, 2018, 6:00 pm–8:00 pm
Location: Conference Center Sea-Tac Airport

MEETING EVALUATIONS

of responses 1

1. Overall Meeting Experience	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

2. Presentations	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
		X	

Comments: FAA presentation was a little too technical.

3. Discussion	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
		X	

Comments: Need to know at start of the meeting how many public comments there are so we can adjust accordingly.

4. Overall Comments, Suggestions, or Questions:

Appendix A

Summary of Public Comments

1. David Goebel (Vashon Island; oral comments):
 - Commented on operations and flight paths and the current FAA NexGen Scorecard.
2. Bernedine Lund (Quiet Skies Puget Sound; oral comments):
 - Inquired as to StART's final goal, and what they want to have happen 20 years from now? Stated there are only so many planes that can operate within Sea-Tac's small footprint.
3. Sue Petersen (Quiet Skies Puget Sound; oral comments):
 - Suggested that instead of speculating on aviation noise it is better to listen to the community. She lives under the 3rd runway glide path, and the sound is deafening.
4. Debi Wagner (Quiet Skies Puget Sound; oral comments):
 - Played a recording of flights over her house and expressed frustration with being asked to be respectful during the meetings. Described daily abuse from airport as bullying.
5. Larry Cripe (Quiet Skies Puget Sound; oral comments):
 - Commented that In Burien the flight path decision was made assuming Burien could not fight back.
6. Alli Larkin (Quiet Skies Puget Sound; oral comments):
 - She has lived in Des Moines for 39 years. She read from a 2015 article that discussed aviation noise impacts. The article indicated that Next Generation procedures were a potential cause of increased aviation noise.
 - National Sky Justice had their first meeting last week and will be a force in addressing the issues.
7. Dr. Wendy Ghiora (oral comments):
 - The Port has a responsibility to the communities beneath the runway that are exposed to carcinogens, noise, and sleep deprivation. Please consider these before expanding the size of the airport.
8. Kent Palosaari (oral comments):
 - Children's health was not on the list of issues for StART to address and should be.
 - Asks that StART begin working with the community, rather than against it. There is still a trust problem for many in the communities.

9. Austin Smith (Normandy Park; oral comments):
 - Commenting on the meeting itself, at all of these meetings, for every one person that shows up there are hundreds that do not. Please do not forget to consider those that do not have the ability to be here in person.
10. Seth Osborn (oral comments):
 - When he goes outside to create his YouTube videos, he needs to pause and wait until the airplane noise subsides. He would like the group to take the concerns of the public into actual consideration.
11. J.C. Harris (oral comments):
 - There is no Memorandum of Agreement that could be signed that the public would think it was worth the paper it was signed on.
 - Do the people at the table have the stamina to fight this fight for years to come?
12. Anne Kroeker (oral comments):
 - She lives beneath two flight paths where planes operate at different altitudes. This parameter should also be addressed.
 - The carbon footprint of airport operations needs to also be addressed. She wants an explanation for the number of missed arrivals.
13. Dana Hollaway (oral comments):
 - Until impacts are evaluated and addressed, the Airport Master Plan should be rejected. It is unacceptable to the community.
14. Blanche Hill (oral comments):
 - She has lived under flight paths for many years. Particulate matter from the planes covers the streets. She believes what needs to happen is the development of a hyperloop as a transportation alternative.
15. Joe and Shirley Compos (written comments):
 - It is completely outrageous how many take-offs are diverting directly over Burien. We did not purchase our house 26 years ago to be directly in the flight path of all of the excessive flights being jammed into Sea-Tac's schedule. The noise of direct overhead jets and propeller flights impacts our peaceful neighborhood terribly. I also know this impacts pets, wildlife, and the general health of our community.
 - Also, we wonder what happens to and who reviews airport noise emails that are sent to noiseabatement@portseattle.org. We would also like accountability and action instead of finger pointing between the FAA, Port of Seattle, and Alaska/Delta Airlines.
 - It appears reverse thrust is being used unnecessarily as a general guideline, and far too much at night, which interferes with sleep, quiet time for neighborhoods as well as

nighttime wildlife such as owls. Will all 3 runways ever be constantly used? How about if Sea-Tac Airport built a 20-foot high noise abatement wall as they do along highways?

16. Susan Cwiertnia (written comments):

- Dispersion concept is intriguing and I would like to see more progress in this area. We live in Des Moines area (Woodmont Beach/Marine View Dr.). This is directly under the approach for North Flow and we can read numbers on bottom of jets as they land.
- The past few months we have noted jets landing overhead every 40 to 120 seconds. This is a very high and concentrated frequency directly overhead. The noise is indescribable and unhealthy. We can't even talk to our neighbors. Dispersing the flights in the corridor to lessen frequency would be a helpful start. Sad to say that when the planes were grounded during the Horizon Air incident the other week, the silence was deafening, but much appreciated. With the noise gone we actually had relaxation and quiet enjoyment of our home, beautiful community and nature. Dispersion is only near-term. Long-term should be a new airport.

17. Anonymous (written comments):

- Keep to your N-S runway. STOP flying over Burien . . . We are not "too poor and uneducated to stop you."
- Stop reverse thrust between 10 pm and 7 am unless you are going to crash.
- Stop adding more air traffic and freight to this airport: It's past capacity!!! Build an airport to the north.
- Airport runoff is still killing the returning salmon in our local streams that run down to the cove in Normandy Park. The airport needs to haul off this tainted water and additives.
- The airport air pollution causes cancer and lung problems and heart issues. This additional morbidity and mortality needs to be acknowledged.

18. Deborah Dennis (written comments):

- I'm looking for real numbers in terms of projected growth; long-term realistic solutions for a wonderful area with a growing economy. I agree with Joe Scorcio that it's time to move to solutions. Let's start taking bites out of this apple before it takes a bite out of us.

19. Brooke (written comments):

- I am concerned about planes veering due west from the runways over Lake Burien and my own home, 3 houses south of the lake. Flights over the lake are occurring daily and I do call "Quiet Skies" Hot Line to report them. How are these due west routes allowed by the FAA?

20. M.J. Weaver (written comments):

- The Advisory Round Bd. is weak and needs to be more decisive.
- The reason given "reverse thrust performance" may save money for the airlines, but the homeowners' value of their homes is devalued.

- The taxes for us have not decreased.
- This reason of “reverse thrust” should not be used unless it is an emergency. It is often used at nighttime.
- Many citizens have called in at the time of excessive noise, identifying the airline and time, but nothing is accomplished. Our voices are not heard.
- The people who can make decisions are not present here. Are we just beating the air?
- The reverse thrust is not always N and S problem. The take-off goes west often and extremely noisy and low over Burien. The aircraft departing over Burien is most frequently Alaska.

21. Arut Fox (written comments):

- I heard lots of comments about safety of airplane travel—what about the safety of those living below the airplanes who have flights going over every minute? We can’t talk when we are outside until the flight goes over and then talk fast for 50 seconds until the next plane. We can’t leave our windows open—even in this hot weather. We have to have tax relief—my property taxes went up 32 percent. How can we be treated as mansions and have no sanity? I have spent thousands of dollars on new windows and insulation to no avail. Now I need an air conditioner because I can’t open my windows if I want to sleep at night or talk on the phone. King County Assessor needs to be involved here! Property assessments have to include environment! State Reps and U.S. Senators and Congressional Representatives need to be involved!

22. Jean Hilde-Fulghum (Shoreline; written comments):

- I'm Jean Hilde-Fulghum and I'm from Shoreline, which is 25 miles north of Sea-Tac. In its "Greener Skies Final Report," the FAA called Shoreline ". . . *central to the area where procedures would be changing north of the airport.*" We in the north-end have witnessed those changes and they are not good.
- I've lived in my home since 1995. About three years ago, what had been a half-dozen planes a day turned into (seemingly overnight) a jet aircraft roaring overhead literally every 30 to 60 seconds, for hours at a time with no silence in between. This goes on from 5:00 a.m. until well after midnight on days when Sea-Tac is in south flow, about nine months out of the year. A single over-flight at the FAA's DNL of 65 may be just an annoyance. Hundreds of over-flights per day is cruel and unusual punishment. Roaring aircraft throughout the night causing sleep deprivation is nothing less than torture.
- My understanding of what the FAA meant by "procedural changes" was the implementation of RNP procedures, which, for the sake of efficiency, re-route the majority of south-bound arrivals into a single narrow corridor rather than the conventional widespread approach patterns, every single aircraft taking the exact same approach. This "sacrificial" corridor goes right over my home and my neighborhood.

- Thus, the aviation noise that used to be shared by the wider community is now entirely dumped onto the lower socioeconomic communities along the I-5 corridor. We're getting all of the noise without any of the economic compensation that is said to come with airport growth. This concentration of aircraft is also unfairly dumping aviation pollution over our homes, pollution that is well known to cause numerous health problems. We're getting all of the downside with none of the upside.
- This unjust noise dumping has robbed us of the peace of our own homes and yards. I cannot work in my beloved garden. I literally wear earplugs inside my home. We in the north-end are also being subjected to increasing traffic going into Paine and Boeing fields, traffic that is frequently at low altitude in order to accommodate southbound Sea-Tac aircraft.
- My neighbors and I are suffering. Despite being 25 miles from Sea-Tac, we now have a virtual runway over our heads that operates on a 24/7 schedule. Our north-end communities are being severely impacted by NextGen changes and Sea-Tac's growth. We, too, need to be included in these discussions.

