



## SEA-TAC STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY ROUND TABLE

### StART FACILITATOR'S MEETING SUMMARY

Monday, April 1, 2019

5:30-7:30 pm, Conference Center, Sea-Tac Airport

Member	Interest Represented	Present
Terry Plumb	Burien Community Member	X
Michael Matthias	Des Moines City Manager	X
Chris Hall	Federal Way Community Member	X
Brian Wilson	Burien City Manager	-
Sheila Brush	Des Moines Community Member	-
Jennifer Ferrer-Santa Ines	Normandy Park Finance Director	X
Earnest Thompson	Normandy Park Community Member	-
Kyle Moore	SeaTac Government Relations and Communication Manager	-
Robert Akhtar	SeaTac Community Member	-
Fernando Ruiz	Congressman Adam Smith, Legislative Assistant	X
Lyndall Bervar	Congressman Adam Smith, District Rep	X
Zachary Carstensen	Office of Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal, Director, Outreach and Engagement	X
Lylianna Allala	Office of Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal	-
Stasha Espinosa	Office of Sen. Patty Murray	-
Adam LeMieux	Office of Congressman Rick Larsen	-
Louise O'Rorke	Office of Sen. Maria Cantwell	X
Eric Schinfeld	Port of Seattle, Sr. Manager, Federal & International Government Relations	X
<b>Resources</b>	<b>Title</b>	
Dave Kaplan	Port of Seattle, Local Government Relations	-
Stan Shepherd	Port of Seattle, Manager of Noise Programs	-
Arlyn Purcell	Port of Seattle, Director of Aviation Environmental Services	-
Marco Milanese	Port of Seattle, Community Engagement Manager	X
Clare Gallagher	Port of Seattle, Director of Capital Project Delivery	X
Jason Ritchie	FAA Assistant Manager, Seattle Airports District Office	-
<b>Consultants</b>		
Phyllis Shulman	Facilitator, Civic Alchemy	X
Megan King	Note taker, Floyd Snider	X

#### Additional Participants:

Mary Ellen Eagan, Harris Miller Miller Hanson, Inc.

April 1, 2019

StART Facilitator's Meeting Summary- Federal Policy Working Group April 1, 2019

Page 1

## Meeting Objectives:

To deepen shared understanding of the noise elements in the FAA Re-authorization Bill, and to discuss criteria for developing priorities and level of effort for this working group's advocacy on the implementation of these provisions moving forward. This group will also work to begin identifying 2-4 FAA bill implementation priorities.

## Meeting Summary:

### In-Depth Review of Sections of the FAA Re-authorization Bill

*Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle – Federal Government Relations*

Mary Ellen Harris is a consultant based out of Boston who has been working for many years on aircraft noise and policy issues. She was invited as a guest to provide an up-to-date overview of the key components of the FAA Re-authorization Bill as it relates to relevant noise provisions. She does not work for or represent the FAA; therefore, her opinions are independent and are based on her experience.

Highlights of the Bill include:

- FAA Re-authorization Bill reauthorizes the FAA and programs until the end of FY 2023. Implementation plans for this legislation are still in early stages of development.
  - FAA is in the process of working to prioritize contents of the bill.
  - The FAA has been receiving short-term authorization for a number of years; this is the first long-term authorization which allows for more long-term planning.
- Subtitle D is an entire section devoted to airport noise and includes actions focused on noise.
- Provisions in Subtitle D fall into:
  - Studies: Aircraft noise effects, noise annoyance, health impacts, phase out of Stage 3 aircraft
  - NexGen Provisions: review of stakeholder engagement, appointment of regional ombudsmen, study effects of speed changes on noise
  - Supersonics: FAA must take "leadership position"
  - Misc.: mandatory use of helicopter routes in Long Island, and Stage 2 aircraft at 4 airports (not Seattle)
- Noise Provisions with direct impact at airports:
  - Updating noise exposure maps – if significant change in noise level
  - Addressing community noise concerns – consider dispersal headings for certain RNAV departure procedures
    - Requested by airport
    - Must not cause safety concern
    - Must not increase noise over other areas
  - FAA grant funding for pilot environmental mitigation programs

The overview included reviewing key aspects of relevant provisions. The provisions were summarized in a handout provided at the March StART Federal Policy Working Group meeting. Numerous provisions have completion dates that look unlikely to be met. It was stated that it is likely that some of the regional

ombudsmen have been hired, but there have been none publicly announced. Some of the required work is already underway including work on supersonic aircraft, revision of Part 150 land use compatibility guidelines (Section 187), and the study on potential health and economic impacts of overflight noise (Section 189).

Questions and responses included:

- Is there anything study-wide related to noise or environmental impacts missing from the list of noise provisions?

*Response: There are other things being studied, but not called out in this legislation.*

- Has the regional ombudsman for this region (West Coast Region) been hired?

*Response: None have been publicly announced.*

- How can it be expected that the FAA will meet the timelines for implementation?

*Response: It seems unlikely they can meet the stated timelines. She believes that the FAA is trying now to sort out priorities and timelines.*

- Is there the possibility that communities can have any impact on the FAA's prioritization?

*Response: It is recommended to meet and communicate with the FAA to try to influence the prioritization of task requirements.*

- If this is a 5-year re-authorization that is about study and research, is the FAA meeting their requirement by conducting the studies, or is there any requirement to make adjustments based on the outcome of the studies?

*Response: Some provisions require outcome changes.*

- SeaTac has seen a 41.6% flight traffic increase since early 2000s, which has resulted in significant impact to communities, but the FAA doesn't consider this a "significant impact"?

*Response: Part 150 for Seattle will be updated once NEPA documents are completed. As part of the environmental review of the Master Plan, environmental noise impacts are reviewed, and in addition to that, the Part 150 review is conducted*

- is there any action plan or penalties if deadlines are missed?

*Response: There could be some effort (hearings) from the congressional side to hold FAA accountable to completion, as expected by bill.*

- Section 190 -has this grant program been developed yet?

*Response: Not yet . This program does not have a deadline, so likely not a top priority. Given that, it may provide a good opportunity to influence the grant requirements and project scopes.*

- Is it clear what the FAA's priorities are?

*Response: No. Noise and land use are underpinnings for many of the other issues so would expect those to be the priority.*

- Is there political pressure related to any of these provisions ?

*Response: There is on all of them, but the noise, land use, and NextGen sections are the ones with more visibility.*

- Do the congressional reps have any focus on any of these sections?

*Response: The Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus is looking to add language to the transportation appropriations bill requiring FAA to prepare a timeline for implementation of all noise provisions in the FAA Reauthorization bill.*

#### Draft Initial Criteria for Developing Priorities for the Working Group Work Plan

*Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle*

Draft prioritization criteria (Attachment A) were presented to the Working Group for input and discussion. The criteria would be utilized to decide on key areas of focus /action for the Working Group. Some of the draft criteria are more relevant to utilize for reviewing new legislation versus reviewing provisions in the FAA Re-authorization Bill.

Draft criteria included:

- Applies to Sea-Tac's specific operational procedures and impacts
- Provides near-term benefits
- Provides significant impact
- Recognizes relevant timelines
- Increases flexibility and innovation
- Addresses community priorities
- Incorporates/advances leading edge research
- Potential for broader advocacy partnerships

The working group recommended three additional criteria:

- Creates measurable outcomes tied to clear metrics
- Engages a wide variety of stakeholders
- Maintains national focus on an important issue

Community representatives will check in with their communities and provide additional thoughts and/or criteria at the next meeting. The Working Group discussed whether to prioritize criteria and concluded that there could be different priorities depending on the topic/action.

#### Priorities Discussion:

The Working Group discussed which of the FAA Re-authorization Bill noise provisions are the highest priorities for the Working Group to take action on/try to influence. It was noted that Sec. 173, 187 and 188 were related. The Working Group decided that their priorities would be on: Sections 173, 187, 188, 189, and 190.

Once priorities were identified, discussion focused on what it means for StART to try to influence the FAA on these provisions? Ideas included:

- Sections 173/187/188 - Work with the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus and discuss how StART could support and partner with current national efforts. Joint advocacy may include pressuring FAA to meet deadlines and complete work. It was suggested that staff from the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus present to the next StART federal working group. This is a follow-up action item.
- Section 189 - Have an informational conversation between the FAA in DC and Port representatives to understand expectations and how they will proceed. Once that is understood StART can shape next steps.
- Section 190 – Meet with the local FAA rep (or FAA in DC) in the short-term to set the stage for partnership going forward. This will also potentially focus the FAA to brief the congressional delegation on things they are already tracking. Focus could be on communicating with the FAA on:
  - Making implementation of the grant program a priority
  - Engaging the regional ombudsman
  - Grant parameters including potentially changing the requirement that projects be within a 5-mile designation
  - Design of the grant program including funding partnerships
  - Early identification of potential projects and their costs
  - Reality checking the appropriated funding for the grants and advocating for additional funds

#### **Next Steps**

- Eric will provide summary of March and April meetings at next full StART group meeting.
- Agenda for the May Working Group meeting will include a report back on informational conversation between the FAA in DC and Port representatives regarding Section 189.
- Agenda for the June Working Group meeting will include next steps regarding Section 190.

**Next Meeting:**  
**May 6, 2019, 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm**  
**Location: *SeaTac International Airport, Room 4A***

## ATTACHMENT A

*StART Federal Working Group  
Federal Aviation Noise and Air Quality Legislation  
DRAFT Prioritization Criteria  
As of March 2019*

1. **Applies to Sea-Tac's specific operational procedures and impacts**, rather than – for example – policies designed to address metroplex issues.
2. **Provides near-term benefits**: prioritizes measures that could have immediate impact on community concerns related to aviation activities at Sea-Tac.
3. **Provides significant impact**: prioritizes measures that would truly affect the issues of concern – including “out of the box” thinking beyond air travel.
4. **Recognizes relevant timelines**: for implementation of FAA Reauthorization measures in particular, priorities action within Congressionally mandated deadlines
5. **Increases flexibility and innovation**: prioritizes measures that allow for new approaches to existing concerns, including allowing local communities to address issues in ways that might differ from national standards.
6. **Addresses community priorities**: focuses action on those topics that are of most concern to local residents.
7. **Incorporates/advances leading edge research**: prioritizes those measures that align with the most current thinking on aviation activity impacts, and/or those measures that would increase scientific understanding of aviation activity impacts.
8. **Potential for broader advocacy partnerships**: prioritizes measures that might appeal to airport-area communities and their Members of Congress from across the country for coalition-building purposes.