



## SEA-TAC STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY ROUND TABLE

### StART FACILITATOR'S MEETING SUMMARY

Wednesday, August 28, 2019

6:00-8:00 pm, Sea-Tac Airport Conference Center

| Participant                      | Interest Represented |   | Participant         | Interest Represented |   |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------|---|
| Eric Zimmerman                   | Normandy Park        | - | Tony Gonchar        | Delta Air Lines      | - |
| Earnest Thompson                 | Normandy Park        | - | Scott Ingham (Alt)  | Delta Air Lines      | X |
| Mark Hoppen                      | Normandy Park        | X | Scott Kennedy       | Alaska Airlines      | X |
| Jennifer-Ferrer-Santa Ines (Alt) | Normandy Park        | - | Matt Shelby (Alt)   | Alaska Airlines      | - |
| Tejvir Basra                     | SeaTac               | X | Laura Sanders       | Lynden (air cargo)   | X |
| Robert Akhtar                    | SeaTac               | X | Chris Schaffer      | FAA                  | X |
| Carl Cole                        | SeaTac               | X | Arlyn Purcell (Alt) | Port of Seattle      | X |
| Steve Pilcher (Alt)              | SeaTac               | - | Lance Lyttle        | Port of Seattle      | X |
| Katrina (Trina) Cook             | Tukwila              | X | ---                 | ---                  |   |
| David Cline (Alt)                | Tukwila              | X | ---                 | ---                  |   |
| Brandon Miles                    | Tukwila              | - | ---                 | ---                  |   |

#### Additional Participants:

Mary Ellen Eagan, HMMH; Janell Barrilleaux, FAA; Cayla Morgan, FAA; Joelle Briggs, FAA; Marco Milanese, Port of Seattle; Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle; Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle; Tom Fagerstrom, Port of Seattle

**Facilitator:** Phyllis Shulman, Civic Alchemy

**Note Taker:** Megan King, Floyd Snider

#### Meeting Objectives:

To recap the Aviation Noise Working Group meeting and review the Federal Policy Working Group advocacy Work Plan. To expand understanding of and discuss the components and requirements of a Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study.

#### Welcome

**Lance Lyttle, Port of Seattle**

Lyttle welcomed the group and stated that the intent of StART was and still is to provide a forum for communities to discuss and address aviation-related issues of concern. He commented that because of the participation by communities, the FAA, and the air carriers, StART has taken some good first steps. Lyttle emphasized that there is still more to do, and recognizes the sensitive nature of this work. He apologized for Commission approval of the preliminary design funding for selected Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) Near-Term Projects without advance community outreach. He stated that he

understands the concerns and looks forward to the public comment period for the SAMP Near-Term Projects environmental review. Lyttle shared that the Port will begin more proactive notification to flag Commission topics of interest to the airport cities. He reviewed the projects that received preliminary design funding approved at the Commission meeting.

Lyttle expressed disappointment with some StART members for using this Commission notice issue as a reason to suspend participation in StART. He emphasized that the Port is committed to being a partner, and will work to improve trust, but that trust is a two-way street. He expressed concern that some StART members are not adhering to the Stakeholder's Commitments within the Operating Procedures. He concluded his remarks by stating that he believes that work done so far initiated by StART is constructive. He is committed to working with StART and encouraged Burien, Des Moines and Federal Way to rejoin the StART process. Lyttle's complete talking points are included in Appendix B.

Lyttle invited other StART participants to comment in response to his statements. The comments included:

*Mark Hoppen:* Commented that it is easy to see why some cities around the airport, with the legacy of the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway conflict, are quick to react. He referenced that the cities' situation is similar to a line in the movie "Matilda" – "You're big, I'm small, nothing you can do about it" is the feeling that some of the cities have living next to a major economic engine. He extended appreciation for Lyttle's statement, and expressed hope that all other associated parties, FAA and airlines, are also acting in similar good faith.

*David Cline:* Spoke on behalf of the Tukwila mayor and city council. He stated that Tukwila remains committed to continuing its participation in StART and to work constructively on solutions. He stated that Tukwila and the Port have long histories in the region and he recognizes that progress in improving relationships can be made over time.

*Scott Kennedy:* Thanked the Port for convening StART. He recognizes that in a process such as StART's that rough patches will be unavoidable, but emphasized that Alaska Airlines is committed to the process and continuing the work to address these challenges and maintain constructive conversations. He stated that the Alaska Airlines Vice President of Communications has reiterated their commitment to StART. He commented that the work already accomplished and in process is valuable; bringing flight operations and experts to the table is beneficial; and looks forward to continuing coordination.

*Carl Cole:* Shared that three years ago, the Port and City of SeaTac began re-negotiating their Interlocal Agreement (ILA). Cole commented that by the time they met with the Port, he felt a little intimidated, but as time went on, he stopped objectifying staff as "the Port" and began relating to them as individuals. Through the ILA process, Cole stated that he learned a lot about airport operations, and that the Port representatives learned just as much about issues for communities living adjacent to the airport. He applauded that open and honest negotiations came under Lyttle's leadership and recognizes the benefit of StART. He emphasized that if the impact of efforts coming out of StART helps make one person hear one fewer plane, it is worth it. He shared appreciation for the effort, and commented that SeaTac will continue their participation in StART.

*Scott Ingham:* Expressed gratitude for including Delta Air Lines in StART. He highlighted a number of initiatives that are now underway – the glide slope adjustment, the ground noise study, revised runway use agreement, taxi utilization study, and late-night noise limitation program – that were initiated by StART and stated that these are all big steps. Ingham spoke to the importance of collaboration and supported StART's intent to improve the ability to work together.

*Eric Zimmerman:* Provided a statement in writing to be read at the meeting in his absence. The written text is included in Appendix C. He stated that StART was offered as a forum to discuss, learn, and explore solutions. He commented that the Port, FAA, and Airlines have all participated in good faith, and where allowed by federal law, have shown eagerness to implement changes. As an aggregate, multiple incremental changes may result in an actual noticeable change. Without changes to federal law, major operational changes aren't possible. Zimmerman encouraged communities who have chosen to temporarily suspend their participation to rejoin and work toward collaborative incremental changes.

## **Facilitator's Update**

### **Phyllis Shulman, Civic Alchemy**

Shulman reviewed the meeting schedule for September and October. No Working Groups meetings will be held on the first Monday in September due to the holiday. The Federal Policy Working Group will meet on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday instead of the Aviation Noise Working Group. The Aviation Noise group will not meet in September.

## **Summary of Aviation Noise Working Group Meetings**

### **Tom Fagerstrom, Port of Seattle**

The Aviation Noise Working Group (Working Group) reported on their August 12 meeting. The Working Group meeting summary is attached as Appendix D. The briefing focused on key items discussed at the meeting related to the Working Group's Work Plan including:

- An update on the Revised Runway Use Agreement - the primary intent is to limit use of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Runway during the late-night hours. According to an FAA review of the draft agreement, draft language relating to the Preferential North Flow during night hours would trigger an environmental review (approximately one year). If the goal is to put the key changes in Revised Agreement related to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Runway in effect as soon as possible, removing the Preferential North Flow language should allow for prompt approval. No objections to this strategy were expressed in the Working Group.
- The Late-night Noise Limitation Program implementation. The program is active. Noise levels are currently being monitored between 12AM-5AM. Third quarter results expected to be published in October.
- An update that the Noise Abatement Departure Profile (NADP) analysis is underway. The analysis will identify the NADP that could offer the greatest noise reduction for the community. Currently, airlines are being surveyed to determine which procedures they are currently using and why.
- Contracting for a firm to do the Ground Noise Analysis is almost complete and additional discussions will occur at the next Working Group meeting.
- Overview of the Port's new noise comment system, including what information is collected and the type of reports that can be created utilizing the information.

## **Summary of Federal Policy Working Group Meetings**

### **Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle**

The Federal Policy Working Group (FP Working Group) reported on their July 8 and August 5 meetings. The Working Group meeting summaries are attached as Appendix D. The briefing focused on key items discussed at the meeting including:

- The FP Working Group has been working with other groups and lawmakers to identify how to best focus effort and strategies to have the greatest impact.
- An overview of the FP Working Group's Work Plan. The Work Plan identifies key priorities for action and implementation steps addressing three general categories:
  - Provisions passed last year by Congress in the FAA Reauthorization Bill that are relevant to the interest of StART members
  - Current legislation:
    - Representative Steven Lynch – Air Traffic Noise and Pollution Expert Consensus Act
    - Representative Adam Smith - Protecting Airport Communities from Particle Emissions Act
  - Other:
    - WHO Europe Environmental Noise Guidelines – clarity on the study and how FAA is potentially incorporating it into their studies moving forward
    - Metroplex Airports – Requesting that the GAO study of FAA noise programs should include other airports, not just Metroplexes
    - High Speed Rail and other options to address growing demand for travel

Schinfeld stated that the Work Plan also includes topics from the Aviation Noise Working Group's Work Plan. He also noted that the Work Plan is a living document that will change over time as StART continues to engage in discussions. The current Work Plan reflects the input and priorities of all six jurisdictions that have been part of StART. The FP Working Group will follow the schedule in the Work Plan unless there are factors that arise that impact its execution.

### **Part 150 Study Panel Discussion**

**Mary Ellen Eagan, HMMH**

**Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle**

**Cayla Morgan, FAA**

**Janell Barrilleaux, FAA**

Mary Ellen Eagan, an independent consultant from Harris Miller Miller & Hanson (HMMH), who is a national expert on Part 150 Studies, provided an overview of the history, purpose, components, and process of a Part 150 Study. She noted that the legislation defining Part 150 studies is more than 30 years old and has been revised multiple times. She stated that a Part 150 Study is a voluntary program that airports undertake primarily because they are interested in improving land use compatibility around an airport. She reviewed the phases of a study that include: first determining the scope, goals, participants,

and schedule of the project; then data collection followed by developing a noise exposure map that represents current conditions and 5-years into the future; and finally, produce a noise compatibility program that determines appropriate mitigation within the 65 DNL area. She stated that a Part 150 study typically takes 1-3 years to complete.

She reviewed some differences between a master planning process and a Part 150 Study and how data from a master planning process can dovetail with a Part 150 Study. She noted that if an airport is undergoing a master planning process and elects to undertake a Part 150 Study, that the Study typically utilizes data from and follows the master planning process.

The presentation can be found [here](#).

Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle, described the Port's sound insulation program. He reviewed the eligibility requirements, how those are determined and constraints on the program based on FAA requirements and State law. He shared data on the implementation of the program and the timetable for additional insulation projects. He shared some details about the program and its implementation including:

- The Noise Remedy Boundary takes the noise contour generated by modeling, and modifies it to follow roadways, natural breaks, and other areas, so line does not cut through homes, etc.
- Avigation easements are permanent. Port is aware that some building materials degrade over time, but the FAA does not currently fund and State law does not allow for second insulation of structures that have already been insulated.
- To qualify for the program, homes must be built before 1987, or 1986 in Des Moines, due to cities revising building codes requiring builders to meet or exceed the FAA standards in new construction.
- There are approximately 140 homes in the noise contour that are potentially eligible and have not yet been insulated. The individuals coming into the program now are typically new homeowners. Information has been sent to all 140 homes, and 48 applications have been received so far. Of those, about 7 did not qualify because of the year the home was built. 34 of the remaining homes qualified for insulation after sound testing was conducted (7 did not qualify). 9 homes have been completed this year, with more homes starting in September. 16 homes remain eligible and waiting on homeowner participation.
- FAA pays 80% of eligible construction related costs with the Port paying 20%
- The program is now focusing on condominiums consisting of 3 complexes with approximately 133 units. Firms have been hired to inspect complexes. Insulation is due to be completed by 2021.
- 18 potentially eligible apartment complexes (877 units) have been identified. The Port will conduct a pilot project on one building in 2022.
- Seven places of worship have been identified that may be potentially eligible for sound insulation.
- The South 3<sup>rd</sup> Runway Approach Transition Zone is an area off the end of the runway protection zone. There are approximately 16 single family homes and six apartment buildings in this area that may be voluntarily purchased by the Port.

After the presentations, the panel members including Cayla Morgan and Janell Barrilleaux from the FAA, answered questions asked by StART participants and covered topics including how Noise Exposure Maps are developed, the role of noise monitors in Part 150 studies, and the regulations surrounding homeowner noise insulation.

Questions from StART participants included:

- If the FAA grant funding cannot cover re-insulation, or repair, is that something that can be done with other funds?
  - *Response:* No, state law considers that a gift of public funds.
- Has the policy of insulating the interior of homes to achieve 45 DNL been in place for a while, or is this new?
  - *Response:* It has been a policy with the FAA for several years.
- Who pays the other 20%?
  - *Response:* Airport revenue.
- Some of the people that have the biggest complaints live in areas that are zoned commercial/industrial (non-conforming use) – Is there any anecdotal input for actual use? Is that considered?
  - *Response:* Yes – those are counted in existing compatible land use, which would identify properties that are inconsistent with the surrounding zoning.
- When would the environmental reviews/components be conducted within the Part 150 Study?
  - *Response:* Actions that are a result of a Part 150 would be identified for further environmental reviews, as needed. Specific reviews would be conducted independently of the Part 150 Study but prior to the implementation of each action.
- There have been complaints about the speed of the home insulation program. Why can't more houses be done sooner?
  - *Response:* The process includes hiring a contractor, hiring an architect to identify the best approach for noise reduction (windows, doors, chimney caps, etc.) and obtaining the products. Due to the limited number of manufacturers, delivery of products can be delayed. Speed is also determined at the rate homeowners apply for the program.
- One of the criteria is that homes must be built prior to 1987 to qualify for the sound insulation program. Are you saying that homes built after this year do not qualify?
  - *Response:* Correct- homes built within the program boundary after 1987 are required to meet city building codes that achieve similar sound level reductions.
- Based on interactions with community members, this doesn't seem correct. There may be homes built after 1987 that were not built to standard. I would recommend that the cities and/or Port consider assessing the situation and consider making exceptions to that aspect of the criteria.
  - *Response:* Building codes were enacted by the local jurisdictions (1986 in Des Moines and 1987 in the rest of King County) that either met or exceeded the noise reduction standards that the FAA requires. These standards were meant to ensure that any new

development would be constructed airport noise compatible. The FAA also has a policy that any structure built after October 1, 1998 is not eligible. The October 1, 1998 date is based on the FAA Final Policy on Part 150 approval of Noise Mitigation Measures.

- Was there a provision in the FAA Reauthorization Bill that was looking at secondary insulation?
  - *Response:* There was one in an early draft but that item did not make it into the final FAA Reauthorization Bill. This is an issue shared by many homeowners near airports around the country.
- There is no mention of the devaluation of homes within the 65DNL contour. Have you encountered this in other cities?
  - *Response:* As part of a Part 150 study? No. there have been studies about noise and property valuation, but the findings have been inconsistent as change in valuation often is caused by other factors.
- A Part 150 Study is limited to noise – is there any way this could be expanded to particulates?
  - *Response:* Not without Congressional action.
- Part 150 Studies are fully voluntary, but is there anything that can make it mandatory?
  - *Response:* There have been one or two Part 150 Studies that have been required as part of a record of decision for environmental studies, but otherwise, they are fully voluntary and it is up to the airport to decide whether to do one. The FAA may not continue funding for insulation programs if a Part 150 is not up to date.
- What is the relationship between noise exposure maps and the Part 150 study?
  - *Response:* A Part 150 Study results in two components – a noise exposure map, and noise compatibility program that outlines implementation. Noise exposure contours are often developed as part of other studies such as with a NEPA study. The FAA can require noise exposure contours, but these do not have the same full detail (land use, etc.) as a noise exposure map for a Part 150. The NEPA study conducted for the Sustainable Airport Master Plan will include the current 65 DNL noise exposure contour, but will not include the full Part 150 Noise Exposure Map. Sometimes airports will also generate contours as part of master planning, then revise/update those when they conduct the formal study, to make sure it's current.
- The Port has 24 noise monitors at the airport, how can the data for these be used in a Part 150 Study?
  - *Response:* The FAA does not allow noise monitor data to impact contours, but the data can be used to confirm the model. Noise measurements can have less accuracy than what is used in the development of the noise model. Predictions from the noise model can be looked at and compared to collected data, but the data can't be used as model input. Sometimes there is noise corruption at noise monitors, such as community noise events that can be captured/recorded as aircraft noise.

- Since the FAA can change flight paths, how do you determine the impacts of one community versus another?
  - *Response:* Whether it appears to be the case or not, the FAA’s policy has never been to shift noise from one community to the next.
  
- Do all large airports conduct Part 150s, and if so, how often?
  - *Response:* Most large airports conduct Part 150 studies; although, some large ones do not. Port of New York/New Jersey are engaged in their first one now. Miami has not done one. They may have done noise mitigation, but they have not conducted a Part 150 Study. A few airports were able to document programs, meet requirements, and receive federal funding without going through the process. In general, most large airports have though. 275 airports participating in the AIP program, \$107M has been spent in studies, \$5.9B has been spent on mitigation.

The FAA panelist concluded the panel by responding to the concern that the airport’s Part 150 Study is out of date and that it will be a few years before the next Part 150 Study is undertaken. The Port and the FAA recognize that operational levels have increased since the last Part 150 Study. The FAA and Port have worked together to determine how best to address this. They are considering waiting until the updated forecast is approved by the FAA; reviewing the contours run by the consultant for the assessment; and comparing the contours and data to the 2018 contour to see if there is an increase over non-compatible uses. Next, they will determine if it’s prudent to then start the Part 150 . The FAA wants to make sure they have good data through the updated forecast to make decisions.

**Public Comment**

Compiled public comment are included here as Appendix A.

**Meeting Wrap Up**

**Lance Lyttle, Port of Seattle**

Lyttle restated an apology for the Port’s oversight of not informing cities prior to the July Commission meeting and vote. He expressed the hope that the cities who have temporarily suspended their membership in StART will rejoin. Lyttle thanked all participants and the public for taking the time to attend and participate.

**Next Meeting:**  
**October 23, 2019, 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm**  
**Location: *Conference Center Sea-Tac Airport***



## APPENDIX A

### Summary of Public Comments

- Marianne Markkanen (SeaTac) (oral comments):
  - Shocked that Burien and Des Moines have suspended their involvement in StART. Expressed appreciation that SeaTac participants are still involved. Those who are currently deciding not to participate were instrumental in the beginning of this group and developing all the projects that are on the work plan of the working groups.
  - Commented that she is one of the homeowners that have been rejected from the sound insulation program due to when her house was built in 1999. She was not warned by her realtor. The house was purchased before the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway was built.
  - Stated that the level of noise in her house is astounding. She is paying for exterior house cleaning due to all of the residue on the siding from particulates.
  - Stated that she experiences plane traffic every minute.
  - Stated that her home valuation was lowered by \$18,000 as a result of noise.
  - Thinks that not allowing a house built after 1987 to qualify for the sound insulation program is not appropriate and that it is a crime that the FAA does not have enough money to fund more insulations. Suggested there should also be an appeals process, so there can be an evaluation of individual homes.
  - Expressed that she believes it is a disgrace that sound insulation was completed in only nine homes in 2018.
- David Goebel (Vashon Island) (oral comments):
  - Commented that the Vashon area is very rural and attracts a community that prefers quiet and is averse to noise.
  - One of only two PBNs are on top of Vashon Island. Flight tracks that used to be spread out, are now directly over them, within a plane's width.
  - Commented that the intention is that these planes would transition through Elliott Bay, but there were no PBNs on the east side; therefore, the conventional approaches on the east side do not mix well. So, they get to 6000 feet and level off, because they have nowhere else to go. In the past, the planes had a better descent than they do now with greener skies.
  - Stated that what is happening is that instead of decreased noise there is more carbon emissions and more noise. There have been no studies after NexGen to evaluate the impacts of these new flight patterns. Recommended that it is important that in the scoping of SAMP that the Port consider the cumulative effect. Now with flight track data, actual data can be used for evaluation.

## APPENDIX B

### StART TALKING POINTS – 8/29- LANCE LYTTLE

- I want to thank everyone for coming this evening, especially right before a holiday weekend. Your participation is greatly appreciated.
- I would like to make a few comments before we begin tonight's formal agenda.
- My intention in forming StART, in close collaboration with your city representatives, was to provide a forum for community input and action, with stakeholders from all parties at the table working to address current operational concerns.
- Because of the cities', the air carriers', and the FAA participation, we've taken some good first steps. There is more to do, and we value the contributions made toward constructively addressing the concerns of the communities.
- Knowing that this is a sensitive topic, we again wish to apologize about the lack of timely notification regarding the Commission's recent action to approve preliminary design funding related to certain projects within the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) Near-Term Projects (NTP). The oversight was not intentional, and we remain committed to prompt communication with airport-area communities on SAMP-related and other relevant issues.
- Preliminary design funding is a practice for local jurisdictions – including your own – to do limited planning work so that a decision to proceed, or not, is more informed. We understand your concerns about the SAMP Near-Term Projects and look forward to engaging you fully in the upcoming public comment periods.
- In fact, the Port will begin a new communication to the Highline Forum members in advance of each Commission meeting, highlighting what is on the upcoming agenda and a short explanation of the item. City managers and administrators will have it in advance of the meeting and can include it in a weekly report, if that is of interest.
- Port Commission agendas are always published Thursday in advance of each meeting; that will continue. This proactive communication is to provide more assistance in flagging possible items of interest.
- I want to take this opportunity to clarify exactly which five SAMP-related projects preliminary design work was approved for:
  - Design work for a **permanent fire station on the west side of the airfield**, so that we can get to west side emergencies more quickly;
  - Design work for a **maintenance facility on the west side of the airfield**, consolidating with services already located in that area;
  - Design work for the **main terminal Ground Transportation lot**, to better manage the TNCs, taxis, limos and other vehicular congestion entering the garage;
  - Design work for the **southbound lanes of the North Airport Expressway**, to identify congestion points related to widening the Arrivals roadway deck; and

- Design work for **Taxiway A/B improvements**, which would necessitate moving the glideslope antenna and allow for a glideslope change to 3.0 degrees or higher as recommended by StART.
- I am disappointed that some StART members have used the Port's communication oversight on the SAMP Near-Term Projects as a justification to pull away from the StART process and to make broader statements about the transparency, commitment and character of the Port and its staff.
- Trust is a two-way street, and I was glad to see it referenced in some of the communications we received from the cities voting to suspend participation. Working together, we have focused on problem-solving with conversation and creativity. I am committed to being a good partner, and I will continue to work to earn and keep your trust. However, as I stated, trust is a two-way street. I have seen some StART community representatives repeatedly not operate in good faith as members of the roundtable and in accordance with the agreed-upon operating procedures.
- My view is that we can work together to find ways to coexist in a mutually beneficial way. I welcome a conversation about how we can form true partnerships toward real outcomes, with all parties held to the same standards.
- Our commitment to productive engagement is more important than any single frustration or slight. That is why the work identified through StART needs to continue. I believe we have done good work here.
- I look forward to engaging with all parties about the best way to work together. We are open to how we can move ahead, and we will be meeting with each of the cities individually.
- Burien, Des Moines, and Federal Way are all welcome to rejoin the conversation at the table, with a renewed and shared commitment to the goals of StART and the process by which we have collectively agreed to operate.
- Collaboration and partnership are what result in achievement. So again, I say thank you for your commitment and participation in helping to improve conditions for the South King County communities around the Airport.
- With that I'll turn it over to Phyllis.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **WRITTEN STATEMENT PROVIDED BY ERIC ZIMMERMAN,**

#### **StART Community Representative, City of Normandy Park**

In recognition of the airport's direct and growing impact on the Seattle metro area, START was founded to offer diverse airport stakeholders a forum to discuss issues, conduct learning, develop shared understandings, identify problems, and, where possible under federal law, explore solutions.

The Port, FAA, airlines, and city professional staffs have voluntarily participated in good faith, engaged significant staff and budget resources, and where allowed by federal law, have shown both willingness and eagerness to explore any changes, which are likely to benefit airport-impacted communities. It is recognized that these changes would be incremental and not transformational-- the only type of change currently possible without action by Congress, but still worth pursuing. As an aggregate, multiple incremental changes seem likely to achieve tangible positive benefit for communities -- and a small positive change is better than none at all. In addition, partial and incremental mitigation of future negative changes seems very viable within the START model.

Absent transformational legislative action by Congress, incremental changes are also the only close-in community changes, which are legally viable. Any city which votes to discontinue a collective pursuit of positive incremental changes, so that unrealistic changes or disruption to airport use can be emphasized, risks increasing harm to their community instead of finding ways to decrease it.

The Pacific Northwest depends on SeaTac airport for its positive impact on economic activity, jobs, and overall future. Another regional airport is needed, but, so is SeaTac, and great regional economic harm would occur through restrictions on demand-driven use of the airport. Moreover, no such restrictions are legal.

I ask START members to embrace the process and return to the table to pursue collective incremental changes and mitigation which offer a strong chance of achieving positive community impact, until such a time as Congress provides a legislative framework for additional regulation of airport noise and pollution. As well, I challenge START participants to use the forum to educate their communities on what changes are and are not possible under federal law.

## APPENDIX D

**START FACILITATOR'S MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Aviation Noise Working Group**  
**Monday August 12, 2019**  
**5:30 – 7:30, Conference Center SeaTac Airport**

| <b>Attendee</b>            | <b>Interest Represented</b> |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Mark Hoppen                | Normandy Park               |
| Tejvir Bashra (phone)      | SeaTac                      |
| Eric Zimmerman             | Normandy Park               |
| Jennifer Ferrer-Santa Ines | Normandy Park               |
| Jennifer Kester            | City of SeaTac              |
| Bill Vadino                | Federal Way                 |
| John Reising               | Federal Way                 |
| Stan Shepherd              | Port of Seattle             |
| Marco Milanese             | Port of Seattle             |
| Robert Tykoski             | Port of Seattle             |
| Clare Gallager             | Port of Seattle             |
| Tom Fagerstrom             | Port of Seattle             |
| Scott Ingham               | Delta Airlines              |
| Chris Schaffer             | FAA                         |
| Vince Mestre               | L&B                         |

**Facilitator: Phyllis Shulman, Civic Alchemy**

**Note Taker: Megan King, Floyd Snider**

**Other Attendees: Commissioner Fred Felleman; Lance Lyttle, Arlyn Purcell, Alex O'Brien, Port of Seattle; Steve Alverson, ESA Airports (phone)**

### **Meeting Objectives**

To provide updates on actions in the Rolling Work Plan including the Noise Abatement Departure Profile Noise Analysis. To receive a demonstration on Sea-Tac Airport's new noise comment system. To discuss and resolve a number of process issues brought up in the Working Group.

### **Meeting Summary**

#### Introductions

Commissioner Felleman expressed appreciation for participants and their efforts. He stated that he is impressed by and supportive of the work that has been done through StART.

Lyttle notified the group that the Cities of Buren and Des Moines have temporarily suspended their participation in StART. He emphasized that his hope is that they will rejoin StART. Lyttle mentioned that he is appreciative of the time/effort/work that has been done so far, and hopes the participants from the other cities will remain, and continue the good work that will benefit all surrounding communities.

A StART member stated they he also is appreciative of the opportunity that StART provides to cooperate and that he supports the ongoing work and progress made so far, and will continue to participate in the progress that has been made. This member emphasized maintaining realistic expectations of what can be accomplished in the near term and what requires longer-term legislative changes. A different StART member disagreed with that perspective.

### Updates on Implementation on Draft Rolling Work Plan:

#### Late Night Noise Limitation Program

Marco Milanese, Port of Seattle

- Program is live as of July 1, 2019. Noise statistics are being collected from the four noise monitors. Data will be reported quarterly, with the first report out in October.
- The Working Group will be updated on how information is reported out to the airlines and the public. The Late Night Noise Limitation Program has a webpage that provides additional information.

#### Revised Runway Use Agreement

Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle

- The first runway use agreement between the Port and FAA was put into effect in 2009. Through discussions at the Working Group meetings StART participants recommended revising the agreement, for the purpose of reducing the use of the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway during the late night hours
- The FAA identified one issue with the revised agreement, which if maintained would trigger an environmental review, as it would be considered a change to operational procedures. The language was related to the north flow preferential use during nighttime hours. If the Port wanted to maintain the inclusion of this language, then the FAA process for assessing the Revised Runway Use Agreement would take about a year in order to perform the environmental review. Port staff stated that their recommendation to the Working Group was to remove the text that would trigger the review in order to expedite implementing the revised agreement. It was stated that the text regarding the north flow preferential use could be worked on as part of a separate process with a longer time frame. Guidance on this issue was requested from the Working Group. There was no objection to going forward in this manner.

#### Glide Slope Adjustment

Robert Tykoski, Port of Seattle

- The Port has received Commission approval to enter into a reimbursable agreement with the FAA to further the planning associated with the glide slope relocation.
- Stated that it will take about four years to implement. The design process for the adjusted flight procedures is the primary time driver.

Discussion and questions included:

- What is the length of time to implement? Originally, recalled implementation was expected to be 2-3 years.
  - *Response:* The timeline for the procedure development and design is 2-3 years with full implementation closer to 4 years.
- Can this timeline be expedited?
  - *Response:* Likely not, as that is the time required to design and publish a revised procedure. The Port is already doing what they can to expedite the process and will continue to see if they can identify other ways to speed up the timeline.

#### Updates on Implementation of Noise Abatement Departure Profiles Noise Analysis

Steve Alverson, ESA

Alverson provided an update on the Noise Abatement Departure Profile (NADP) Noise Analysis. The update included:

- ESA is underway with their scope of work.
  - The first step in the process is surveying the airlines to know the profiles they are currently using, so ESA can model the difference between the Distant NADP and the NADPs the sample airlines are flying.
  - Five airlines have been surveyed.
  - The NADP analysis is focusing on the 737-800, as it is the predominant aircraft flown at Sea-Tac.
  - Have received responses back from United and Southwest so far.
  - Have also heard from others that they are working on compiling information and will provide their responses by the August 15<sup>th</sup> deadline.
  - Next steps include summarizing the information received, and then modeling the departure profiles to see how they compare to each other, and if there is a preference for one over the other.
  - Results will be summarized by 8/30, and they will then begin modeling noise exposure, with preliminary results by 9/9, and final results by 9/30.
  - Assuming schedule is maintained, Steve will be at the October StART meeting to present results.

Discussion and questions included:

- Will the analysis consider if changes in departure procedures will affect other procedures, and how that would be resolved?
  - *Response:* This is not included in the current scope, but typically proposed procedures will be within the same range. Looking at effects would be the next phase, if procedure changes would be broadly implemented. The initial plan was to first identify if there were benefits from any of the procedures, and then do additional analysis, if necessary.

- If this is a long-term process, would it make sense to include evaluation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway at the same time, in case that it's use may change?
  - *Response:* If there is a benefit to procedures identified, they could be applicable to any runway. The extra step is identifying the population that could possibly be impacted or benefited. Alverson will attempt to evaluate this under their current contract. Mestre added that there could be conflicts with a potential step-down procedure, which may have a near-term effect, but could change over time if the FAA decides to implement any additional Next Gen approach procedures.
- How is the noise reduction quantified?
  - *Response:* The analysis will look at single-event noise contours from each procedure and look at the changes. It will also look at grid-points along the centerline of each procedure to see how noise is changing and where residences are in reference to those contours.
- Recommendation by a StART participant that the evaluation specifically include impact on number of people, not just land use. It was noted that this is an equity and social justice issue, so it is important to consider and understand.
  - *Response:* ESA's current contract is not scoped to count people, but census information can be used to get rough estimates in population.

#### Ground Noise Study

Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle

The overview included:

- Final interviews were held last week with potential consultants to conduct the study. A preferred consultant has been selected and the contracting process is underway. The expectation is that the contract will be finalized within a month and there will likely be a briefing at the October Working Group meeting.
- The purpose of the Ground Noise Study will be to identify ground noise emanating from the airfield, and then to identify options or opportunities for noise reduction.

Discussion and questions included:

- Is there a plan to keep Burien and Des Moines updated as things move forward? StART participant stated that it is important to keep cities updated who are temporarily suspended, even if representatives are currently not participating.
  - *Response:* It was stated that reports would continue to the Highline Forum as well as the larger StART group. Meeting summaries are posted on StART's website. Port staff responded that they will consider how best to conduct outreach to the cities who suspended participation.
- Is there an update on the taxiway procedure test?
  - *Response:* The FAA is still considering the pilot test and had stated that the fall is a more likely time for a pilot. Also, because it is a change to air traffic control, it requires union negotiation, which takes time. Both Delta Airlines and Alaska Air Lines are supportive of the pilot. Port staff indicated that it might be possible to record noise data to better understand the noise benefits of the procedure.



## Sea-Tac Airport's New Noise Comment System Demonstration

Alex O'Brien, Port of Seattle

Alex provided a demonstration of the new noise comment system including an initial overview of the types of reports and data that can be generated from the system. He solicited feedback and recommendations on the type of reports and data of interest to the working group. Highlights of the demonstration included:

- The system is integrated with the Port's current flight tracking database and is used to manage comments and provide a response as quickly as possible.
- The mobile app download instructions, online comment form and contact phone number can be found at: <https://www.portseattle.org/page/submitting-comment-airport-noise-programs>
- Includes a mobile app that can be downloaded from the Port's website.
- Internal reporting data was displayed. Data can be sorted by city .
- Data can also be sorted by who is making the comment – top commenter has over 3,000 in current data set (since July 11, 2019).
- Data can also be sorted by location of comments.
- Two big technology changes have affected the number of comments – the Airnoise.io button and other mobile apps.

Discussion and questions included:

- Can cities request specific data to be provided?
  - *Response: Yes*
- What kind of analysis does the Port expect to conduct based on the information being collected?
  - *Response: Looking for trends, reviewing flight paths, and trying to identify unusual issues that may be causing the comments.*
- Can the analytics become useful for the FAA to help them identify potential future changes to flight patterns?
  - *Response: The goal of this system is comment management and response. Comments are not used by the FAA as an analytic to change flight patterns.*
- What information would be most useful to StART?
  - *Response: There can be recognizable patterns and collecting the data may be useful.*
- Can the system report the number of people commenting instead of the number of comments?
  - *Response: Yes*
- Has Port Noise Programs ever considered showing some of this data to the public to show greater transparency?
  - *Response: The system is only a month old, but Port staff will discuss the possibilities.*

City representatives stated that there is information that could be helpful to them including number of comments per city or zip code, number of people complaining, and number of complaints per person. Reports could be sent to cities or made available on the website. Port staff responded that they would

prepare some sample reporting data and share it at the October Working Group meeting. Staff will provide some options for discussion at the meeting. Port staff requested that Working Group participants provide any ideas on what information they would like provided. Ideas can be provided by email to the facilitator. Cities also have the option of filing a public disclosure request for data.

#### Working Group Process Discussion

Phyllis Shulman, Facilitator

Shulman surveyed Working Group participants for other near-term or mid-term action items or issues that the Working Group may want to add to the Work Program. Shulman stated that most of the items initially identified by StART are currently being worked on, or have shifted to the Federal Policy Working Group. It was requested that any additional potential issues be brought up for discussion at the October meeting. A Working Group participant commented that one priority issue is health and ultra-fine particulates as well as the health effects of noise. Shulman reminded the Working Group that health was identified as a priority during the 2019 StART prioritization process. It was requested that the Working Group continue to have updates on the taxiway study as well as an update on whether the FAA is meeting their deadlines related to the FAA Reauthorization Act. It was requested that the work of the Aviation Noise Working Group and the Federal Policy Working Group be sure to be coordinated. It was requested that an update on the Q-320 whistle noise be provided at the next Working Group meeting.

#### Working Group Process Issues

Phyllis Shulman, Facilitator

Shulman discussed a number of Working Group process issues that were brought up in a previous meeting.

#### Use of Consultants

- Cities can request to have their own consultants participate in presentations. They would be responsible for financing their involvement. The city making the request would be responsible for providing information on the purpose of the consultant's involvement, the nature of their expertise, and contact information for the consultant. The Port will make the final determination regarding their involvement.

#### Audiotaping Working Groups:

- Shulman stated that Working Group meetings would not be audiotaped. Currently, relationships are in a low-trust state. It is important that participants can engage in open conversations without concern that comments will be utilized out of context or misused. Audiotaping in low trust as well as litigious environments diminish involvement. StART is striving to change the nature of interactions from adversarial to cooperative.

### **Future Meetings Dates/Times:**

Next meeting: October 7, 2019, 5:30 pm -7:30 pm, Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, Room 4A

**APPENDIX E**  
**StART FACILITATOR'S FEDERAL POLICY MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Monday, July 8, 2019**  
**5:30-7:30 pm, Conference Center, Sea-Tac Airport**

| <b>Member</b>              | <b>Interest Represented</b>  | <b>Present</b> |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|
| Terry Plumb                | Burien Community Member  | X              |
| Michael Matthias           | Des Moines City Manager  | -              |
| Chris Hall                 | Federal Way Community Member   | X              |
| Brian Wilson               | Burien City Manager  | X              |
| Sheila Brush               | Des Moines Community Member  | X              |
| Jennifer Ferrer-Santa Ines | Normandy Park Finance Director   | -              |
| Earnest Thompson           | Normandy Park Community Member   | X              |
| Kyle Moore                 | SeaTac Government Relations and Communication Manager                      | -              |
| Robert Akhtar              | SeaTac Community Member  | X              |
| Larry Cripe                | Burien Community Member  | X              |
| Steve Edmiston             | Des Moines Community Member  | X              |
| Lyndall Bervar             | Congressman Adam Smith, District Rep                                       | X              |
| Zachary Carstensen         | Office of Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal, Director, Outreach and Engagement | -              |
| Lylianna Allala            | Office of Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal                                    | X              |
| Stasha Espinosa            | Office of Sen. Patty Murray  | -              |
| Adam LeMieux               | Office of Congressman Rick Larsen  | -              |
| Louise O'Rorke             | Office of Sen. Maria Cantwell  | -              |
| 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   | -              |
| Emily Jackson              | Note taker, Floyd Snider   | X              |

**Additional Participants:**

Yasmine Medhi and Jessica Mulligan, Office of U.S. Representative Pramila Jayapal (D-WA);  
Amanda Wyma Bradley, Office of U.S. Representative Adam Smith (D-WA)

## Meeting Objectives:

To discuss information shared by the FAA. To continue to discuss the FAA Reauthorization Act and new legislation priorities. To provide feedback on the Draft Work Plan for the Working Group.

## Meeting Summary:

### Introduction of new DC staff for Representative Smith and Representative Jayapal

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

*Jessica Mulligan, Office of U.S. Representative Pramila Jayapal*

*Amanda Wyma-Bradley, Office of U.S. Representative Adam Smith*

*Yasmine Medhi, Office of U.S. Representative Pramila Jayapal*

New staff from Representatives Smith and Jayapal introduced themselves and their respective work in initiatives related to transportation and aviation. The staff stated that Congresswoman Jayapal had an amendment that was passed by the House of Representatives as part of the FY2020 transportation appropriations bill. This amendment would transfer \$2 million to fully fund items from the 2018 FAA Reauthorization Act related to Subtitle D - Airport Noise and Environmental Streamlining. It will ultimately be up to the agency how they use the money, but Congress can hold them accountable via this directive. The staff stated that Congressman Smith has two aviation bills, one that has already been introduced and a new Aviation Impacted Communities Act that will be introduced soon.

StART members shared perspectives, concerns, and recommendations including:

- The focus of these initiatives should be on health impacts broadly, not just noise.

### Debrief of FAA Presentation at June StART Meeting

*Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle*

*Working Group Participants*

StART members shared perspectives, concerns, and recommendations related to the FAA presentation at the June StART meeting, including:

- Several participants felt the information provided by the FAA did not appear to be new, and would have liked the FAA to provide the presentation further in advance in order to pre-brief and support relevant questions.
- The participants had a general consensus that the FAA should consider the results of independent studies in their research, including those conducted by the WHO. They would also like to see the results of the 2017 survey of noise annoyance.
- One participant felt the amount of research taking place appeared to be fairly extensive, particularly with regards to runway use and reverse thrust, and that these studies could be used to develop impactful interim actions/operational changes.
- One participant was concerned about Section 174, what it means for the new noise maps, and future Part 150 updates.

The Federal Policy Group discussed the following goals for the group related to the study:

- Request that the FAA provide a formal response to the WHO Europe noise study, .

- Request the FAA to release the results of the 2017 survey of noise annoyance along with related policy guidance.
- Work to find and secure federal grant dollars for the Port to apply toward implementing impactful interim actions.

Update on FAA Reauthorization and New Legislation Priorities

*Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle*

*Working Group Participants*

Revised draft priorities were presented to the Working Group (attached) related to the FAA Reauthorization Bill, along with priorities for the group related to existing proposed legislation and ideas for additional policies not covered in existing proposed legislation. Participants discussed whether these were still the priorities that the group would like to recommend congressional representatives work on. The group discussed whether they should limit themselves to these priorities or if they have capacity for more items. The group discussed moving forward with drafting additional policies for legislation.

Federal Advocacy Work Plan Draft

*Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle*

*Working Group Participants*

The group was presented with a draft work plan identifying issues, topics, goals, and steps for the priorities the group has selected (attached). Participants discussed ideas and strategies for advocacy. These strategies included:

- Working with a national coalition (including partners at the Boston round table and other cities) to gain congressional support for bills. For Section 189 this could include making sure that the intent of the legislation is not missed and that studies are carried out for all cities named in the legislation.
- Requesting a congressional assessment on whether the proposed bills will pass, along with a timeframe for implementation after passing.
- Direct engagement with high-level decision makers at the FAA.
- Engaging with Congress on what mitigation ideas would be allowed under Section 190.
- Discussion of the GAO letter, whether it applies only to metroplexes, and whether an additional letter for single sites is needed.

**Next Steps**

- Eric will draft initial thoughts about possible new legislation based on the issues that have previously come up from the group for consideration.
- Eric will update the Federal Advocacy work plan matrix to incorporate suggestions from the group with a focus on the FAA bill, new legislation, and engaging with Congress to speed up operation of near-term items.

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

**FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 Relevant Noise Provisions  
(checkmark represents Federal Working Group priorities)**

- **Sec. 173, which sets a one-year deadline for the FAA to complete the ongoing evaluation of alternative metrics to the current DNL 65 standard. [Must be completed by 10/5/19]**
- **Sec. 187, which sets a two-year deadline to complete the ongoing evaluation of alternative metrics to the current Day Night Level (DNL) 65 standard AND provide initial recommendations of proposed changes based on the findings. [Must be completed by 10/5/20]**
- **Sec. 188, which would evaluate alternative metrics to the current average day-night level standard, such as the use of actual noise sampling and other methods, to address community airplane noise concerns. [Must be completed by 10/5/19]**
- **Sec. 189, which would study the health impacts of noise from aircraft flights on residents in the metropolitan areas of Boston, Chicago, DC, New York, Northern California, Phoenix, Southern California and Seattle. [Must be started by 4/5/19]**
- **Sec. 190, which would create a pilot grant program involving not more than 6 projects at airports for environmental mitigation projects that will measurably reduce or mitigate aviation impacts on noise, air quality, or water quality at the airport or within 5 miles of the airport. [No timeline designated for enactment; the pilot program “shall terminate 5 years after the Secretary makes the first grant”.]**

*IN PROCESS:*

- **Sec. 180, which would create a Regional Ombudsman for each FAA region to serve as a regional liaison with the public, including community groups, on issues regarding aircraft noise, pollution, and safety. [Must be completed by 10/5/19]**

*OTHER:*

- **Sec. 174, which requires an airport to submit a revised noise exposure map if a change in operation would establish a substantial new noncompatible use, or would significantly reduce noise over existing noncompatible uses. [Ongoing, no specific deliverable timeline]**
- **Sec. 175, which requires the FAA to “consider the feasibility of dispersal headings or other lateral track variations” when proposing a new area navigation departure procedure or amending an existing procedure that would direct aircraft between the surface and 6,000 feet above ground level over noise sensitive areas. [Ongoing, no specific deliverable timeline]**

- Sec. 179, which would study the relationship between jet aircraft approach and takeoff speeds and corresponding noise impacts on communities surrounding airports. [Must be started by 10/5/19 and completed by 10/5/20]
- Sec. 186, which would initiate a review of the potential benefits, costs, and other impacts that would result from a phaseout of covered stage 3 aircraft. [Must be started by 4/5/19 and completed by 4/5/20]

#### **2019 Federal Noise Legislation**

- ✓ **The Protecting Airport Communities from Particle Emissions Act (Smith-WA)**, which would direct the FAA to report on ultrafine particles and their health impacts for communities around the 20 largest U.S. airports. The study would also analyze the potential impacts of mitigation options, emissions reductions, and the increased use of aviation biofuels.
- ✓ **Air Traffic Noise and Pollution Expert Consensus Act (Lynch-MA)**, which would direct the FAA to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide for a report on the health impacts of air traffic noise and pollution.

#### *OTHER ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION:*

- Secondary noise insulation packages
  - 65 DNL noise contour
  - Flexibility for airports/local communities to address specific impacts
  - Increased funding for existing federal noise programs
  - Incentivizing alternative transportation options
-

# StART FACILITATOR'S FEDERAL POLICY WORKING GROUP MEETING SUMMARY

Monday, August 5, 2019

5:30-7:30 pm, Seattle Tacoma International Airport Conference Center

| Member                     | Interest Represented   | Present |
|----------------------------|--|---------|
| Terry Plumb                | Burien Community Member  | -       |
| Michael Matthias           | Des Moines City Manager  | -       |
| Chris Hall                 | Federal Way Community Member   | X       |
| Brian Wilson               | Burien City Manager  | X       |
| Sheila Brush               | Des Moines Community Member  | X       |
| Jennifer Ferrer-Santa Ines | Normandy Park Finance Director   | X       |
| Earnest Thompson           | Normandy Park Community Member   | X       |
| Kyle Moore                 | SeaTac Government Relations and Communication Manager                      | X       |
| Robert Akhtar              | SeaTac Community Member  | X       |
| Bill Vadino                | Federal Way  | X       |
| Larry Cripe                | Burien Community Member  | X       |
| Steve Edmiston             | Des Moines Community Member  | X       |
| Lyndall Bervar             | Congressman Adam Smith, District Rep                                       | X       |
| Zachary Carstensen         | Office of Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal, Director, Outreach and Engagement | -       |
| Lylianna Allala            | Office of Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal                                    | X       |
| Stasha Espinosa            | Office of Sen. Patty Murray  | X       |
| 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>   |         |
| Stan Shepherd              | Port of Seattle, Manager of Noise Programs                                 | X       |
| Arlyn Purcell              | Port of Seattle, Director of Aviation Environmental Services               | X       |
| <b>Consultants</b>         |  |         |
| Emily Jackson              | Note taker, Floyd Snider   | X       |

## Additional Participants:

Amanda Wyma-Bradley, US Office of Rep Smith, phone  
 Jessica Mulligan (US Rep Jayapal)

## Meeting Objectives

To provide feedback on draft legislation from U.S. Representative Adam Smith. To finalize the Work Plan for the Working Group.



## Meeting Summary

### Feedback on Aviation Impacted Communities Act

*Lyndall Berver, U.S. Representative. Adam Smith*

*Amanda Wyma-Bradley, U.S. Representative Adam Smith*

Staff from U.S. Representative Adam Smith's office gave an overview of the bill that Rep. Smith is preparing to introduce. They discussed that there are many different stakeholder groups interested in the bill including the Beacon Hill neighborhood that is interested in being eligible for noise mitigation. The bill identifies a process for communities to be eligible for "designated communities status". The bill creates a provision for a designated community to select a community advisory board that has to authority to identify studies, which can be used to develop a noise mitigation action plan for the community. It also provides funds for mitigation. Feedback was solicited from StART Working Group participants.

Feedback and questions from StART participants included:

- The word "jet" is not broad enough and should be changed to "turbo powered aircraft".
- Who sets parameters and limitations for mitigation? City of Sea-Tac's #1 priority is improved mitigation options.
  - *Response:* It is up to the communities and the community board to identify mitigation options. 55 DNL and above will be the baseline for eligibility.
- Concern about Vashon and how they will be covered.
- What form will FAA's rationale take if the FAA determines that community advisory board recommended mitigation measures will not be effective and won't be used?
  - *Response:* No decision has been made, but agree more concrete language needs to be included.
- Clarify the definition in who is covered in Section.7-2
- How will this compel the FAA to release their 2017 study?
  - *Response:* Rep. Smith is considering changing the language to identify the National Academy of Science as opposed to FAA study.
- Consideration of international studies should be included in the bill.
- Add a provision to the bill to add city manager/administrator/designee to community boards to ensure that the city voice is heard. Also, need a provision for elected officials to participate in providing input.
- Mitigation funding for loss in home value should be included – i.e. if home values decrease by some percentage (say 15%) an arbitration claim could be made in compensation.
- Suggest a stronger community voice for representatives/flexibility to have elected officials, community stakeholders, citizen experts, and city managers. Language should be clear on the process for deciding who participates on a community board or define who may sit on committee so that all parties may be included. Language in new law for state process for small airports could be used as a model.
- How are communities defined? Neighborhood versus cities. Too many communities could cause administrative headaches.
- Airport advisory committees exist for several local communities (Burien, SeaTac, Des Moines)
- FAA is often a non-verbal member. How will the FAA participation be defined?

- Burden needs to be shifted to the FAA to respond to community's interests by changing language to "shall" for implementation of suggestions. Usually burden is on the community.
- Port of Seattle indicates that they want to be supportive of communities and address their concerns. Concern about FAAs ability to provide funding for so many communities if the legislation remains so broad. Administrative concerns about too many community boards. Concern that organized communities could shift flight paths to communities that have not organized themselves. This could result in moving the burden of impacts rather than solving problems.
  - *Response:* They could consider reducing who is included in the legislation to only major airports. But, eliminating smaller rural airports may also shrink the number of allies in Congress.
- Agree that only major airports should be included, otherwise this is too complicated. Address most impacted communities first, otherwise could pit communities against each other.
- Focusing on major airports would allow funding to go further with the most impacted communities.
- Suggest adding to legislation the creation of a flight tax per passenger and something similar per cargo plane.
- Suggest reviewing and possibly utilizing Congresswoman Jayapal's language to define airports/regions.
- Recommend adding a mechanism for resolving disagreement or confusion within community advisory board recommendations. Consider adding a neutral party or facilitator for dispute resolution.

Congressman Smith's staff requested that any additional feedback/comments from StART be provided to their office by Friday, August 23<sup>rd</sup>, as a first deadline, so they may be incorporated in an early draft. Next steps included finalizing the draft in the Fall and providing a preview to the Working Group before being introduced. The date of introduction is not known at this time.

### Review of Updated Federal Advocacy Work Plan Draft

*Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle*

Schinfeld provided an overview of the Working Group's Draft Work Plan. The Work Plan reflects previous Working Group decisions about priorities and where they would like to focus their engagement. The Work Plan identifies the topics/issues and the process steps. Feedback on the Draft Work Plan was solicited.

StART participant comments included:

- GAO letter can be used to get some quick wins along with accomplishing long term goals

The Working Group agreed by consensus that the items in the Work Plan reflect their interests and that they are ready to move forward with the items listed. There was acknowledgement that additional items may be added to the list in the future.

Schinfeld provided an overview of the general steps for advocacy. These included:

- Step 1. Communication by letter
- Step 2. Coalition building

Step 3. Direct engagement with DC and FAA (by phone and in person)

Step 4. Introduce Legislation

Step 5. Getting FAA decision makers in the room

Discussion focused on comments related to the process steps for the Work Plan. Comments included:

- Identify the responsible parties for carrying out the steps.
- Identify how local and state elected officials will be included.
- Provide an opportunity to review and provide feedback from the larger StART group.
- Recommend looking at how other communities are advocating to the GAO for their needs. Identify how to reach out to other airport roundtables. Sheila Brush will send the John F. Kennedy Airport group's comments to facilitator for distribution.
- Goals that are program shaping, for example, human health studies on the impacts of aircraft noise have the potential to be more impactful.
- Jayapal letter to FAA asking for a timeline on FAA Reauthorization noise provision implementation and could be used to establish congressional intent. This forum could be used to help draft a letter.
- Reach out to other airport communities in legislation to identify shared outcomes
- If a trip to DC, to meet with the FAA and Congressional representatives, is considered, subject matter experts, in addition to elected officials should be included.

#### Next Steps on Work Plan Implementation

Working Group participants discussed how best to structure and schedule the Working Group given that a number of the items on the Work Plan are timely. It was agreed that the Working Group would schedule monthly meetings through 2019. There was a recommendation that draft letters could be shared and commented on via a shared document program like Google docs or Dropbox. Finalization of letters could occur during Working Group meetings. Schinfeld will update the Work Plan based on comments, will begin drafting the GAO letter, letter to the delegation, send an invitation out for Google docs, and identify other action items. Sheila Brush will provide a GAO letter template.

#### **Next Meeting:**

**Monday September 9, 2019, 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm**

**Location: *SeaTac International Airport Conference Center, Room 4A***