

StART

MEETING SUMMARY

JUNE 24; 5:00 PM – 7:00 PM

VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

Meeting Objectives:

- An overview of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) findings for the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) Near-Term Projects published on May 22, 2026

I. Facilitator Welcome, Meeting Management

Andrés Mantilla, Facilitator, Uncommon Bridges;

Wendy Reiter, Airport Managing Director, Port of Seattle (POS)

- Developing an airport master plan to effectively accommodate growth is an FAA requirement
- The state demand forecast updated recently continues to project significant regional growth in air travel
- The report identified a gap of 40 million passengers annually that cannot be accommodated.
- The SAMP SEPA Draft Environmental Impact Statement was released on May 22nd
- Four public meetings in SeaTac, Des Moines, Federal Way and Burien
- The Port has also scheduled two virtual meetings on June 30 and July 9th
- The SAMP-SEPA public comment period ends on July 21st
- Comments:
 - Request for faster turnaround time for meeting minutes
 - Main issue for members is providing community with a summary of the meeting in a timely manner

II. SEPA Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the SAMP Near-Term Projects

Steve Rybolt, Environmental Program Manager, POS

- Review of the SAMP near-term projects:
 - The primary near-term project is a new terminal with 19 new gates
 - The purpose of an environmental review:
 - Released to assess the potential impacts of the proposed projects
 - 31 near-term projects
 - Needs to be completed before decisions are made
- Review of environmental impacts:

- Operating in a constrained environment
- Expect to be operating in a very slow growth mode at SEA soon
- The near term projects are intended to alleviate congestion
- Will also increase operations
- NEPA and SEPA assess the incremental environmental impacts between no action and action
 - About a 2.7% increase in operations between no action and action by 2037
- POS has a variety of voluntary policies and programs in place that are not regulatory requirements
- Under NEPA- the Federal Aviation Administration was the lead. POS is the sponsor
- The FAA produced the Environmental Assessment
- Under SEPA - POS is the lead agency
 - SEPA responsible official - Sarah Cox
 - POS Chose to pursue an Environmental Impact Statement
- The FAA identified 18 different conditions in the Record of Decision
- Surface transportation is the area where the POS identified significant impacts
- 26 total intersections that the POS will be required to mitigate if a trip-generating NTPs moves forward
- Greenhouse gas and climate
 - Removed from NEPA but still a requirement in SEPA
- Cumulative impacts were removed from NEPA but are a requirement in SEPA
 - Cumulative impacts look back five years, look at what is happening now, and five years into the future
- Air Quality Updates
 - The Air Emissions Data Tool is the model for identifying air emissions and noise impacts
 - We found that we have small temporary construction related emissions
 - In the long term, the near-term projects lead to minimal increases in air emissions
- POS conducted a human health risk assessment that focused on:
 - Toxic air pollutants exposure
 - Cancer risks
 - Emissions would not exceed health-based air quality standards
- Ultrafine particulate matter
 - Science does not support independent causal ultrafine particulate matter effects to human health
 - Need a broad scale multi-year epidemiological study on aviation emissions
- Climate
 - Project a moderate increase in greenhouse gas emissions
 - Primarily a result of aircraft operations that we do not control
 - We are working on programs to minimize those, such as sustainable aviation fuels
- Noise
 - POS conducted a literature review on aircraft noise exposure

- There's a lack of broad scale aviation focused studies to understand health effects of aviation noise
- These health effects exist, but not enough to create a regulatory standard
- POS supports the FAA in considering an updated/new metric to assess impacts of noise.
- Environmental Justice
 - Used Washington State Department of Health's Environmental Health Disparities map
 - Validated it using the POS equity index
- Next Steps
 - POS released the SEPA draft EIS on May 22nd
 - Notified everyone 30 days in advance that it was
 - The comment period is 60 days
 - Hoping to have a final SEPA EIS decision by the end of the year
 - Then starts the SEPA appeal period
 - Once the environment review is done, the POS Commission will have to take action on any of the near-term projects moving forward
 - Typically, SEPA requires an EIS be 30 days
 - July 21st will be the end of the 60-day public comment period
 - Worked to make sure that all documents are accessible.
- Questions & Comments:
 - Would additional demand become real if the near-term projects weren't built?
 - Response: If we do not build the near-term projects, SEA will slow down to less than a 1% growth in future years. Near-term projects will accommodate additional demand.
 - Were the local tribes consulted?
 - Response: Yes, the FAA is required to consult directly with the tribes
 - How are you defining a significant impact under NEPA and is it different under SEPA?
 - Response: POS utilizing a lot of the work that was already done under NEPA, because it met what was required under SEPA.
 - Would an intersection level of service decrease from service level C to service level D represent a significant impact?
 - Response: It's kind of a complex answer since not all roads are the same. It's clarified in each city's code on what is defined as a significant impact. POS worked with the cities, WSDOT, and local jurisdictions
 - What is the POS looking at with regards to level of service? Is it just cars getting through an intersection, or is it looking at non-cars as well?
 - Response: POS looking at motorized transportation, specifically cars. With the mitigation that's being proposed, we fully anticipate including non-motorized transportation within that mitigation
 - When you say you look back five years (regarding cumulative impact), what does that mean?

- Response: Baseline, our existing condition, is 2022. POS also looked into the future. Looking at when the projects would be built in 2032 and into 2037
- What's the threshold that constitutes a significant impact, for example, with air quality?
 - Response: For air quality, we use the Clean Air Act, with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Those are set by the EPA. The EPA delegates to the states, and the states delegates to regional clean air agencies. If we exceed the standards, that would be identified as significant
- How do you define impacts when you don't have a standard and established standard to compare against? And how can you say whether or not there's significance?
 - Response: Here is an example using ultrafine particulate matter. There are no established significance thresholds for ultrafine particulate matter at this point. The EPA has the sole discretion to set those. This would be the same as other areas where there are no significant thresholds as well
- How do you baseline equity? How do your values lead your projects?
 - Response: The Washington State Disparities Index was the primary tool used to help understand vulnerable populations and if the projects have disproportionate impacts on those communities. POS takes a regulatory approach but is also undertaking many efforts outside of SEPA that are impactful
- If there is no standard that's been established by the federal government, did you look at World Health Organization or European standards to see what other parts of the world might be doing in these areas?
 - Response: There are other noise standards that exist in the world, but in the United States, the FAA uses the Aviation Environmental Design Tool with a 65 DNL threshold
- The additional airline emission would not occur but for the building of the additional terminal. Can you help me understand?
 - Response: POS physically does not control aircraft emissions. The EPA has the sole authority to do that. The idea behind the Near-term Projects is that it will minimize or make efficiencies so that we don't have congestion. Airports typically do not induce demand, it's typically based on the local economy. The intent of the near-term projects is to accommodate demand that's here and will soon come
- When you mention the modest increase in emissions, 2.1% in 2032 and 7.7% in 2037, does that consider plane emissions?
 - Response: Yes, and POS considers that a modest increase in emissions
- We need to find more ways to reduce greenhouse gases. Look at mitigating someplace else where the POS does have the ability to control.
- How come we never see Federal Way's name on any of these documents? It would be helpful for people to understand where the city is and how they are affected.
 - Response: As we move forward, I will do my best to make sure that maps have Federal Way identified.

- Will SEPA be done before 2027?
 - Response: Yes, would love to get this done by the end of this calendar year. However, it will depend on the type of comments received and how long it will take to review and respond, and there could be potentially additional analyses.
- How long before construction would start on any of these projects?
 - Response: May see near-term projects constructed probably no earlier than 2028. Aiming for substantial completion of projects around 2032-2037.
- How does the POS anticipate environmental review occurring post completion of SEPA. Is this the last environmental review for these projects, or do you expect more?
 - Response: This is project level review. Subsequent evaluations may be required, which may require the POS to go back out to the communities and address those.
- We need to be more up-front with not knowing the future health effects.
- There needs to be some kind of compensation or something for disproportionately affected communities.

III. Recap of 6/8 Part 150 Noise Study TRC/Aviation Noise Working Group Meeting
Tom Fagerstrom, Noise Programs Manager, POS

- The 6/8 meeting started with the Part 150 Noise Study Technical Review Committee (TRC) portion of the meeting and included some of the early measures being considered for inclusion in the draft Noise Compatibility Program.
- ESA's, the consultants conducting the Part 150 Study on POS's behalf, presentation broke the possible measures into three categories: noise abatement (including intersection departures, increased glideslope for arrivals and offset approaches and arrival preferential runway use), land use and program management measures.
- ESA ended with a schedule update on the next steps for the Part 150 Study.
- The various programs that fall within the Aviation Near-term Noise Action agenda that were covered during StART Noise WG portion of the 6/8 meeting including the Late Night Noise Limitation Program's 1st quarter numbers, the Third Runway's late-night usage percentage to date and March and April Noise Comments/Complaint totals.
- Also at the meeting, an analysis based upon a hypothetical early morning expansion of the Late Night Noise Limitation Program's hours from midnight to 5 AM to midnight to 6 AM was summarized. It was determined that expanding the program would be difficult and not achieve its intended noise reduction results since most of the flights are already less noisy aircraft and the 5 AM to 6 AM hour is essential for carriers positioning aircraft during that time to support the post-6 AM departure bank.
- Tom also covered the Fly Quiet Awards report out, the Noise Insulation update and the Airport Roundtable of Roundtables recap that were provided at the meeting.

IV. Public Comment

- David Goebel:
 - Publishing the video of the meeting would really be helpful.
 - Thinks an AI Summary would work fine.
 - Does not like the current webinar panelist mode.
 - Recommends more in-person options.

V. Wrap Up/Next Steps

Andrés Mantilla, Facilitator, Uncommon Bridges

- TENTATIVE NEXT MEETING: AUGUST 26 – 5:00 - 7:00 PM VIA ZOOM

MEMBERS	INTEREST REPRESENTED	PRESENT
ALETHIA MILLER	ALASKA AIRLINES	X
AMY ARRINGTON	NORMANDY PARK – CITY	X
WENDY REITER	PORT OF SEATTLE – CHAIR	X
BARTON DELACY	DES MOINES – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
BILL VADINO	FEDERAL WAY – CITY	X
BOB LARSON	BURIEN – CITY	X
BRANDON MILES	TUKWILA – CITY	X
EVAN MAXIM	SEATAC – CITY	X
JACK DOVEY	FEDERAL WAY – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
JEFFREY HAMMAR	NORMANDY PARK – CITY (ALT)	X
JEFF HARBAUGH	BURIEN – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
JOE DUSENBURY	DES MOINES – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
KAREN VELORIA	BURIEN – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
KATHLEEN WILSON	TUKWILA – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
KATHERINE CAFFREY	DES MOINES – CITY	X
MICHAEL BRUGATO	FEDERAL WAY – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
MOIRA BRADSHAW	NORMANDY PARK – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
ROGER KADEG	SEATAC – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
SARAH COX	PORT OF SEATTLE – CHAIR (ALT)	X
WILL BOOTH	SEATAC – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE	X
RESOURCES		
MARCO MILANESE	PORT OF SEATTLE	X
PARIS EDWARDS	PORT OF SEATTLE	X
STEVE VITTNER	PORT OF SEATTLE	X
PRESENTERS		
STEVE RYBOLT	PORT OF SEATTLE	X
TOM FAGERSTROM	PORT OF SEATTLE	X
CONSULTANTS		
ANDRÉS MANTILLA	UNCOMMON BRIDGES	X
JULIA MARTINEZ	UNCOMMON BRIDGES	X
PUBLIC COMMENT		

DAVID GOEBEL		X
AUDIENCE		
ALEKSANDAR KRSTIC		X
ANTHONY HEMSTAD		X
DAWSON FRANK		X
JC HARRIS		X
SKY LARON		X