



SEA-TAC STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY ROUND TABLE

StART FACILITATOR'S MEETING SUMMARY

Wednesday, December 11, 2019

6:00-8:00 pm, SeaTac Airport Conference Center

Participant	Interest Represented		Participant	Interest Represented	
Eric Zimmerman	Normandy Park	X	Tony Gonchar	Delta Airlines	-
Earnest Thompson	Normandy Park	-	Scott Ingham (Alt)	Delta Airlines	X
Mark Hoppen	Normandy Park	X	Scott Kennedy	Alaska Airlines	X
Jennifer-Ferrer-Santa Ines (Alt)	Normandy Park	-	Matt Shelby (Alt)	Alaska Airlines	-
Robert Akhtar	SeaTac	X	Justin Biassou	FAA	X
Carl Cole	SeaTac	X	David Suomi	FAA	X
Steve Pilcher (Alt)	SeaTac	-	Tom Fagerstrom	Port of Seattle	X
Katrina (Trina) Cook	Tukwila	X	Lance Lyttle	Port of Seattle	-
David Cline	Tukwila	-	Marco Milanese	Port of Seattle	X
Brandon Miles	Tukwila	X	Arlyn Purcell	Port of Seattle	-
Laura Sanders	Lynden (air cargo)	-	Eric Schinfeld	Port of Seattle	X
Laurel Dunphy	Port of Seattle	X	Stan Shepherd	Port of Seattle	X

Additional Participants:

Jason Poole, FAA; Steve Alverson, ESA, Tom Eckert, Delta Airlines

Facilitator: Phyllis Shulman, Civic Alchemy

Note Taker: Megan King, Floyd Snider

Meeting Objectives:

To discuss the results of the Noise Abatement Departure Profiles Noise Analysis. To recap the Aviation Noise Working Group and Federal Policy Working Group meetings. To update on the FAA's end-around taxi procedure.

Welcome

Laurel Dunphy, Port of Seattle

The Airport Operations Director, Laurel Dunphy, chaired the meeting in the absence of Lance Lyttle and Lance's alternate, Arlyn Purcell. Dunphy acknowledged and thanked two of the community representatives who will not be returning in 2020 - Trina Cook, Tukwila community representative, and Earnest Thompson, Normandy Park community representative. She also announced that Port representatives will be meeting with representatives from the cities who have temporarily suspended their involvement in StART on December 17.

Dunphy reviewed several StART accomplishments in 2019, including the Revised Runway Use Agreement that is resulting in reduced 3rd runway use at night, conversations that are on-going with airlines regarding reducing late night noise as part of the Late Night Noise Limitation Program, and finalizing the scope for the Ground Noise Analysis. She shared that Lyttle is committed to continuing the work with the communities.

Dunphy reminded cities that StART community representative terms are up at the end of the year and that cities can re-nominate current members or nominate new members to serve on StART. It was requested that cities provide the names of representatives serving the 2020-2022 term by the end of January.

Facilitator's Update

Phyllis Shulman

Shulman requested cities provide their selected representatives information by the end of January and include if participants are interested in participation on either working group. Shulman will try to meet individually with new members to provide an orientation to StART prior to the first meeting of the new year.

There will be no StART meetings in January. Meetings will resume in February with the Federal Policy Working Group meeting on the 1st Monday in February, and the Aviation Noise Working Group meeting on the 2nd Monday in February. The next main StART meeting will be on February 26.

Recap StART Federal Policy Working Group Work Plan

Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle

Schinfeld reviewed that the role of the Federal Policy Working Group (FP Working Group) is to develop a shared policy agenda. The priorities identified by the FP Working Group include advocacy for proposed legislation, identifying ideas for new legislation, and actions included in the 2018 FAA Re-authorization Bill. The FP Working Group met on November 4 and December 11. Meeting summaries are attached in Appendix B. Schinfeld provided an overview of the meetings including:

- Joint letters, co-signed by the six cities, to Congress and the FAA were finalized and mailed, as well as delivered in person in Washington, DC to Congressional staff. These letters summarize policy priorities and ask to engage directly with the FAA on some of these shared priorities. Responses to the letters will be shared with the FP Working Group. It is anticipated that the February FP Working Group meeting agenda will include updates and responses from Congressional staff.
- U.S. Representative Adam Smith is drafting legislation responding to the interest expressed in public comment as well as in StART in allowing for secondary noise insulation packages in limited situations where the initial infrastructure has “failed”. There are very specific situations where the insulation may no longer work for reasons that are not the fault of the homeowner. The bill has been through technical review by FAA and by the House Transportation Committee and is expected to be introduced in a few weeks.
- Discussion of sending a delegation to Washington DC to meet with FAA and members of Congress to discuss issues and advocate for shared policy interests. It was stated that it is important to meet face-to-face, particularly with the FAA and members of Congress on issues of importance. The goal would be to meet with the FAA, US Senators Murray and Cantwell; US Representatives Smith, Jayapal, and Larsen; and, if time allows, potentially other members

of Congress including US Representatives Lynch and Speier. A tentative date of March 25-26 is being considered as that is a time when both House and Senate are in session, and is after the State legislative session has concluded. Once a date is set, preparation will be important in order to develop a shared message and a unified voice.

- US Representative Jackie Speier (who represents communities near San Francisco International Airport) has introduced eight pieces of legislation related to airplane noise and emissions. These bills will be brought to the next Working Group for review as well. As any new bills are introduced, the Working Group will have the opportunity to review and evaluate them in future meetings as well.
- State Representative Orwall is drafting legislation regarding secondary insulation. Eric will connect with Reps. Orwall and Smith to discuss the crossover between their proposed bills.

End-around Taxi Procedure Update

Jason Poole, FAA

Jason Poole, FAA Air Traffic Manager, provided an update on the proposed end-around taxi procedure. The FAA organized a work group to analyze, through modeling, whether this procedure was feasible and reduced taxi time from the runways to the gates. Dave Suomi stated that there are some airports that have infrastructure (extended pavement around the perimeter of runways) that allow for an end-around taxi procedure such as at Atlanta Hartsfield International. The work group reviewed current taxiways, aircraft staging areas, and current routes for aircraft taxiing. The work group analyzed parameters for the use of a new end-around taxi procedure during south flow operations and during inclement weather.

The FAA work group ran models to evaluate the pros and cons of the procedure. Even though the concept looked like it may have advantages, the analysis showed that there were numerous constraints and challenges with the procedure and that it would increase airfield operational complexity, congestion, and potentially decrease safety. It was noted that the analysis also showed that taxi times would increase and departures would be slowed. He reported that the FAA determined that the procedure is not feasible. He notes that the airports where the end-around taxi procedure has worked have more space on the perimeters of the airfield that allows for movement away from active runways. He noted that land surrounding SeaTac's active airfield is constrained. The presentation can be found [here](#).

Questions from StART participants included:

- One of the things the community was interested in was moving aircraft further from the west, and closer to the terminal. Was there anything your group discovered that could result in this without the full end-around taxi procedure change?
 - *Response:* Given the layout of SeaTac Airport, and limited airfield space, there aren't many options available. The best way to reduce aircraft from the western side of the airfield, is to have less aircraft staged on airfield awaiting a gate. That is best done by improving the flow and timing of arrivals.
- As we anticipate more gates coming online, will additional gates alleviate, worsen, or make no difference to current taxiway staging?

- *Response:* This is a difficult question to answer. Ideally, there would be improvement, but demand would need to be balanced with the capacity of the airport.
- Is there a way to designate one runway for takeoff and one for landing? Would that make a difference?
 - *Response:* To determine runway use, air traffic controllers look at safety and efficiency, and airport through-put. During low operational volumes, air traffic controllers, based on the Revised Runway Use Plan, often determine one runway for takeoff and one for landing. Each day the FAA advises pilots which are the approach and departure runways.
- One of the reasons this end-around taxi procedure concept was brought up in StART was to see if noise impacts to the communities on the west side of the airfield would be reduced if aircraft did not have to stop and throttle-up their engines when staged for crossings. Can the FAA share thoughts on this?
 - *Response :* (Dave Suomi, FAA) – End around taxiways do work well at some airports, where there is a true dedicated taxiway. In these locations, the aircraft are taxiing approximately 1500 feet off the end of the runways at a lowered elevation. In these cases, the taxi procedure does not intrude with the runway operations. The real estate at SeaTac is not adequate to support this procedure, because of the airfield taxiway proximity to runways.

Noise Abatement Departure Profiles Analysis

Steve Alverson, ESA

The focus of the meeting was on the Noise Abatement Departure Profiles (NADP) Analysis. Steve Alverson, ESA, the consultant hired to do the analysis, attended in person and reviewed the analysis methodology, the results of the analysis, and recommendations for action. Alverson reviewed the definitions of the two departure profiles, a Close-In NADP and a Distant NADP. He clarified the analysis was based on the responses from the five airlines surveyed as to which procedure they are utilizing when operating Boeing 737-800s. 737-800s were chosen for the analysis due to their prevalence at Sea-Tac Airport. After additional review, Delta Air Lines confirmed that it is using a Distant NADP (the slide presentation does not show this update) and not a Close-In NADP as was initially reported by Delta. All five airlines surveyed utilize the Distant NADP. The analysis also includes terrain effects on noise contours, which are important to consider given the variability in terrain in the region.

Alverson concluded that the analysis shows that utilizing the Distant NADP would provide the most benefit for noise reduction in certain communities north and south of the airport. For some communities, there would be no change, particularly those to the west and east of the airport. Alverson presented the noise modeling results from the analysis. He emphasized that as a part of their standard operating procedures, most of the domestic airlines are already using the Distant NADP, so the change would not be as dramatic as if they were not. However, there would still be associated noise reduction benefits. Based on the analysis, and the potential for noise reduction for some communities, he recommended that the Port request all airlines to implement the Distant NADP, or the ICAO (international) equivalent, and track/report implementation, as well as evaluate changes in noise exposure levels over time. There is an

FAA Advisory Circular that allows for airports to work with airlines to select the NADP that makes the most sense for their airport.

Next steps include some additional analysis, discussions with the FAA, discussions with individual airlines to understand exactly how they are flying the Distant NADP, the development of educational communication materials, and additional input from StART. ESA will also be analyzing the departure profiles of the 777, a much louder aircraft, to see if there is a significant variation in the noise contours between the 777 and the 737-800. The presentation can be found [here](#).

Questions from StART participants included:

- Does simulation software have the ability to look at other levels of noise contours, to see where is the extent of the 60 dB, 70 dB contour, etc. to capture other noise levels that may be resulting in disruption to communities?
 - *Response:* Yes, the model has a lot of flexibility, but the model is limited by 10,000 feet in aircraft height, so you lose the ability of the model to accurately delineate for lower SEL dB levels. The contours become somewhat nebulous due to the limitation of the data and the model.
- How difficult would it be to generate a map that evaluates 65 or 70 SEL dB?
 - *Response:* It is not difficult, but one would have to look at where the 10,000-foot altitude is reached, and how accurate the contours may be at that noise level. (Follow up statement from participant that this information would be beneficial for conversations with communities.)
- What is the difference between 80 and 90 dB?
 - *Response:* 80 dB is perceived as about half as loud as 90 dB.
- Are there some areas where there is no measurable change to noise to communities neighboring the airport?
 - *Response:* There will be a difference, but that difference is not shown here, as it is likely very small and cannot be shown effectively on a contour.
- Is there no difference in noise reduction between the Close-In and Distant NADP for the City of SeaTac?
 - *Response:* The analysis so far did not look only at specific communities. Given SeaTac's close proximity to the airport, noise reduction as a result of the distant NADP would likely be limited.
- Is there a way to communicate the data in a different way so that community members get a better understanding of the impacts, for example to create a scoring system?
 - *Response:* You could possibly do that, but there are limitations as there is no acoustic way to create a scoring system and the scoring system would be difficult to substantiate.
- What procedure do cargo carriers use?
 - *Response:* Domestic cargo carriers typically use the Distant NADP and international cargo carriers likely use the Close-In NADP.

Recap Aviation Noise Working Group Near-Term Action Agenda

Tom Fagerstrom, Port of Seattle

Tom Fagerstrom reported on the Aviation Noise Working Group (Working Group) November 18 meeting. The meeting summary is attached in Appendix C. His summary focused on the status and results of several of the Working Group's efforts to address noise including:

- Vince Mestre, noise consultant, provided information about possible next steps related to the Noise Abatement Departure Profile Analysis. He reviewed the FAA Advisory Circular and the role that airports play in implementing these procedures. Next steps included Port staff setting up a discussion with the FAA air traffic division and flight standards to determine if there are any airspace issues with either the Close-In or Distant NADP. Implementation would include making a formal request to airlines to change to a Distant NADP.
- Additional outreach and dialogue regarding the Late-Night Noise Limitation Program's 3rd Quarter Results. Sit-down meetings were held with the three airlines with the most exceedances. The conversations have been productive and options are being discussed that could possibly result in future schedule or fleet changes. Airlines have expressed interest in additional information. Initial conversations with the three airlines are summarized as:
 - EVA Air is open to schedule adjustments in the future, possibility moving a departure, if feasible, as well as potentially changing from a 777 aircraft to a 787 aircraft at some time in the future.
 - FedEx Express is in the process of phasing out the MD-11 aircraft, which is the primary noise exceeder. They also noted that they will be looking at adding flights in the busy holiday season, so they anticipate more exceedances in the 4th quarter.
 - China Airlines Cargo is discussing the possibility of moving a flight out of the late-night time hours. They do not have the option of changing aircraft, as they do not have other aircraft types in their fleet.
- Results from the Revised Runway Use Agreement continues to show a significant decrease in landings per night on the third runway. Landings are averaging two per night, down from over 10 per night. A few exceptions occurred due to runway closures on two occasions.
- Additional information is provided in the Working Group Meeting notes and the 2019 summary of the Working Group Action Agenda provided as a handout.

Comments from StART participants included:

- StART member from Normandy Park has noticed a big difference in noise reduction at night since the Revised Runway Use Agreement was put into effect. Stated that other community members have also noticed the reduction. Commented that the many community members appreciate the change. Thanked StART for this work.
- It was requested that clear and easily understandable communication materials regarding the results of the Noise Abatement Departure Profiles Analysis be prepared for communicating with communities. Input into and review of the communication materials can be provided by the Aviation Noise Working Group.

Public Comment

Compiled public comment are included here as Appendix A.

Meeting Wrap Up

Laurel Dunphy, Port of Seattle

Dunphy thanked StART participants and thanked Trina Cook for her participation over the last two years. Given that this was the last meeting of 2019, StART participants were asked for any year-end reflections.

Trina thanked the Port for initiating StART. She stated that in the beginning, she did not have a grasp on what this process would be like. She commented that she is an airport fan and has a very different perspective about the airport from some of the other community representatives. Trina acknowledged that she has learned as much from the other community representatives as the Port representatives. Hearing from the other communities has changed her perspective and she sees and acknowledges the good work the Port is doing (with noise, and other topics like ground transportation). She thanked StART participants for the work so far and wished the group good luck with continuing on.

Eric Zimmerman thanked the Port and participants for continued involvement and work that has been done so far. He shared optimism that the suspended communities will come back to the table to continue the good conversations together.

Next Meeting:

February 26, 2020, 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Location: *Conference Center at Sea-Tac International Airport*

Appendix A

Summary of Public Comments

1. Anne Kroeker (Des Moines) (oral comments):

- Commented that she doesn't speak for the cities who aren't present, although she is from one of the cities not currently represented.
- Stated that she is perplexed that StART continues without the suspended cities. Emphasized that the data collection and analysis can continue, but when, hopefully the suspended cities come back, that they will be able to provide input into actions and analysis being considered.
- Commented that the trust of the community is important and is critical going forward. Stated that communication to communities should share what is the work of StART, different than what is solely the work of the Port. Perhaps materials generated from the work of StART should be released and identified as being materials from StART, and not just from the Port. This would help build trust of the community.
- Stated that it seems that the east coast seems to get better and newer aircraft than the west coast. Perhaps the airlines could be asked to bring in newer / quieter planes to the west coast, because of the needs of the communities. Commented that a direct ask to the airlines could be considered.

Appendix B
Federal Policy Working Group Meeting Summaries

StART FACILITATOR'S FEDERAL POLICY WORKING GROUP MEETING SUMMARY

Monday, November 4, 2019

5:30-6:30 pm, Seattle Tacoma International Airport Conference Center

Member	Interest Represented	Present
Jennifer Ferrer-Santa Ines	Normandy Park Finance Director	X
Kyle Moore	SeaTac Government Relations and Communication Manager	X
Robert Akhtar	SeaTac	X
Flannery Fox	Office of Sen. Patty Murray	X
Yasmine Mehdi	Office of Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal (phone)	X
Jessica Mulligan	Office of Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal (phone)	X
Resources	Title	
Eric Schinfeld	Port of Seattle, Sr. Manager, Federal & International Government Relations	X
Consultants		
Phyllis Shulman	Facilitator, Civic Alchemy	X
Emily Jackson	Note taker, Floyd Snider	X

Additional Participants:

Rihanna, City of Normandy Park Fellow

Meeting Objectives: To receive updates and discuss the Senate Appropriations noise policies, joint Port-Cities letters to Congress and FAA, and Representative Adam Smith's legislative efforts.

Meeting Summary:

Update on Senate Appropriations Noise Policies

Flannery Fox, Legislative Outreach Aide, Senator Patty Murray

Fox provided an update on language in the Senate's FY2020 transportation appropriations bill relating to the FAA. She stated that there is increasing attention on aviation noise issues from the Senate, particularly around intensifying interest from senators for FAA to meet its deadlines on releasing reports identified in the FAA Reauthorization Bill. The specific language is as follows:

- "Noise and Community Outreach. —The Committee directs the FAA to improve the development of flight procedures in ways that will give fair consideration to public comment and reduce noise through procedure modification and dispersion to reduce the impact on local communities. The FAA should utilize state-of-the-art technologies, metrics, and methodologies to measure actual noise at ground level experienced in communities affected by flight paths and not rely solely on computer modeling or other theoretical measures. The FAA should give high priority to evaluating where increased noise levels disrupts homes and businesses, and threatens public health, and should provide appropriate resources to regional offices to work with local communities to meet this objective. The Committee directs the FAA to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 90 days of enactment of this act that details the efforts

made by the FAA during the last two fiscal years to comply with Committee’s directives on this topic. The report must include detailed information on specific locations that have been reevaluated using the requested methodologies, the number of flight paths that have been altered as a result of that testing and community input, the number of properties that have been purchased, and any other mitigation efforts undertaken by the FAA.

- “Noise Health Effects Research. —The Committee has included language for 2 years requesting the FAA to prioritize research conducted through FAA’s Center of Excellence for Alternative Jet Fuel and Environment, and the Aviation Sustainability Center on the impact of aviation noise on both sleep and cardiovascular health. The Committee has also previously directed the FAA to evaluate alternative metrics to the current day night level 65 standard and other methods to address community airplane noise concerns, including cumulative noise impacts from increased frequency of flights. Communities across the country contend with an increased frequency of passing aircraft on a daily basis and the Committee is concerned that the FAA is not heeding this direction and therefore requests the FAA to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 90 days of enactment of this act that details the efforts made by the FAA during the last two fiscal years to comply with the Committee’s direction. The report must include detailed findings of the research completed to date and the alternative metrics identified to evaluate noise impacts that will adequately address community concerns.”

Questions and discussion included:

- How can local cities influence the FAA to release data/reports?
 - *Response:* Senate is often surprised by how hard it is to get answers from the FAA for Senate inquiries. Continued engagement and pressure from the community is important. Organization at the grassroots level and the formation of coalitions is important. Aviation noise is an issue in many states.
- When might final action on appropriations occur?
 - *Response:* Currently no clear answer on that. There are many factors at play.
- How can we best identify which senators from other states have interest in aviation noise issues?
 - *Response:* Ideally, the Working Group would utilize contacts already established by community representative along with additional outreach.

Joint Port-Cities Letters to Congress and FAA

Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle

Schinfeld reviewed the slightly different content contained in each letter. He stated the importance of including signatures from all six original cities participating in StART. This request was made to all six cities and all are in process of finalizing their agreement to sign on to the letters. Schinfeld expressed optimism that the letters will be finalized and sent by the end of November.

Questions and discussion included:

- Is it best to have city managers or mayors sign the letters?
 - *Response:* The Port does not have a strong preference. If cities have a preference (e.g. elected officials sign the congressional letter and city manager signed the letter to FAA) they may decide as they see fit.
- How likely will there be a response from either congressional representatives or FAA on the letter?

- *Response:* Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal is planning a response. As far as implementing what is requested in the letter to the FAA, the FAA operates cautiously according to their hierarchy and procedures. They are likely considering what a plan might be to respond to the potential consequences of the studies' conclusions. The current delay in meeting the deadline to release the studies is not unusual.

The Working Group discussed the role of the new FAA community engagement officer noting that the position lacks neutrality since reporting is to the regional director of FAA rather than being independent.

Update on Representative Adam Smith's Legislative Efforts

Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle

Schinfeld provided updates on four items:

- Lyndall Bervar, Congressman Adam Smith, forwarded an email to the Working Group regarding FAA's response to the WHO guidelines.
- Based on Sheila Brush's suggestion, a letter was sent to the Government Accountability Office requesting that the GAO study incorporates analysis of NextGen's impact on Single-Site airports in addition to multiple-airport metroplexes.
- Based on discussion at the last StART Federal Policy meeting, the work plan now includes the development of a new piece of legislation that allows funding of failed noise insulation. It was stated that regulations do not prevent this; it is only the FAA's interpretation of the regulation. Congressman Smith's office is interested in championing this legislation. They are in the process of drafting the legislation. There is optimism that this could be passed fairly quickly. A draft bill will be available in the next week or so and will be shared by email.
- Congressman Smith's Particle Emissions Bill is scheduled for a hearing. The bill proposes a study on aviation related ultrafine particle impacts on human health, and aviation biofuels.

A working Group community representative commented on the importance of StART and these Working Group meetings and that the progress brings optimism.

Next Steps on the Work Plan

Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle

Schinfeld led a discussion on the immediate next steps for the Work Plan which includes taking steps to build relationships with communities and airports nation-wide, traveling to DC to have direct conversations with elected officials and the FAA, and emphasizing to the FAA the importance of completing and releasing studies identified in the FAA Reauthorization Bill. Travel to DC would likely be at the end of January to early February. The Port will work with cities as well as with the Working Group to discuss representation, focus, and coordination. Trip planning will be a topic at the December Working Group meeting along with a review of the draft failed insulation legislation.

Next working group meeting is rescheduled for Monday, December 9. It was stated that there would likely not be a meeting in January.

Next Meeting:
Monday Dec. 9, 2019, 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
Location: *SeaTac International Airport Conference Center, Room 4A*

StART FACILITATOR'S MEETING SUMMARY

Federal Policy Working Group

Wednesday, December 11, 2019

5:00-5:45 pm, Seattle Tacoma International Airport Conference Center

Member	Interest Represented	Present
Kyle Moore	SeaTac Government Relations and Communication Manager	X
Robert Akhtar	SeaTac Community Representative	X
Resources	Title	
Eric Schinfeld	Port of Seattle, Sr. Manager, Federal & International Government Relations	X
Consultants		
Phyllis Shulman	Facilitator, Civic Alchemy	X
Megan King	Note taker, Floyd Snider	X

Additional Participants:

Dave Kaplan, Port of Seattle

Meeting Objectives: To receive updates and discuss progress on the Federal Policy Working Group's priorities and to plan a trip to Washington DC to discuss issues with Congressional representatives and FAA.

Meeting Summary:

Update on Joint Port-Cities Letters to Congress

Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle

Schinfeld provided an update on the joint Port-Cities letters to Congress and the FAA drafted by the Federal Policy Working Group. The letters were finalized and mailed, as well as delivered in person in Washington, DC to Congressional staff last week. He emphasized the importance of all six cities signing the letter, providing for the opportunity for a joint policy agenda. Responses to the letters will be shared with the Working Group. Schinfeld anticipates that the February Working Group agenda will include updates and responses from Congressional staff.

Schinfeld provided an update on a bill US Representative Adam Smith is drafting on secondary noise insulation. Rep. Smith's office received feedback from FAA, the US House Transportation Committee, and others. The draft bill is expected to be formally introduced in the coming weeks. Schinfeld also communicated with Airports Council International who stated that they would work to support the bill on behalf of all US airports. He also stated that Rep. Smith is continuing to draft the Aviation Impacted Communities Act.

Schinfeld shared that US Representative Jackie Speier (who represents communities near San Francisco International Airport) has introduced eight pieces of legislation related to airplane noise and emissions. These bills will be brought to the next Working Group for review as well. As any new bills are introduced, the Working Group will have the opportunity to review and evaluate them in meetings.

Questions and discussion included:

- Is Rep. Speier involved with any legislative committees that can help to get these bills approved?
 - *Response:* She is on the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus.
- At one point, the question of whether the FAA could reinterpret the current regulation about noise insulation was raised – has FAA stated whether they would be willing to consider that?
 - *Response:* FAA has stated they will not reinterpret the current regulation, without a bill requiring them to do so.
- Why was the re-insulation piece left out of the 2018 FAA Reauthorization Bill?
 - *Response:* Unable to find out any information about this.

Schinfeld stated State Representative Orwall is drafting state legislation regarding secondary insulation. He will connect with Reps. Orwall and Smith to discuss the crossover between their proposed bills, such as consistency with definitions of “failure”.

Washington DC Trip Planning

Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle

The Working Group discussed the goal of the Washington DC trip: to meet with FAA and members of Congress to discuss issues and policy interests. It was stated that it is important to meet face-to-face, particularly with the FAA, as the communities desire the FAA’s direct involvement in making changes. Face-to-face meetings with members of Congress also help to elevate the importance of the issues being discussed. The goal would be to meet with FAA, US Senators Murray and Cantwell; US Representatives Smith, Jayapal, and Larsen; and, if time allows, potentially other members of Congress including US Representatives Lynch and Speier.

Schinfeld went over a number of logistical considerations including:

- Planning the trip for when both the House and Senate are in session.
- Planning the trip when State legislators could also be included, in particular, State Representative Orwall or State Senator Keiser. This would speak to planning the trip after the conclusion of the State legislative session.
- March looks to potentially be the best month because it also avoids spring break for schools.
- The trip would likely be for 2 days. March 25-26 would be a good starting point to check schedules for availability.
- Initial thinking is that each entity would pay for their own representatives to attend.

Next steps include:

- Schinfeld will check with possible attendees and coordinate with the cities to see if the tentative date will work and get a first response of who each entity might like to send.
- Schinfeld will check with the airlines who are part of StART to see if they have any interest in participating or supporting the group’s trip.
- Schinfeld will check with Congressional offices to confirm availability on proposed dates.

The Working Group discussed the size and structure of the delegation. Initial ideas were to include two Port Commissioners, city managers/electeds from six cities, Airport Managing Director, two State

legislators, and a few community representatives. The discussion included how decisions could be made regarding who would be invited to attend. The Working Group tended towards having each city decide on its representatives, based on some simple criteria, for example how many each city could choose and commitment to agreement on a unified voice. The Working Group emphasized the importance of having a strong community voice in addition to the voice of officials, noting that hearing from community members can be more impactful than hearing from “professionals”. Once a date is set, preparation will be important in order to develop a shared agenda.

The Working Group meeting closed with a reminder that there would be no Working Group meetings in January. The next Federal Policy Working Group meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 3, 2020.

Tentative Next Meeting:
February 03, 2020, 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
Location: *SeaTac International Airport Conference Center, Room 4A*

Appendix C
Aviation Noise Working Group Meeting Summary

AVIATION NOISE WORKING GROUP
StART FACILITATOR'S MEETING SUMMARY

November 18, 2019; 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm

Seattle-Tacoma International Conference Center, Room 4A Conference Room
17801 International Blvd. ([Directions](#))

Attendee	Interest Represented
Eric Zimmerman	Normandy Park
Robert Akhtar	SeaTac
Mark Hoppen (phone)	Normandy Park
Jennifer Kester	SeaTac
Scott Ingham (Alt.)	Delta Air Lines
Tom Fagerstrom	Port of Seattle
Marco Milanese	Port of Seattle
Stan Shepherd	Port of Seattle
Jason Ritchie	FAA
Vince Mestre	L&B

Additional Participants: Lynae Craig, Alaska Airlines (phone), Lance Lyttle, Port of Seattle

Facilitator: Phyllis Shulman, Civic Alchemy

Note Taker: Emily Jackson, Floyd Snider

Meeting Objectives:

To discuss and get input on the Noise Abatement Departure Profiles Study's next steps. To provide an update on the Late-Night Noise Limitation Program outreach. To recap and share insights on the recent AAAE/ACI-NA Noise Conference. To review and discuss input received on the Ground Noise Study Scope.

Meeting Summary

Noise Abatement Departure Profile Study: Next Steps

Vince Mestre

Mestre provided a review of the Noise Abatement Departure Profiles Study and described the implementation steps, if action is taken. He stated that based on the study, NADP 2 (ICAO B for international carriers), known also as the distant procedure, is the preferred departure profile that offers the greatest potential noise reduction benefit for local communities. Next steps include the Port making a formal request through a letter to each airline asking them to utilize the NADP 2 for each runway and changing their operations specs (if not already using NADP 2), and then, communicating the changes to the FAA. Once there is FAA approval, pilots would be authorized to use NADP 2.

Discussion and questions included:

- Based on previous conversations, it seems that most of the airlines are currently flying a distant procedure, is that correct?

- *Response:* This is true for the Boeing 737, but no other aircraft types have been surveyed for this analysis. Airlines have often adopted this procedure since it saves fuel.
- What are international airlines doing?
 - *Response:* International airlines from Asia with wide body aircraft primarily use the distant procedures, and European airlines use a combination of both procedures.
- Will changing to the NADP 2 procedure result in an increase of noise for Normandy Park residents, even though it may have benefits for other communities? It would be helpful to have a clearer understanding on where the benefits are and whether there are impacts on Normandy Park.
 - *Response:* The Port will work with the consultants to clarify where there are potential benefits and impacts and develop visual information useful to communities. There does not appear to be a noise increase in Normandy Park.
- Since studies have only been performed on the Boeing 737 aircraft, is that the only aircraft that would be included in possible changes to the departure profile?
 - *Response:* All aircraft would be included in the request, not just the 737. The noise reduction benefits are expected to be similar when the NADP 2 is applied to larger aircraft.
- Are there differences in emissions between the two procedures?
 - *Response:* Yes, the distant procedure results in less fuel burned and less greenhouse gases. Getting the aircraft up faster reduces criterion pollutants as well.
- Could a phased-in approach be used or do the departure profile changes need to occur all at once?
 - *Response:* Each airline could implement it at different speed based on changes to their operations specs. This could take place over a timespan of months to a year. If pilot training is required, it could be longer than a year.
- Has the airport decided that they are going to make this request and is there a timetable?
 - *Response:* The Port will continue to get input from the Working Group and will have preliminary conversations with the FAA before next steps.
- What would the numbers look like for Boeing 747 aircraft or large body aircraft? Could that be modeled so that there is a comprehensive understanding of the proposed change?
 - *Response:* Based on the study and other analysis, the trend is anticipated to be similar with larger aircraft.
- Since the benefits will be greater to communities that are further from the airport than the StART communities and given the close in communities won't notice a difference, why pursue this?
 - *Response:* The purpose is to find noise reduction benefits without negative impacts, wherever they can be found.
- Would this potentially make Seattle the second airport in the US to have a procedural policy of this nature?
 - *Response:* San Francisco International Airport and Chicago O'Hare International Airport may have similar procedure policies in place.
- If this were to set a precedent, does this create additional costs for the airlines to implement?

- *Response:* This is not currently known. The distant procedure is probably already built into the aircraft flight management system.

Participants provided feedback suggesting what information would be needed to better educate communities about this effort as well as recommended formats. It was expressed that it would be helpful to have a map that shows city boundaries and which areas would benefit, which there would be no change in, and which areas might have an increase in noise. Port staff said that they would work with the noise consultants to develop those materials and review those draft materials with StART.

Late-Night Noise Limitation Program: Outreach Update

Tom Fagerstrom and Marco Milanese, Port of Seattle

Fagerstrom provided an update on the Late-Night Noise Limitation Program outreach.

- All of the airlines that had noise exceedances received letters that included data showing their exceedances. Letters also went out to airlines that had operations during late night hours that did not exceed noise thresholds.
- A number of airlines who had noise exceedances expressed interest in the program and the third quarter results and asked for additional information about their operations that exceeded noise thresholds in the third quarter, 2019.
- The Port initiated conversations with the three noisiest carriers during the third quarter's late-night hours. Port staff shared information about these conversations including:
 - EVA Air- They currently fly the Boeing 777. Staff met with them about the possibility of utilizing quieter aircraft. EVA Air stated that they did not see that possibility in the near future. They shared that they are currently developing their 2020 summer schedule and that they were considering moving their flights to an earlier departure time, but these times may still fall after 12:00am. Conversations are expected to continue.
 - China Airlines Cargo -a meeting has been scheduled.
 - FedEx - They are planning on transitioning the MD11 and DC10 out of their fleet, which has been responsible for the majority of their late-night noise exceedances. A timeline was not provided at this time. They mentioned that, due to the holiday season, expect increased operations during the fourth quarter.

One community representative commented that it's great to hear that the Port and airlines are engaging in a dialogue about late-night operations.

Noise Conference Recap

Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle

Shepherd shared that the annual AAAE/ACI-NA Noise Conference was held this year in Seattle and had record attendance (200 attendees). Participants mostly included airport employees, the FAA, and airport consultants due to the highly technical nature of the conference presentations. Shepherd shared information about some of the presentations that he attended.

Notable presentations included:

- Ruud Ummels discussed an expert study on understanding community and noise – This study indicated that a communication disconnect exists between noise professionals and the communities their studies serve. The data needs to be clear, transparent, easy to

- understand, and should be inclusive of all of the communities surrounding and impacted by an airport, not just close-in neighbors.
- Study on noise annoyance stated that 20-30% of noise annoyance complaints are attributed to the noise level, the rest is non-acoustic. People additionally complain as a result of seeing aircraft, not just hearing aircraft.
 - Sound insulation program – San Francisco International Airport staff Gerardo Fries is working on a program that fixes and repairs older noise reduction insulation in homes where it has failed. They are using city funds (SFO is operated by the City), since FAA funds are not available.
 - Faculty from the William D. Ruckelshaus Center discussed considerations for designing constructive community stakeholder engagement for airports.
 - FAA talked about technical data for taxiway noise, modeling of supersonic jets that will be entering the market in the future, urban air mobility and unmanned aerial systems that are entering the U.S. market soon.
 - Vince Mestre was awarded the annual Randy Jones Award for his work in aviation noise mitigation and monitoring.

Working Group members requested access to the presentations and agenda. An email was sent to Working Group members after the meeting with this information. Presentations are available at:

<https://www.aaae.org/AAAE/AirportNoiseConference/Agenda/Presentations.aspx>

Discussion and questions included:

- Could community members attend conferences like these in the future?
 - *Response:* Yes, although this conference was more technical and geared towards industry professionals. The UC Davis Aviation Noise and Emission Symposium in March may be more interesting to community members as its focus is more oriented to community issues and concerns.
 - Would the Port be able to send StART community representatives to the UC Davis symposium in March?
 - *Response:* The Port currently has not budgeted for that, but Port staff stated that they would be willing to look into that possibility. Cities may additionally choose to send their representatives.

Ground Noise Study Scope Input Received

Tom Fagerstrom and Marco Milanese, Port of Seattle

Fagerstrom and Milanese provided the Working Group with a draft list of items suggested by StART participants to add to the scope for the Ground Noise Study. One Working Group participant had performed some preliminary analysis to identify locations with line of site to the Airport, that may correlate with noise complaints. It was suggested that maybe that analysis could be used to help determine where to locate noise monitors. The Working Group indicated that the scope looks good.

Fagerstrom reviewed the general timeline of the study. He stated that, after an on-the-ground assessment of noise sources, the noise consultants are planning to do the noise monitoring sometime in March or April. Analysis of the data and the development of potential mitigation approaches will take place over the Summer of 2020. There will be multiple opportunities for discussion and input from StART. The noise consultants aim to share findings and potential mitigation options by the Fall of 2020.

Future Meeting Date/Times:

Tentative Next Meeting: February 10, 2020, 5:30pm - 7:30pm, Seattle-Tacoma International Conference Center, Room 4A Conference Room

