

StART

MEETING SUMMARY

AUGUST 25, 2021; 5:00 PM – 7:00 PM

VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

Agenda Items:

- Aviation Emissions Research within the Vicinity of Airports
- SAMP Primer & Public Process
- Federal Policy Working Group Meeting Update
- Aviation Noise Working Group Meeting Update
- Public Comments

Meeting Summary:

- I. Facilitator welcome, introduction, and agenda, *Brian Scott from BDS Planning & Urban Design*
- II. Opening Remarks, *Lance Lytle, StART Chair/SEA Managing Director*
 - A. Welcomed the newest community representatives – Jeff Harbaugh and Diana Smith from Burien.
 - B. Thanked presenters Kevin Welsh, Executive Director, FAA Office of Environment & Energy, and Dr. Jonathan Levy and Dr. Kevin Lane, Boston University
 - C. Shared an update on the Port's efforts regarding Late Night Noise Limitation Program outreach.
 - The Port met with the regional and national team at FedEx just yesterday about their late-night noise exceedances. They pledged to continue the conversation. Additional details about the meeting will also be discussed at the next Aviation Noise Working Group meeting.
 - Also, the Port will draft a joint letter with member cities to acknowledge EVA Airway's efforts to limit their late-night noise at SEA by changing to a quieter aircraft.
 - D. Informed meeting participants that the FAA concurred with the Port's analysis and issued a [notification](#) on August 25 that the North SeaTac parking lot alternative was removed from further consideration within the Sustainable Airport Master Plan's (SAMP's) environmental assessment. Port staff based that decision on environmental concerns expressed by the public during the 2018 SAMP scoping, the environmental analysis conducted by Port staff themselves and the availability of an environmentally preferable alternative.
- III. Aviation Emissions Research within the Vicinity of Airports Update, *Kevin Welsh, Executive Director, FAA Office of Environment & Energy, and Dr. Jonathan Levy and Dr. Kevin Lane, Boston University*

Kevin Welsh explained that the FAA has already increased their work on climate change and on noise mitigation as these are top priorities for the administration. Kevin Welsh then introduced Dr. Kevin Lane who shared his presentation on ASCENT Project 18: Community Measurements of Aviation Emissions Contribution to Ambient Air Quality within the vicinity of Boston Logan International Airport.

 - A. Research on aviation emissions, including ultrafine particles (UFPs), has been ongoing for over a decade, including studying its impact on communities.

- B. UFPs have led to the need to create a new set of analysis and evaluation standards.
 - C. UFPs are the products of combustion and can penetrate the lungs deeply. Epidemiological evidence is growing rapidly that indicate a connection to cardiovascular disease and hypertension.
 - D. UFP attribution has been traced back to multiple sources such as vehicles, aircraft, and construction operations.
 - E. Most of the previous research is based on road-based exposure. Mobile monitoring requires the instrument to be closer to the source to understand the exposure to the communities.
 - F. Since there is a lack of UFP monitoring infrastructure, the development of dispersion models and collecting precise data and assessment is still underway, albeit delayed.
 - G. Current literature on aviation activity and particle number concentrations (PNC) shows that being downwind of an airport is associated with increased PNC and that there are higher emission rates for departures vs. arrivals.
 - H. These previous studies have limitations due to several variables such as the use of low temporal resolution data, lack of variability in meteorology, and limited distinction between in-flight vs. airport contributions.
 - I. Recent aviation-related PNC studies were unable to distinguish between roadway and aircraft features, therefore, the ASCENT Project 18 study was created to measure UFP concentrations near flight paths.
 - J. The goal is to leverage a set of UFP measurements in a community near a major airport across multiple years to evaluate time trends and contributions from transportation sources.
 - K. Comparing UFP data from before and during the pandemic shows an approximately 80% decrease in ambient PNC, yet as roadway traffic recovered to almost pre-pandemic levels and aircraft activity recovered to approximately 50% of pre-pandemic levels, the ambient PMC was measured to return to pre-pandemic concentrations.
 - L. The key challenges are developing physically interpretable insights about arrival/departure contributions and considering air pollution impacts within a broader exposure/health context.
 - M. The field of study is rapidly evolving. From road-based only to road-based + aviation and exposure studies are being built towards overlaying with health impacts.
- IV. SAMP Public Process. Tom Hooper, POS Manager of Aviation Planning and Clare Gallagher, POS Capital Project Delivery Director

The Port's long-term vision is a phased approach. The Near-Term projects are the subject of the first phase of the environmental review process and the Long-Term Vision projects would require a later phase of environmental review following additional planning. For the near-term, the Port planned for projects to accommodate a projected 56 million annual passengers by 2027.

A. Near-Term Projects

- The FAA needs to sign off before the Port is ready to publish the SAMP NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) EA (Environmental Assessment) draft document.
- There are more than 30 projects the Port will study as part of the process.
- The Port met with the FAA on August 25 and requested that the public comment period be extended to 60 days from 30. The FAA is aiming for a September/October publication date, but it may be postponed to early 2022 (mid-February) to ensure a timely notice, outreach, and comment period post-holidays.
- The Port Commission will be briefed during the public comment period.
- There is expected to be three virtual public hearings

- Publishing the NEPA environmental assessment will come first, followed by SEPA. SEPA, like NEPA, is focused on near-term projects.

B. Long-Range Planning

- Long-range planning is a campus wide, comprehensive planning effort and includes a 20-year facilities development and capital programs plan.
- The Port's forecast is focused on SEA's airfield and airspace operations. Other local airports are considered when calculating SEA's forecast.
- The Port recognizes that the most recent Part 150 Study for SEA, approved by the FAA in 2014, needs to be updated and plans are in place to do so once SAMP is complete.

V. Federal Policy Working Group Update, *Eric Schinfeld, Federal Government Relations Senior Manager, POS*

During the last Federal Policy Working Group meeting, held on August 2, the members agreed to add the following three items to the shared federal policy agenda:

- A. EPA Grant Program: New legislation by Congressman Adam Smith developing a new two-part EPA Grant Program to research and collect data on aircraft and airport noise and emissions and to use the data to develop a mitigation strategy.
- B. Sustainable Skies Act: The legislation proposes a blender's tax credit for sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) to incentivize the production of SAF and help the U.S. airline industry reach its goal of eliminating net carbon emissions by 2050.
- C. Select American Jobs Plan items: The American Jobs Plan include two pieces: a \$1.2 trillion infrastructure and climate change package and a \$3.5 trillion American Families Plan
 - 1) The working group decided to strategically focus on three issues within these bills:
 - Noise insulation funding
 - Sustainable aviation fuels tax credit
 - Healthy Ports Initiative (environmental justice grant program for communities of color)

No one at the StART meeting had objections to these adjustments to StART's shared federal policy agenda.

VI. Aviation Noise Working Group Update, *Tom Fagerstrom, Airport Noise Programs Coordinator*

The Aviation Noise Working Group met on August 9, and discussed the following topics:

- A. Third runway utilization: A host of factors are considered by FAA Air Traffic Controllers when determining when to use or not use the third runway during the late-night hours.
 - Reasons for third runway use during late night hours include planned or unplanned closures of other runways, anticipated busy period for departures, potential for air traffic/runway conflicts, adverse weather conditions.
 - Between September 2019 - July 2021, an average of 1.2 landings a night occurred on the third runway compared with an average of 10-12 landings before the Runway Use Agreement was finalized. The FAA confirmed their continued commitment to the agreement.
- B. ANCA: Vince Mestre, Consultant gave an overview of The Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA) to clarify the intent of the legislation.
- C. Late Night Noise Limitation Program: Port met with FedEx and will also be in communication with China Airlines Cargo and Amazon Prime Air to discuss their late-night noise exceedances.
- D. Noise Comment Monthly Report for June was discussed. All reports can be found on the [Port's website](#).
- E. The Ground Noise Study, an outcome of previous Noise Working Group discussions, was recently

re-started. Consultants conducted close-in noise monitoring in August.

VII. Public & Written Comments

Please note that the Port of Seattle is not taking public comment on the draft federal environmental assessment (EA) for the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP). Members of the public will have the opportunity to provide comment once the SAMP EA is published. All comments received at the August 25, 2021 SEA Stakeholder Advisory Round Table (StART) meeting are included in this August 25 StART meeting summary.

A. *Public Comments*

- Terri Lindike: Being close to the third runway, planes are now going over their house, which was not the case previously. She has questions about the westside construction campus.
- David Goebel: President of Vashon Island Fair Skies. It's critical that Vashon is included in the SAMP environmental assessment. Don't hide behind the 65 DNL. Excluding Vashon would be met with extreme resistance.
- Bernedine Lund: Surprised that nobody has mentioned the international panel on climate change. The sooner we start working on climate change, the better. Doesn't buy what the Port says about growth and that it is driven by demand. Everyone needs to think about what it is that they really want.
- Virginia Friend: 17 planes went over my house during the StART meeting. Any environmental assessment needs to include impacted rural areas like Vashon.
- Rich Rotruck: Long-term resident of Vashon. Request that Vashon is included in the SAMP environmental assessment. NextGen procedures implemented only on the west side of SEA resulted in a significant noise impact to Vashon.
- Alan: Noise over my house has increased, especially at night. Planes are flying over Vashon every couple of minutes. Include Vashon in SAMP environmental assessment to make sure their voices are heard.
- Tonya Roberts: I moved to Vashon 12 years ago when the only noise came from Joint Base Lewis-McChord. Just before COVID the flight path was changed, and it was non-stop noise. During COVID they experienced some noise reduction. Consider the impact of water and how that amplifies noise.
- Al Becker: I grew up on Vashon. Today it feels like every day, several times a day, they are landing in his yard. Include Vashon in any study you do regarding noise and emissions.
- Rob Harmon: I live on Vashon. Port received 6 times as many complaints from Vashon as the next highest zip code. Activities of FAA & Port is a serious concern for Vashon. Include Vashon in the Environmental Assessment.
- Cheryl Richmond: I am a Vashon resident, living on the north end where I moved seven years ago. No airplanes were flying over my house then. Include Vashon in the noise study and emission studies. Just because they are rural, they should not be excluded.
- Roxanne Thayer: I am a Vashon resident. You constantly leave Vashon & Maury Island out. Even in your map you left it out. They must be included in all the studies. Lived in the same place for over 41 years. Never been so bad. Planes fly so low at 5000-7000 feet. I am looking for equitable distribution of flights that existed previously.
- Hamdi Mohamed: I am a SeaTac resident, and a candidate for the Port of Seattle Commission. I

am speaking today as a SeaTac resident. I wanted to urge the Port not to build the parking lot in North SeaTac Park. But since it's been removed from the SAMP environmental assessment, I want to express gratitude to the Port and all who organized and made that happen.

- Beka Economopoulos: I am a resident of Vashon. Pretty surprised at the frequency of the airplane traffic. At home we have an Airnoise button and sometimes we are hitting it every minute. We got away from the city for their kids but the noise and air traffic is non-stop. Hope the SAMP environmental assessment will take Vashon into consideration.
- Michael Sperrazza: I am a Vashon resident. NextGen is impacting Vashon. Late night cargo flights have been taking off at low altitudes. This must be considered. Now it is almost not normal when we do not hear planes. That needs to be changed.
- Carol Jones: I agree with all said from those from Vashon speaking tonight. I lived here for 40 years, and I didn't know we were going to be under a NextGen flight path. I can't sit outside in my backyard because of the noise and low-flying planes. We need to be included in the environmental assessment. It is so unfair and frankly I am so angry.
- Natalie Craig: I am a Vashon resident. I agree with all that was said thus far. Every minute or two a plane flies over the house. We should be included in the environmental assessment, and something should be done about NextGen.
- Rob Briggs: I am a Vashon resident. Vashon needs to be included in the environmental assessment. UN Secretary-General Gutierrez said climate change is code red for humanity. Any consideration to increase capacity at SEA needs to be tabled. A sustainable airport plan needs to be implemented to bring emissions to zero and not about how to increase emissions.
- Richard Folks: I lived on Maury Island since 1974. Very little plane traffic at that time. Now it's constant and irritating. I hope Vashon will be included in all the studies.
- Anne Kroecker: I suggest that you support a more equitable sustainable aviation fuels tax. It's not a tax. You are wasting public dollars. The Port's response to the King County public health study was ineffective and disrespectful to people who gave input. A better response would have been that they want to create a better report going forward.
- Jed Doyle: I live adjacent to the park that was going to be turned into a parking lot. And I am glad but concerned that such a process can move along so quickly. My apartment rattles every day from the planes. The whole world has environmental issues facing it today. Any green design going into any of the things you are talking about? The amount of stress just thinking about the parking lot alone was too much. There is a problem the way the Port is reaching out to people.

B. *Written Comments*

- Hello, below please find my written comments for submission to the August 25th meeting. I cannot attend live as I am working at that time. My comments are in regard to the SAMP and my opposition to lot L06 in North SeaTac Park.
My name is Meagan Lass and I live near north SeaTac park, an invaluable area of forested land that is used in large numbers every single day by our community. I own property on 24th avenue south and use this area almost daily for long walks with my dog. I see firsthand the positive impact this space has on our community- improved air quality, noise and pollution reduction, healthy wildlife and plant habitat, recreation facilities for adults and children alike. A place for people to walk their dogs, to teach their children how to ride their bikes for the first time, for local sporting events. A place for people to gather, safely, outdoors with common

interests be that biking, remote car racing, nature walks, habitat restoration, and so much more. This forested area is the natural heart of this community and removing it for a parking lot would be a travesty. It is unnecessary and counterproductive to the needs of our neighborhood. There is a current parking lot for airport employees further south on 24th avenue that can and should be built upon to expand; that would not require the removal of such a vital natural resource. It would provide additional parking spaces for employees while having a lesser impact on the people that live and vote in this neighborhood and the city of SeaTac.

I urge the Port of Seattle to do the right thing that is in line with the needs of the community as well as your mission to maintain projects that do not negatively affect the environment and choose another location for additional parking. I would also note that taxpayers have already paid for public transportation that goes directly to the airport and it would behoove the short term and long term growth plans to incentivize public transportation usage for airport employees.

Please, for the good of our community and environment, don't pave over our forest. Don't pave over our playgrounds, our animals, our trees and vegetation. Don't pave over our trails. Don't pave over the heart of this neighborhood.

Thank you, Meagan Lass, Resident of SeaTac, WA

- I oppose the new parking lot. I support building UP on existing facilities rather than tearing up trails and trees for new ones. Allison Ostrer
- Dear StART members,
The Port of Seattle must not cut down 11 acres of forest within North SeaTac Park for the 1,500-spot employee parking lot L06, which is proposed in the SAMP.
Commission President Felleman and Commissioners Bowman and Steinbrueck toured the site of L06 recently. Their visit shows that they heard our community's concerns and understand how important this park and its forest are to our health and wellbeing. Thank you for taking this step. It is genuinely appreciated.
But as long as the proposal for Lot L06 remains active - we risk that it will be built. This would cause avoidable negative health impacts to our communities that are already highly impacted by environmental health disparities. It would destroy much of our mountain biking trail system. It would negatively impact waterways and further fragment our regional forest ecosystem.
The Port proposed an alternative - a multi-story parking structure on already-paved land. This appears on page 4-49 of the 2017 SAMP Technical Memorandum 6 on Alternatives.
Ideally, the Port would find a climate and community-friendly alternative to new parking. But if it can't, its own idea of building up, not out - on already paved land - is much less harmful than a sprawling, noisy, one-level lot where a beloved forest used to be.
In a 2016 audit (https://www.faa.gov/airports/airport_compliance/), the FAA stated that the Port's Aviation Division told them that North SeaTac Park "is the culmination of a long-term and very open planning process to compensate the area's residents for cumulative airport impacts. According to the Aviation Division, the Park is the best compatible use of a severely airport-impacted area." Lot L06 is incompatible with this obligation. Thank you for listening. Warm regards, Rachel Doyle

- Hello, I am unavailable for the zoom meeting and would like to have my comments logged. It is unacceptable for Vashon to be omitted from the EA and EIS. Since NextGen has been in operation, a once rural, quiet island has turned into a constant airway of overhead flights. We moved here 6 years ago specifically to the country and the plane noise was more diffuse. I understand that we live across the water from an international airport and now that there is one straight line created by NextGen, the noise is constant over Vashon. Include Vashon in the EA and EIS. This noise is unacceptable. Thank you. Kate Dowling

- Hello, I would like to submit a comment regarding the proposed parking lot in North Seatac park. I strongly oppose this project. It seems that there are other already paved locations where parking could be provided, but in any case I would much rather see the Airport incentivize its employees to make use of public transport to reduce cars on the road.
I don't see any upside whatsoever to destroying more green space in such a built-up area, especially when that green space is so well used by multiple community groups that have no other options nearby if this part of the park is destroyed.
I beg the port to reconsider this proposal in the interests of the health and recreational needs of the community. I live in a neighboring community and I love using the mountain bike paths in this park. I also love to see other community members using the walking trails, disc golf, ball fields and mountain bike trails. There is nothing else of this size and natural beauty close by. Please don't take it away. Colleen Hinton

- Dear StART members, The Port of Seattle must not cut down 11 acres of forest within North SeaTac Park for the 1,500-spot employee parking lot L06, which is proposed in the SAMP. there are other solutions that can treat the environment and nearby community better. Commission President Felleman and Commissioners Bowman and Steinbrueck toured the site of L06 recently. Their visit shows that they heard our community's concerns and understand how important this park and its forest are to our health and wellbeing. Thank you for taking this step. It is genuinely appreciated.
But as long as the proposal for Lot L06 remains active - we risk that it will be built. This would cause avoidable negative health impacts to our communities that are already highly impacted by environmental health disparities. It would destroy much of our mountain biking trail system. It would negatively impact waterways and further fragment our regional forest ecosystem. There are multiple other alternatives. One, proposed by port - is to build a multi-story parking structure on already-paved land. This appears on page 4-49 of the 2017 SAMP Technical Memorandum 6 on Alternatives. Another option that wasn't proposed, but will have an even better ecological footprint, is to build automated underground parking. (disadvantages would be the cost per space, and that the volume required will make it the biggest underground parking facility ever built - which is a risk)
Also note that the further the parking will be from the airport, the higher the direct and indirect pollution and carbon footprint will be from vehicles transporting airport employees from the parking to the airport and back.
Ideally, the Port would find a climate and community-friendly alternative to new parking. But if it can't, its own idea of building up, not out - on already paved land - is much less harmful than a sprawling, noisy, one-level lot where a beloved forest used to be.

In a 2016 audit (https://www.faa.gov/airports/airport_compliance/), the FAA stated that the Port's Aviation Division told them that North SeaTac Park "is the culmination of a long-term and very open planning process to compensate the area's residents for cumulative airport impacts. According to the Aviation Division, the Park is the best compatible use of a severely airport-impacted area." Lot L06 is incompatible with this obligation. Thank you for listening. Rotem Yossef, SeaTac

- o Growth of the aviation industry

Each of you need to consider what 'growth' of the airline industry really means and if this is what the county and world needs in this time of global climate change.

The PSRC Final Report of May 2021 predicts that flights will increase from 400,000 per year to over 800,000 per year by 2050. This is based on projected population growth and demand for flights.

In making this prediction, the PSRC did not take into account the negative impacts of such growth and has not provided the leadership that was needed. The PSRC also made this prediction before seeing the result of this unlimited growth as described in the Aug 11, 2020 report by the IPCC (International Panel on Climate Change).

The PSRC cited the public's demand for flights as the reason for the growth in the number of flights. Everyone here and others related to aircraft flights need to challenge the reason for that growth. This will not be the first time that the public demands for particular product or service is limited. For example, in the past there was greater and greater demand for smoking products; however, when the dangers of smoking were made known to the public, limits were placed on advertising and where one could smoke, tax increases on tobacco products were increased, and smoking (in the US) decreased. Similar limits were put on other things dangerous to the public, such as opioid use, asbestos use, leaded gasoline for vehicles (though the FAA still allows lead in piston driven aircraft), and many other activities that were not initially limited or controlled. The same can be done for airline flights, such as replacing a flight with electronic business meetings, using non-polluting modes of transportation such as electric cars for shorter trips and hyper-loop for long trips. Note that money is included in the infrastructure bill for hyper-loop. The costs of building new infrastructure can replace the need to cover the increasing costs of climate disasters.

You have to take action now to prevent the worst outcome described by the IPCC report. Not expanding the airport is one step in the right direction.

Additional information on who is affected by reduction in flights.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214367X21000466> Abstract:

"Aviation is responsible for at least 3.5% of global warming, and demand is predicted to rise rapidly over the next few decades. To reverse this trend, air travel demand will need to be managed. An important question is: 'who would be affected by air travel demand reduction policies? The answer to that question largely depends on who is participating in air travel, and how unequally it is distributed. Existing analysis suggests that participation in air travel in the UK is highly unequal and driven by richer, highly educated and urban households. However, so far little is known about how these patterns of inequality have changed over time – has air travel participation increased among low income households, e.g. due to the rise of low-cost carriers and 'normalisation' of air travel as a social practice? Would these groups therefore now be

more affected by flight taxes or frequent flyer levies? To address these questions, this paper examines trends in air travel inequality between 2001 and 2018 in the UK based on two representative surveys, providing the first micro- level analysis of air travel inequality over time for this country.

We find that while disadvantaged groups have contributed to the expansion of air travel over the past two decades, they remain far less likely to be affected by air travel demand management policies because air travel inequality is still at a very high level. These findings challenge common discourses that present air travel as a widespread norm, and demand management policies as socially unfair.”

The authors say that “proposals for a frequent flyer tax or levy that have been put forward by various organizations, including the Committee on Climate Change (Carmichael, 2019), should be duly considered as far more beneficial from an environmental and justice perspective.”

Bernedine Lund, resident of Federal Way and volunteer for 350 Seattle aviation group

- 11 acres of earth, shelter, ecosystem, irreplaceable trees and shade for parking. Clearly alternatives are being sacrificed for the cheapest direction. Cheap like scum, cheap like destroying nature without thought. Sacrifice like ignoring lives of creatures as if they don't exist, as if oxygen and shade and life doesn't take priority over dollar. This is the kind ignorance that younger new generations are in danger of. Have you walked through that forest? I guarantee you haven't seen one the last natural water bogs in the city that is gently downhill from the parking lot and you shouldn't. All in participation of this location, all in support of this deforestation should be ashamed. Clearly another infection of poor management and negligent humans. The direction of this is not about parking. The priority is preservation of life. This is homes to animals, fungus, mycelial networks, water, shade, foliage. Life. You are sacrifice life. Do you understand life. Money and convenience is not the answer any more as you can easily the decorations and rape of environment need to end. What generation is behind this, what entity of foolishness can support this. Your convenience does not take precedent over the vitality of 11 acres of life that sacredly live under the commercialized layers of clouds and sky's. The sound is terrible enough, now you want to our nature from the ground for molestation of the sky. Your motives are evil, your souls are in need of a shattering cleaning. Please stay out of nature because preservation is the only option. Not pillaging and restoration. Disgustedly written. Corporate greed at its finest tune. Jed Doyle
- Thank you for the opportunity to attend the meeting this evening and for appending these comments. I attended to object to the plan to raze parkland / green space for parking lot L06. I'm very grateful that plan has been scrapped. As another participant noted, though, it is surprising and upsetting that the Port, which is trying to characterize itself and its plans as “green,” would consider this in the first place. And that it seems it's up to private citizens to track these things. I, too, would like to know if “green” and bird-safe tech has been integrated into the Port's plans. Also, to echo several other commenters: climate change is real and happening. The Port is in a position of great power that average folks just don't have—power to make or break our future. The Port controls public funds. This is the time to exercise that power responsibly. This is not the time to expand. This is the time to contract, or at the least figure out how to make do with less.

Someone has to start setting limits. Someone has to start thinking differently, rather than continuing in the carbon / growth mindset. Thank you. Claire Jackson, Esq.

- Vashon Island Fair Skies PO Box 1250
Vashon, WA 98070
<http://www.vifs.org> info@vifs.org (206)682-8638
Dedicated to restoring the pre-NextGen dispersed arrival paths and procedures at Seattle/Tacoma International Airport that had been in place since the introduction of commercial aviation to the Puget Sound region, decades ago.
Written Comments for the Port of Seattle StART Meeting 25 August 2021
Thank you for this opportunity to provide written comment to the StART meeting. It is difficult to drill down into detailed legislative and technical details in just 60 seconds.
I heard rumors that it was possible a full & detailed AEDT analysis, based on real and representative radar track data over Vashon Island, may not be included in the upcoming SAMP NEPA EA.
I was in disbelief considering the Vashon community's strong participation in the scoping phase of SAMP and the community complaints, both in raw number and number of unique households, compared to the rest of the Puget Sound region. If this suspicion is unfounded and Vashon is comprehensively studied in the draft already sent to the FAA, then the remainder of this comment will serve to reinforce that wise decision.
Regardless, let me state that inclusion of Vashon in the SAMP NEPA EA primarily, and the SEPA EIS secondarily, is a bright red line for Vashon Island Fair Skies.
The current governing statute for aviation noise is 1979's ANSA (Aircraft Safety and Noise Act - U.S. Public Law 101-193), which requires the FAA to "establish a single system of measuring noise, for which there is a highly reliable relationship between projected noise exposure and surveyed reactions of people to noise".
DNL fails this legislative requirement miserably. The recently released "Neighborhood Environmental Survey" provides the data proving as much.
In the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188, Congress required the FAA to "evaluate alternative noise metrics to current average day-night level standard". In its April 14, 2020 Report to Congress the FAA ignored this directive and instead provided a simple survey of various noise metrics with zero attempt to comparatively determine which metric best satisfies the legislative requirements in ANSA. This defiance is leading to congress having to micromanage the FAA to follow the law, however the law and data is already clear to everyone else. DNL is seriously under threat, and the abuse of arbitrary and capricious DNL contours to unfairly exclude a community from environmental analysis when a reasonable human being looking at the evidence in whole would conclude that the community was severely impacted by noise may drive the final nail in DNL's coffin. The plain language of DC circuit court judge Thomas Beall Griffith in the Phoenix v. FAA decision eloquently states that the FAA is not entitled to impose its alternate reality on communities across the country: "The idea that a change with these effects would not be highly controversial is 'so implausible' that it could not reflect reasoned decision making".
Contrary to the stealth Greener Skies EA in 2012 with zero Port/FAA outreach on Vashon Island, this time a 60 day deadline would not be an impediment to justice.

Sincerely, David Goebel

President, Vashon Island Fair Skies, a 501(c)3 Public Charity (EIN 82-5451411)

- Hi! I just wanted to comment in advance of tonight's meeting, which I can't attend in person, on my adamant preference for no change to or even enhanced protection for the existing park over the proposal to replace it with a parking lot, which I adamantly oppose. Thanks! Michael Rupprecht
- Listening to loud plane noise as I submit this form. Kevin Mitcham
- I have found this whole airport noise situation to be insufferable. Gary Peterson
- Wouldn't it be prudent to get a copy of the information being presented AHEAD OF TIME so that we can comment effectively?! Sandra Mock
- Please remove the obstacles that make it difficult for the public to attend these meetings. It should be easier to attend than a physical meeting, and not have its time & location obfuscated through a gauntlet of Byzantine passages. David Goebel
- Unacceptable number of flights directly over my home every day. Virginia Louise Friend
- The firehose of noise and fine particulate pollution due to the NextGen flight pattern is lowering our property values and damaging to our health and peace of mind. When I moved here in 2015 it was blissfully quiet. Those days are gone. PLEASE change the flight pattern back to what it was. Mary Woodring
- Very concerned about low level air traffic over Vashon Island. Richard Roberts
- If I'm not able to comment during meeting, I would like to note that it is critical that Vashon be included in the studies. All summer when I'm laying in bed trying to sleep with the windows open, planes one after another in succession loudly scream overhead minutes apart (9pm-10:30pm). Just yesterday a smallish plane went over at such a low altitude I thought it was headed to the Vashon Airport just a mile or two away. The route seems to be exactly the same. Having coffee on my deck, I watched 10s of planes go almost directly overhead passing the same exact branches on a tree. They are so loud! Wilson Hu
- Include Vashon in new noise tests! - The SAMP will include both an EA (Environment Assessment) under NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act), and an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) under SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act). Based on Vashon's strong showing during the scoping phase of the SAMP, together with the fact that the zip code 98070 has, so far this year, ~6 times as many complaints from over twice as many unique households on average than the next highest zip code (98198), and finally the new noise monitor registering hundreds of overflights a day in South flow, the inclusion of Vashon in the EA & EIS seemed a given. However I have heard suggestions that we may not be included after all. Perhaps that's because

if Vashon is included the analysis would, by law, have to consider the cumulative impacts of NextGen on top of the planned expansion in the SAMP, which is a topic the FAA may be loath to broach. It is unacceptable for Vashon to not be included in these studies. Tanya Roberts

- Concerned that Vashon NOT be left out of environmental studies about airport traffic effect. Alan Becker
- I would like to testify on behalf of including Vashon statistics in all environmental assessments regarding airplane noise and the plan for air traffic in the region. Lola J. Michelin
- As a person who lives directly below the south flow overflight path over Vashon Island, I request that Vashon be included in the EA under NEPA and the EIS under SEPA. We are suffering here and need the results of these studies to validate our experience. Kind regards, Susan Helsell Kutscher
- Hello, I am unavailable for the zoom meeting and would like to have my comments logged. It is unacceptable for Vashon to be omitted from the EA and EIS. Since NextGen has been in operation, a once rural, quiet island has turned into a constant airway of overhead flights. We moved here 6 years ago specifically to the country and the plane noise was more diffuse. I understand that we live across the water from an international airport and now that there is one straight line created by NextGen, the noise is constant over Vashon. Include Vashon in the EA and EIS. This noise is unacceptable. Thank you. Kate Dowling
- Would like to be involved in airport-related planning. Rob Hotchkiss
- Waiting to see if you commissioners will ever do the right thing by those who live around and under this plane freeway! Sandra Mocom
- It is essential that Vashon be included in the Environmental Assessment (EA) and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Vashon must be included in the noise monitoring program. Mark S. Peloquin
- The FAA must consider cumulative impacts of NextGen flight paths as part of airport expansion. Holly Taylor

| MEMBER | INTEREST REPRESENTED | PRESENT |
|---------------------|--|---------|
| ARLYN PURCELL (ALT) | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| BILL VADINO | FEDERAL WAY – CITY | ✓ |
| BOB LEONARD | DES MOINES – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | ✓ |
| BRANDON MILES | TUKWILA - CITY | ✓ |
| BRIAN WILSON | BURIEN – CITY | ✓ |
| CARL COLE | SEATAC – CITY | ✓ |
| CHRIS HALL | FEDERAL WAY – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | - |
| DAVE BERGER | FEDERAL WAY – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | - |
| DAVID LASHLEY | NORMANDY PARK – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | ✓ |
| DAVID SUOMI | FAA (EX-OFFICIO) | ✓ |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| DIANA SMITH | BURIEN – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | ✓ |
| ERIC SCHINFELD | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| ERIC ZIMMERMANN | NORMANDY PARK – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | ✓ |
| ERICA POST | TUKWILA – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | - |
| GARMON NEWSOM II (ALT) | BURIEN - CITY | ✓ |
| JEFF HARBAUGH | BURIEN – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | ✓ |
| JUSTIN BIASSOU | FAA (EX-OFFICIO) | ✓ |
| KYLE MOORE (ALT) | SEATAC – CITY | - |
| LANCE LYTTLE (CHAIR) | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| AMY ARRINGTON | NORMANDY PARK – CITY | ✓ |
| MARCO MILANESE | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| MICHAEL MATTHIAS | DES MOINES – CITY | ✓ |
| PETER PHILIPS | DES MOINES – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | ✓ |
| RANDY FIERTZ (ALT) | ALASKA AIRLINES | - |
| ROBERT AKHTAR | SEATAC – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | ✓ |
| SCOTT INGHAM (ALT) | DELTA AIR LINES | ✓ |
| SCOTT KENNEDY | ALASKA AIRLINES | ✓ |
| SHAN HOEL | AIR CARGO | - |
| SUSAN CEZAR (ALT) | DES MOINES - CITY | - |
| TEJVIR BASRA | SEATAC – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | - |
| TOD BOOKLESS | TUKWILA – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE | - |
| TONY GONCHAR | DELTA AIR LINES | - |
| NON-MEMBERS | TITLE | |
| ALEX STONE | OFFICE OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ADAM SMITH | ✓ |
| ANTHONY HEMSTAD | FEDERAL POLICY WORKING GROUP/DES MOINES | ✓ |
| BETH FREILING | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| CHRIS SCHAFFER | FAA | ✓ |
| CHRISTOPHER SEQUEIRA | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| CLARE GALLAGHER | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| COLLEEN HINTON | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| DAVE KAPLAN | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| GENE ACHZIGER | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| HEATHER FERNUIK | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| HOLLY TAYLOR | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| JEETENDRA UPADHYAY | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| JEFFREY BROWN | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| JENNIE SANTORO | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| JUSTIN BIASSOU | FAA (EX-OFFICIO) | ✓ |
| KELLY SCHIMELFENIG | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| LAURA HOLTHUS | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| LINDA REMMERS | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| MARIA HALPIN | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| MARIELLE TRUMPAUER | OFFICE OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JAYAPAL | ✓ |
| MARLYN FOULKES | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| MATT MAHONEY | COUNCILMEMBER | ✓ |
| MCKENZIE COOL | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| NAT CRAIG | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| PETER STEINBRUECK | COMMISSIONER | ✓ |
| PRISCILLA VARGAS | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| RALPH IOVINELLI | FAA | ✓ |
| RICK JOHNSON | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| ROB HARMON | PUBLIC | ✓ |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| SALLY DEL FIERRO | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| SHEILA BRUSH | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| STAN SHEPHERD | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| TANYA ROBERTS | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| TOSHIKO GRACE HASEGAWA | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| TIFFANY LAI | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| TIM TOERBER | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| TOM FAGERSTROM | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| REP. TINA ORWELL | STATE REPRESENTATIVE | ✓ |
| WILSON HU | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| PRESENTERS | | |
| CLARE GALLAGHER | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| DR. JONATHAN LEVY | BOSTON UNIVERSITY | ✓ |
| DR. KEVIN LANE | BOSTON UNIVERSITY | ✓ |
| KEVIN WELSH | FAA OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENT & ENERGY HEALTH | ✓ |
| TOM HOOPER | PORT OF SEATTLE | ✓ |
| CONSULTANTS | | |
| BRIAN SCOTT | BDS PLANNING & URBAN DESIGN | ✓ |
| DORI KRUPANICS | BDS PLANNING & URBAN DESIGN | ✓ |
| VINCE MESTRE | CONSULTANT | - |
| PUBLIC COMMENTS | | |
| ALAN BECKER | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| ALAN | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| ANNE KROEKER | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| BEKA ECONOMOPOULOS | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| BERNADINE LUND | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| CAROL JONES | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| CHERYL RICHMOND | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| DAVID GOEBEL | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| HAMDY MOHAMED | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| JED DOYLE | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| MICHAEL SPERRAZZA | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| NATALIE CRAIG | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| RICHARD FOULKES | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| RICHARD ROTRUCK | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| ROB BRIGGS | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| ROB HARMON | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| ROXANNE THAYER | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| TERRI LINDIKE | PUBLIC | ✓ |
| VIRGINIA FRIEND | PUBLIC | ✓ |

*NEXT MEETING: OCTOBER 27, 2021- TENTATIVELY 5:00 PM - 7:00 PM
LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE*