

Federal Policy Working Group

MEETING SUMMARY

SEPTEMBER 19, 2022; 5:00 PM – 6:20 PM
VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

Meeting Objectives:

Briefing on the FAA Noise Contour Policy. Federal Policy update on the Infrastructure Bill, Appropriations, and the Inflation Reduction Act. Review of the revised draft 2023 FAA Reauthorization Priorities Letter. Discussion about planning for a joint StART DC Fly-in.

Meeting Summary:

- I. Facilitator welcome, introduction and meeting agenda, Brian Scott from BDS Planning & Urban Design
- II. FAA Noise Contour Policy Briefing, Vince Mestre, Consultant
 - o Vince Mestre, co-author of the book 'A Guide to U.S. Aircraft Noise Regulatory Policy', introduced the history of 65 DNL, what it represents, and its possible alternatives – as a way to help the working group understand its implications. This presentation greatly helped the working group, particularly related to writing the 2023 FAA Reauthorization Priorities Letter to push the FAA on their next steps.
 - Origin of 65 DNL
 - Due to an Air Force base inundated with noise complaints from base housing in the early 1950's, acousticians developed the first aircraft noise metrics, called the Composite Noise Rating (CNR) with a recommendation to limit base housing noise to less than 100.
 - 100 CNR equals 65 DNL (Day Night Average Noise Level), making it the origin of 65 DNL published in 1953.
 - In 1965 HUD was passed by President Johnson. To allow HUD housing funded with GI loans, HUD was required to present the original study to protect their loans from becoming banded or void because of the noise impact on housing experienced through their loans.
 - Every housing that used federal funding had to be under 65 DNL.
 - In 1970 the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) implemented the 65 DNL used by the FAA.
 - In 1973 the EPA found that 30% of the people are highly annoyed by aircraft noise.
 - 1978, in his landmark work, Schultz synthesized survey data for road, rail, and aircraft done around the world, and found that 12.5% of the population is highly annoyed at 65 DNL.
 - In 1985, 65 DNL received congressional approval.
 - In 1987 Miedema published that more people, 30%, complain about aircraft noise but when combined with road noise only 12.5% are annoyed.
 - 1992 was the year we could have updated the policy when FICON reviewed it. FICON was dominated by the military and validated 65 DNL.
 - In 2009 the FAA began the noise road mapping process and in 2014 the ISO found that

37% are highly annoyed at 65 DNL for aircraft noise.

- In 2016 the FAA conducted a survey at 20 US airports and in their 2021 publishing shared that 66% of the population is highly annoyed by noise at 65 DNL.
- There are a lot more people that are annoyed than the study it is based on. The survey method is the large reason why the number is higher. In the 60s they would call people on the phone and get a 70 % response rate, today the response rate is 10%. In addition, there is a higher rate of annoyance among the mail responders v. the telephone responders.
- Annoyance doesn't have to do with more flights. It has some effect but not large. If you add 100 flights when there are thousands of flights, you can't really tell the difference in noise. The DNL accounts for this correlation analysis. The math says that from 100 to 200 is the same as from 5000 to 10,000.
- For no predictable reason Tucson airport causes the most annoyance and Syracuse the least.
- Alternatives
 - The FAA is in a difficult position as the current federal policy, ANCA, limits local control. Currently, the only thing airports can do is to insulate homes & schools.
 - SEA has developed a progressive system on the nighttime flights. Most airports in Europe and Australia have nighttime restrictions, which can come in the form of increased landing fees based on the hour and how well the aircraft is.
 - The alternative is not a matter of picking a DNL, rather it is more important to look at what role airports have with the community and interact with them.
 - Possible alternative could be compensation for them or tax breaks in the 65 DNL flight path.

III. Federal Policy Update, Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle

1. Infrastructure Bill

- We are continually tracking the opportunities as they become available.
- Unfortunately, POS didn't get money for roadway infrastructure into the airport. POS applied for \$25M, which would have allowed for less spill over into the communities. POS received high marks from USDOT but was not selected. We have a follow up scheduled to learn why.
- We are looking at electric vehicle charging funds coming out this fall. POS could potentially partner with communities for those funds.

2. FY23 Appropriations

- No deals have been made yet on what the FY 2023 appropriation will be. Hopefully, the continuation of FY 2022 will be passed next week. This would allow them time to figure out what FY 2023 will look like after the election. The election will impact how things will go.

3. Inflation Reduction Act

- The \$370 billion bill passed in August is the largest investment in US history in combating climate change through decarbonization and building energy efficient technologies.
- We will be tracking opportunities to apply for those funds.

IV. Draft 2023 FAA Reauthorization Priorities Letter Revision, Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle

- We will bring this letter to next full StART meeting to see if they have any feedback before sending this off with city signatures.
- What we wrote in the letter mostly tracks with Vince's remarks during his presentation, specifically how the new noise survey calls into question the current standards and pressing the FAA to look at them. In the letter we are not proposing a solution, but rather a process to get to a decision.

V. Planning for joint DC Fly-in, Eric Schinfeld, Port of Seattle

- In-person meetings cannot be replaced, and we would like to take the content of 2023 FAA Reauthorization Priorities Letter to DC. The real benefit is to go to our congressional leadership with these policies to get into the FAA Reauthorization Act.
- Currently, looking at February - March as possible times to go.
- Working group members generally agreed that going to DC is a good and valuable use of time to give a full push on these policies, and that a mix of electeds and community representatives bring credibility to the meetings.
- Paying for the fly-in for community representatives would have to be worked out.
- Eric: what are we trying to achieve? Why is this the most effective way to do that? Eric will think this through and bring this back during the next meeting.

VI. Next Steps

1. We will send out Vince Mestre's presentation deck to the working group.
2. Eric will think through before the next meeting what we are trying to achieve, and why a mixed DC fly-in is the most effective way to do that.
3. Include the revised Draft 2023 FAA Reauthorization Letter at next StART meeting.

MEMBER	INTEREST REPRESENTED	PRESENT
ALANA JARESS	FAA	✓
AMY ARRINGTON	NORMANDY PARK	✓
ANTHONY HEMSTAD	DES MOINES	✓
BILL VADINO	FEDERAL WAY	✓
BRANDON MILES	TUKWILA	-
CHRIS HALL	FEDERAL WAY	-
DIANA SMITH	BURIEN	✓
GARMON NEWSOM II	BURIEN	-
JEFF HARBAUGH	BURIEN	✓
KYLE MOORE	SEATAC	✓
LANCE LYTTLE	PORT OF SEATTLE	-
MICHAEL MATTHIAS	DES MOINES	-
ROBERT AKHTAR	SEATAC	-
NON-MEMBER		
ALEX STONE	OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN ADAM SMITH	✓
AMANDA WYMAN-BRADLEY	OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN ADAM SMITH	-
JESSICA MULLIGAN	OFFICE OF CONGRESSWOMAN JAYAPAL	-
MARIELLE TRUMBAUER	OFFICE OF CONGRESSWOMAN JAYAPAL	-
MEGAN UTEMEI	OFFICE OF SEN. PATTY MURRAY	-
TOMMY BAUER	OFFICE OF SEN. MARIA CANTWELL	-
RESOURCES		
	TITLE	
CLARE GALLAGHER	PORT OF SEATTLE	✓
DAVE KAPLAN	PORT OF SEATTLE	-
ERIC SCHINFELD	PORT OF SEATTLE	✓
JUSTIN BIASSOU	FAA	-

KELLY SCHIMELFENIG	PORT OF SEATTLE	-
LESLIE LARDIE	FAA	-
MARCO MILANESE	PORT OF SEATTLE	✓
PATRICIA LY	PORT OF SEATTLE	-
STAN SHEPHERD	PORT OF SEATTLE	-
TOM FAGERSTROM	PORT OF SEATTLE	✓
CONSULTANT		
BRIAN SCOTT	BDS PLANNING & URBAN DESIGN	✓
DORI KRUPANICS	BDS PLANNING & URBAN DESIGN	✓

NEXT MEETING: DECEMBER 5, 2022, 5:00 PM - 6:20 PM
LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE