



Seattle-Tacoma International Airport
Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update

April 9, 2011
Public Meeting #4 Report

May 23, 2011

Table of Contents

PROJECT OVERVIEW..... 1

OPEN HOUSE OVERVIEW..... 1

OUTREACH AND ADVERTISING..... 2

INFORMATION STATION FLIP CHARTS..... 3

COMMENT CARDS 3

OPEN HOUSE EVALUATION 4

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – OPEN HOUSE AGENDA

APPENDIX B – FLIP CHART NOTES

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Port of Seattle is participating in a Federal Aviation Regulation Part 150 Aircraft Noise and Land Use Compatibility Study. The goal of Sea-Tac Airports Part 150 Noise Study is to analyze noise impacts from aircraft operations. Once these noise impacts have been analyzed and documented, the Part 150 Study goes on to develop and recommend actions that can lessen the effects of aircraft noise.

This is the fourth Part 150 Study the Port of Seattle has engaged in; the first was conducted in 1985. As a result of previous noise reduction initiatives, the Port has invested some \$500 million in sound mitigation programs. Sea-Tac Airport is recognized today as having one of the most comprehensive aircraft noise reduction programs in the nation.

This Part 150 Study represents the first time that the noise impacts from the new third runway, which opened for operation in late 2008, are being analyzed using actual data. Landrum and Brown, a national aviation consulting firm, is the lead consultant for the study. Norton-Arnold & Company, a Seattle-based firm, is a sub-consultant to Landrum and Brown and is supporting the public involvement process for the study.

OPEN HOUSE OVERVIEW

The fourth public meeting for the Part 150 Study was held on Saturday, April 9, 2011 from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. at Sea-Tac International Airport. Some 75 people signed in at the meeting, which was staffed by representatives of the Landrum & Brown consultant team and the Port of Seattle.

This meeting was held in an “open house” format, and was the fourth in a series of five public meetings that will be held throughout the Part 150 Study. The purpose of this open house was to share the initial ideas under consideration for airport noise remedies. The meeting was organized around seven information stations¹:

1. **Introduction to a Part 150** – an overview of the process and the next steps.
2. **Noise Contours** – the input data and the resulting noise contours for the airport.
3. **Temporary Noise Measurements** – the results of the temporary noise monitoring program.
4. **Noise Abatement Options** – the options being looked at to reduce noise by changing operating conditions.
5. **Land Use Mitigation Options** – the options being looked at for noise remedy programs for people living near the airport.
6. **Hush House Analysis** – the latest on a potential hush house to reduce noise from engine run-ups.
7. **Port of Seattle Noise Programs & More** – answering other questions related to the airport and to show some of the technology available to track aircraft near the airport.

¹ The display boards for each station can be found on the project website: <http://www.airportsites.net/SEA-Part150/meetings.htm>

Meeting participants were provided with an agenda, a comment card, and a meeting evaluation form at the sign-in table, and were invited to sign up for a tour of the airfield. The open house agenda is provided in Appendix A of this report. In addition to the comment cards, participants were encouraged to write their comments on flipchart pads.

The information gathered at this meeting will be used to further inform the work of the Part 150 consultant team. A fifth public meeting, which will include a public hearing on the Draft Part 150 report, is anticipated to occur in summer 2011.

OUTREACH AND ADVERTISING

A number of efforts were made to widely publicize this public meeting. A press release was issued to local media outlets, and two emails were sent to the “Constant Contact” email distribution list with nearly 1,000 subscribers. Two advertisements were placed in the Highline Times, and the Airport’s community newsletter, Air Mail, had a front page story on the open house and was distributed to approximately 33,000 households two weeks prior to the open house. The Part 150 website and the Port’s website also included a notice of the workshop.

The cities surrounding the airport also assisted with advertising. Flyers were distributed to all of the cities, local libraries, Highline and Tukwila School District schools and a number of local organizations including a few that were visited by Port staff in person. Federal Way posted the notification of the meeting on its website, at city hall and distributed it through its e-subscribe system. Normandy Park posted the notification at its city hall, the local grocery store and on the city’s website. Des Moines posted the notice on its website and various public facilities around the city. The City of SeaTac posted the notification on its website and included information about the meeting in the City Manager’s Weekly Update. Burien posted it on its website and at city hall.

Notification was also sent to all members of the Highline Forum and to the Technical Review Committee that is advising the Port of Seattle on the Part 150 Study Update. In addition to the Constant Contact distribution list, emails were sent to city, neighborhood and local organization contacts throughout the Seattle/Tacoma area.

The Port of Seattle also utilized the outgoing message on its Noise Information Line to advertise the open house. And, when written responses were made to those with noise-related inquiries or complaints, notice of the open house was included in those responses.

The Part 150 open house flyer was translated into four languages spoken widely in the airport communities (Spanish, Vietnamese, Cambodian and Somali) and distributed to all the airport cities, a number of community organizations, local libraries and schools within the Highline and Tukwila School Districts. A dedicated language line, which was used by a few callers, was set up specifically for the Part 150 process; this line allows anyone who speaks Spanish, Vietnamese, Cambodian or Somali to call and leave a message in their own language and receive a return call from someone who speaks their language. The Port also made interpreter services available upon request to assist participants at the meeting. One person requested a Vietnamese interpreter which was provided at the meeting.

INFORMATION STATION FLIP CHARTS

Participants made a total of thirty comments on the flip charts located next to the information stations. The verbatim flip chart notes are provided in Appendix B of this report. While the comments were fairly diverse, comments about nighttime noise, noise mitigation, and the proposed hush house were most prevalent. A number of people expressed concerns about the reduced noise remedy boundary, while others noted specific locations where they experience loud aircraft noise in their homes. A summarized list of the comments includes:

Nighttime Noise

- Cargo planes should not be allowed to fly at night or in the early morning because they are typically the loudest and oldest aircraft.
- Surprised that there was so much flight activity after 10 p.m., especially on the third runway.
- Airport neighbors experience loud, window-rattling noise late at night.

Noise Mitigation

- Planes should use GPS technology to maximize use of the center and east runway and avoid using the third runway as much as possible.
- Planes should use a higher altitude profile descent approach to “coast” to a landing rather than the current high power stair step approach.
- Insulated windows do not help to keep out the noise.
- Noise mitigation is needed for bedrooms within the 45-50 DNL contour.

Hush House

- It should be located at site “B” or site “C”.
- There were concerns Sites “A”, “B”, and “C”, and potential impacts to Normandy Park, especially since the trees along 192nd are now gone.

COMMENT CARDS

Twelve people made comments on the comment cards and two people provided previously prepared comments and questions. The predominant themes were comments about the potential hush house and the noise remedy boundary.

Hush House

- The preferred locations for the hush house are the “D”, “E”, and “F” sites.
- The hush house would help improve livability and help home values in the area.
- The hush house will help address the noise problem and should continue to be considered as a noise abatement option.
- The hush house should be built because planes can be heard idling for long periods of time on the runways.

Noise Remedy Boundary

- The western boundary needs to be reevaluated because of loud noise at 165th and 5th Avenue S.
- The noise remedy boundary needs to be adjusted to reflect the 2016 future noise remedy area and to address the added noise of the third runway.
- The zigzag of the boundary line at 160th is discriminatory because it excludes Blakely Manor from noise mitigation.

OPEN HOUSE EVALUATION

Meeting participants also evaluated the effectiveness of the public open house. Fifteen people, or about 20% of those attending, filled out evaluation forms at the meeting. Out of the 15 who filled out the evaluation form, not all filled it out entirely, and quite a few people made extra comments.

Under the **Meeting Logistics** heading, all respondents said the day of the week and time was convenient. Fourteen respondents said the meeting place was comfortable and accessible. One respondent said they had accessibility needs that were not considered, but did not clarify their accessibility needs. Twelve respondents said the room was configured in a way that they could see and hear all relevant information. Seven respondents said they would like to receive meeting notices one month in advance and seven said they would like to receive notice two weeks in advance.

Under the **Presentation** heading, eleven respondents said the displays and staff provided adequate understanding of the community's role in the project. Nine said there were topics that they would like to have more information about or were not addressed. Topics in this category identified by respondents included: data and reports; specific information on noise mitigation packages; and, night flights. All of the twelve people who answered this question said the length of the open house was just right and seven respondents said the amount of information was just right (three said the amount of information was not enough and five respondents did not answer this question).

Under the **Public Involvement** heading:

- Nine said they agreed or strongly agreed that they were encouraged to fully participate at the workshop.
- Seven said they agreed or strongly agreed that their expectations at the open house concerning public involvement were met.
- Eleven said they agreed or strongly agreed that they will continue to follow the Part 150 process closely.
- Nine said they agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop was well-structured and staff provided them with the information they needed.

Survey respondents' comments about the *major factors that contributed to the success or shortcoming of the workshop* included:

- It was positive that the open house was held for a longer period of time than previous meetings and that it was in a convenient location.
- The tour was good but would have been better if we could have seen the noise monitors.

- The display maps were finally readable.
- Staff was knowledgeable.
- The material presented was confusing for lay people.
- Several comments that the tour of the airport was outstanding.
- I came to the open house expecting some solutions and there were none; nothing offered for us.
- Current airport management is taking steps to address mismanagement by previous administrations.

Survey respondents' comments about the *how the open house could be designed to work more effectively* included:

- Have summary and full reports available.
- Provide a thumbnail outline to the public.
- Offer better explanations; it's not useful to just know the peak hours of noise.
- Lack of decision makers present.

Survey respondents' *other comments* included:

- The reality is that noise is harming people way outside the study area.
- Need to find more ways to reduce noise impacts, and investigate them to determine cost versus benefit.
- Walked out more angry and confused; the meeting advertising said that information on noise control options would be provided.
- Need a noise fence on the west side of the airport to divert sound from aircraft taking off before they leave the ground.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Workshop Agenda

Appendix B – Flip Chart Notes

APPENDIX A – WORKSHOP AGENDA

**Sea-Tac Airport
Part 150 Study Update
Public Workshop
April 9, 2011**



Welcome to Today's Workshop –

The purpose of today's workshop is to share with you some of the preliminary ideas being considered for noise remedies related to operations at Sea-Tac Airport. We appreciate that you are here!

The Part 150 consultant team and airport staff members are eager to talk with you today. You can ask questions and share your opinions at the following information stations:

- **Introduction to a Part 150** – Learn about the process and the next steps
- **Noise Contours** – See the input data and the resulting noise contours for the Airport
- **Temporary Noise Measurements** – Review the results of the temporary noise monitoring program
- **Noise Abatement Options** – See the options being looked at to reduce noise by changing operating conditions
- **Land Use Mitigation Options** – See the options being looked at for noise remedy programs for people living near the Airport
- **Hush House Analysis** – Get the latest on a potential hush house to reduce noise from engine run-ups
- **Port of Seattle Noise Programs & More**– The Port of Seattle will have a station to answer other questions related to the Airport and to show some of the technology available to you to track aircraft near the Airport

You are also invited to take a tour of the airport. Please sign up for one of the times offered at the sign-in desk.

And – if you want to share any additional comments/questions with the Port, do feel free to leave them at the comments station. A number of Port staff are also on hand today to talk with you directly.

Next Steps?

A Draft Part 150 report, which will include all of the noise modeling information as well as noise remedy measures, will be developed over the next several months. A public hearing on the Draft Part 150 Report will be held in fall, 2011. If you are on the mailing list for the Part 150 process, you will also receive notification of this public hearing.

Again – thank you for spending time at the workshop today. Your opinions are welcomed and highly valued by the Port of Seattle.

APPENDIX B – FLIP CHART NOTES

April 9, 2011 Open House Flip Chart Comments

1. What is the Port's Plan for a 4th Runway and where will it be located?
2. Older A/C with noisiest engines could be given higher minimums over populated areas
3. 312th and 1st Avenue South – Federal Way: Frequent 3-4 a.m. noise (low and loud flights) – one time windows vibrating
4. Turning point – westbound-south (move altitude turn and take it over fewer residents – Commencement Bay – industrial)
5. Why freight in early morning? Oldest and loudest aircraft
6. Federal Way – NE 272nd and I-5 – Very loud planes at night between 11 p.m. and 12:30 am. Extremely loud AM freight plane noise
7. Small commercial aircraft now fly over my house since the 3rd runway was built; pollutes soil, Normandy Park Rd. S and noise
8. Use GPS technology to load center and east runways and to avoid use of west (third) runway
9. London Heathrow handles twice SeaTac's traffic with two runways. Are they just smarter than the Port of Seattle?
10. Include Rainier G&CC but exclude Glen Acres G&CC???
11. In my neighborhood at 12th Ave. S after midnight it seems there is a lot of activity on the third runway. I thought after 10 p.m. noise is supposed to stop. Many nights it is very loud!
12. Yes, Glen Acres is very loud
13. On 5th Ave S at 160th landing noise on the third runway is very loud, especially 9:45 p.m. and later. Early a.m. (6 a.m.) from north landing to south is loud. Our double pane windows have fogged up from vibration.
14. Thanks for a great tour. Clancy and Stan did a great job.
15. Need noise mitigation : at least bedroom insulation out to at least 45-50 DNL (should really be based on single event, not misleading DNL average)
16. When community asked for single event we also meant any level that wakes you up. Site H background noise is not credible (too high). A difference of 10 dB can disturb sleep and raise blood pressure
17. Push FAA ASAP for higher altitude profile descent approach to “coast” into glide step instead of current/legacy high power stairstep approach. (RNP via GPS is similar but requires new technology). Profile descent saves fuel, and cuts noise without expensive land-based retrofit or construction.
18. I am not satisfied – disagree – we are within the contour
19. Our insulation was done several years ago (before the third runway); Port isn't considering anything else – Purchase my house! (We've lived there for 11 years)
20. Air conditioning at my own expense? That is not fair
21. Windows don't help keep out the noise
22. Third runway is destroying the community – businesses closing
23. Use location “C” for a hush house
24. Use location “B” for a hush house
25. What is the estimated cost of real estate acquisition?

26. Building codes should be updated; my house was built in 1999 but windows not insulated enough for the third runway noise. My house right below the third runway is very loud. Port needs to fix building codes
27. Move the airport to a rural area and allow no residential building
28. Concerned about hush house noise, especially the A, B, and C locations for Normandy Park. Fences on 192 act to direct noise into Normandy Park (trees are gone)
29. Noise much louder in Normandy Park so shrinking boundary has zero credibility
30. Noise boundaries need to be single events, especially for people at night