



Seattle-Tacoma International Airport Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update

Technical Review Committee Meeting Report January 19, 2010 1:30 – 4:00

Committee Attendees

Chip Davis
Ron Fincher
JD Hood
Stephen Kiehl
Stacy MacGregor
Cayla Morgan
Sharyn Parker
John Sibold
Al Torrico
Karen Wolf

Port of Seattle Attendees

Michael Carroll
Mary Ann Chamberlin
Tom Fagerstrom
Tom Hooper
Karen Kalanick
Rob Kikillus
Colleen Miller
Steve Rybolt
Marlys St. Laurent
Stan Shepherd
Kym Sullivan
Diane Summerhays
Michelle Taylor

Consultant Team

Rob Adams, Landrum & Brown, Consultant Project Manager
Margaret Norton-Arnold, Norton-Arnold & Company, Facilitator
Fala Frazier, Norton-Arnold & Company, Committee Administrator

Introductions

Diane Summerhays, Director of Community Development at Sea-Tac Airport, welcomed committee members and thanked them for their participation. She reminded those members representing neighbor cities to let the Port know if their city councils could benefit from Part 150 briefings.

Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle Part 150 project manager, introduced himself. He has worked for the airport for about twenty years and was involved with the last Part 150 Study. This is the fourth Part 150 Update for Sea-Tac Airport.

Rob Adams, consultant project manager with Landrum & Brown, specializes in these types of studies and has managed numerous Part 150 Studies, many of them controversial.

Committee introductions included:

Ron Fincher, FAA Seattle District Manager has been peripherally involved in several Part 150 studies, but this is the first time he has been directly involved in a Part 150 Study.

Al Torrico is a Senior Planner with the City of SeaTac and served as a liaison to the Port. This is his first Part 150 Study.

Chip Davis is a Planner with the City of Burien. This is his first Part 150 Study.

John Sibold, Aviation Director for WSDOT, was involved in the Part 150 Study for the Port of Bellingham.

Stacy MacGregor is an Assistant Planner with the City of Tukwila. This is her first Part 150 Study.

Karen Wolf is a Senior Planner for King County, and this is her first Part 150 Study.

Stephen Kiehl, Principal Planner with PSRC, has been working closely with the Port on 3rd runway issues for about 13 years. He wrote the Port of Bellingham's Part 150 Update, and served on the advisory committee for the 2002 Part 150 Update for Sea-Tac.

Cayla Morgan, Environmental Protection Specialist, has worked for the Federal Aviation Administration for the past twenty years. She was involved in the last Part 150 for Sea-Tac, and has been involved with other Part 150 updates for other airports.

Sharyn Parker, Noise Officer with King County Airport, was involved recently with King County Airport's Part 150 Study, and is currently engaged in implementing the results of that study.

JD Hood is a pilot with Horizon Airlines; this is his first Part 150 process.

Presentation of the Part 150 Study Process

Rob Adams provided the Technical Review Committee with an introduction and overview of the Part 150 process. His presentation included background information on airport noise regulations; the elements of the Part 150 Study; a description of the various agencies, parties and their roles associated with the process; and an overview of the public participation program related to the Part 150.

A copy of Rob's presentation was provided to all committee members and is also available on the project website at: www.airportsites.net/sea-part150

Committee Questions and Discussion

Rob had noted that the Federal Airport Noise and Capacity Act **prohibits airports from imposing locally-based restrictions** such as closing runways at specific times of the day. In response to a question, however, Rob said that a few airports – for example, Burbank and John Wayne – do have local restrictions that were in place prior to 1990, and were grandfathered in at those locations.

Group members had questions about the **noise exposure maps**, and wondered if Landrum & Brown might be looking beyond a five year planning horizon. Rob responded that the study would likely be expanded to a ten-year noise exposure/forecast to be used for land use planning purposes only. During the discussion a TRC member wondered about the **FAA's role in the forecast**, and Rob responded that the forecast is submitted to FAA for approval before it is used to guide the remainder of the Part 150 Study.

Rob further noted that, while this Part 150 will certainly include a study of noise impacts from the third runway, **any and all physical changes**, such as new taxiways and holding pads, will also be examined.

A member wondered **how long a Part 150 Study maintained its validity**, and Rob responded that the FAA suggests updating the Part 150 every five years or if significant changes in the operating environment occur.

In response to a question, Rob said that Sea-Tac's Fly Quiet Program is a good example of a measure that has been implemented as part of a **noise compatibility program**.

There was some discussion about "**Next Generation**" technology for aircraft, and for newer landing approaches, etc. that are designed to create less noise impact. Stan responded that Sea-Tac was working on these technologies, but that they were unlikely to be integral to the Part 150 process because they generally do not benefit the 65 DNL. A committee member wondered why Stage 3 aircraft (quieter technology) would still generate peak noise above 65 DNL. Rob responded that

while Stage 3 aircraft are an improvement over older technology, they are not completely silent, and can still be the source of noise impacts.

A group member wondered about **single event analysis** (the impacts of just one plane vs. multiple flights), and Rob responded that the measurement of single events would be a question to the public at the scoping meeting in late February.

Rob's presentation included information on the role of the FAA, the Port of Seattle, the consulting team, and the Technical Review Committee (TRC).

The **TRC will review elements of the Part 150**, providing data to the study, reviewing the analysis, and offering technical feedback on noise mitigation measures. Although it is not a voting body, the comments of the TRC are important to the Part 150, and will be considered very carefully as the plan is being put together. The TRC will meet eight times throughout the course of the study.

The consultant team will be in touch with TRC members soon (especially those who represent surrounding cities) to get comprehensive plans and zoning documents. The Port already has 25 noise monitors in place, and the team will be asking TRC members, as well as the general public, where temporary noise monitors should be placed.

A **robust public participation program** is not only required by Part 150 regulations, but is critical to the overall success of the Part 150. A written public involvement plan will be developed over the next two weeks, and will include public meetings, briefings with small groups, interaction with the Highline Forum, a website, newsletters, and email updates to the general public. Six public meetings are scheduled throughout the Part 150 Study.

In response to a TRC member question, Port staff said that the focus of the advertising for public meetings would be communities within the 65 DNL. The "Air Mail" newsletter is mailed to 33,000 households, an email listserv will be used for notification, advertising will be placed in the *Seattle Times* and *Highline Times*, and elected officials will be notified.

The intent is to conduct the Part 150 Study in as open, transparent, and engaging way as much as possible.

During the discussion, Rob made the point that the noise compatibility program would not pit one neighborhood against another, that is, *we are not going to shift noise from one community to another.*

Technical Review Committee Feedback

The primary discussion question at this first Technical Review Committee meeting was: *What are your recommendations on ways to make this Part 150 process as effective as possible? How do we achieve success?*

TRC members made a number of constructive suggestions:

- It is really difficult to have to explain the constraint about the 65 DNL to the public. It is a very hard pill for the public to swallow, and it seems like such a narrow corridor. You really need to explain it well, and I recommend that you have a larger study area in the background as a companion to the Part 150. Please don't have the "it's not my problem" type of answer when you are trying to define and defend this with the public.
- The Port has a very good story to tell about its noise mitigation program. The public does not have a lot of awareness about this, for example, the effectiveness of the Fly Quiet program and the millions of dollars spent on noise insulation. You need to get this information out. Perhaps you could describe the Port of Seattle in comparison with other airports around the country, and share information about the programs you have put in place.
- Be very clear at the outset of the study what you can and cannot do. Describe the "box" that we live in, for example, we can't just decide to close down the airport. It's really important to manage expectations in this type of process – get that framework established early. *Here's what we can do given the data, the timeframe, and the money available.*
- Use the public participation program to provide the public with an education. How do air traffic controllers operate, for example? Provide the bigger picture.
- A lot of valuable information was provided in today's presentation. This same information should be provided to the public in a quick and concise manner.
- Recognize in the public process that there will be a great deal of anger about the 3rd runway. It will be important to try to separate this from the Part 150. You do need to recognize that many of the issues that will be raised are outside the 65 DNL.
- You'll need to set a firm tone and groundrules at the very first public meeting.

- Don't look beyond a 5-year framework. Too much can change in that time. For example, King County drew boundaries based on more than five years. Everything changed due to the bad economy, and now that airport has a boundary that doesn't make any sense. Deal with the realities of the next five years.
- In the noise remedy program, don't distinguish between a rental unit and a home or condo. We should be treating everyone equally – why should apartment dwellers be worse off because they can't replace their windows?

Next Steps

The first public workshop on the Part 150 is scheduled for February 24. TRC members will be receiving information about that meeting, as well as the detailed public participation plan that will be in place throughout the study. TRC members are strongly encouraged to attend the workshop. The website will also be activated soon.

The next meeting of the Technical Review Committee will be held in mid-April; specific date to be announced.