

APPENDIX E PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Hearing was held concurrently with the fifth Public Workshop on May 15, 2013, at Cedarhurst Elementary from 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M., to satisfy the requirement for a Public Hearing as specified in 14 CFR 150.23(e)(7). Interested citizens were encouraged to attend and to testify or provide written comments at the Public Hearing on the Draft Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study. A court reporter was available to record oral comments and comment forms were also provided. A transcript of the oral testimony and the written comments received at the Public Hearing is included in this Final Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study document and will be on file at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Mountain-West Region Airports Division Office. Public comments on the Part 150 Study were accepted at the Public Hearing and in writing through May 30, 2013. Responses to comments received during this public comment period are included in Appendix O.

Copies of the Draft *Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study* document were located in the locations listed below and newspaper notices were published announcing the availability of the document for review and comment prior to the Public Hearing.

Locations for Draft Part 150 Document Review	
Boulevard Park Library 12015 Roseberg Avenue South Seattle, WA 98168	Seattle Public Library (Main Branch) 1000 4th Avenue Seattle, WA 98104
Burien Library 400 Southwest 152nd Street Burien, WA 98166	South Park Library 8604 8th Avenue South Seattle, WA 98108
Des Moines Library 21620 11th Avenue South Des Moines, WA 98198	Valley View Library 17850 Military Road South SeaTac, WA 98188
Federal Way Regional Library 34200 1st Way South Federal Way, WA 98003	Vashon Library (temporary location) 17707 100th Avenue SW Vashon Island, WA 98070
Foster Library 4060 South 144th Street Tukwila, WA 98168	White Center Library 11220 16th Avenue Southwest Seattle, WA 98146
Kent Library 212 2nd Avenue North Kent, WA 98032	Woodmont Library 26809 Pacific Highway South Des Moines, WA 98198
Port of Seattle Headquarters Pier 69 2711 Alaskan Way Seattle, WA 98121	Seattle-Tacoma International Airport Mezzanine Level 17801 International Blvd. Seattle, WA 98158
Federal Aviation Administration Seattle Airports District Office 1601 Lind Avenue, S.W., Suite 250 Renton, WA 98057	Seattle-Tacoma International Airport Part 150 Study Website: http://www.airportsites.net/SEA-part150/draft.htm

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Public Hearing
May 15, 2013**

Speaker Registration
Public Hearing Transcript
Comments (see Appendix O for Response to Comments)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Sea-Tac Part 150 Update
Public Hearing
6:00-8:00 p.m., May 15, 2013

SPEAKER REGISTRATION SHEET - PLEASE PRINT

	Name	Address	Phone Number	E-Mail Address
1	ANTHONY CURRAN	21222 14TH AVE ^{WA} SO DES MOINES 98198	206-280-3969	
2	Kathy Hept	168 SW 20th St + NP WA	206 948 7478	
3	DALE RILEY	13426 4TH AVE S.W	206 246 2112	
4	TANICE STEWART	13604 12TH AVE S Burien	206-243-6998	DATAN STEWART@MSN.COM
5	MRS ANICHA DO	12824 12TH AVE S. Burien	206-243 1683	
6	Jim Jolumbe	22806 13TH AVE S DES MOINES ^{WA}	206 878 8920	
7	MARIANNE MARKKANEN	20613 12TH AVE So SEATAC	206-824-6822	mmarkkanen@comcast.net
8	Green Cx Bickel	27024 13TH AVE So DES MOINES	(253) 508-3645	tab.hey@hotmail.com
9	BRETT FISH	19236-35TH AVES. SEATAC, 98188	206 878-0807	
10	Liz Shuman	1138 S. 224th St Des Moines	206-824-5375	
11	JOHN OCTOIA	1230-S. 207th St. Sea-Tac	206-414-2378	HISTENGATES@AOL.COM
12	MARVYN WAHLSTROM	19233 7TH PL S, DES MOINES	206-824-2927	
13	Ronald Tamell Wilms	22300 7th St, 110th Ave, Burien, WA 98148	206-857-8986	-
14	Ben Jon Cortese	520 S. 150th St Burien WA.	206-241-0915	pj@burienfm.org
15	Kerry Tinker	17934 1st Pl SW	206-243-1724	KerryTinker@gmail.com
16	Mary Jane Andersen	13005 7th Ave S Burien	206-241-6671	
17				
18				
19				
20				

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

21 THE CITY OF SEATAC'S ^{FIRST} MAYOR FRANK HANSEN & GINA MARIE LUNDSEY
MADE A DEAL / AGREEMENT TO NOT SITE A "GRE" GROUND
RUNUP EXCLOSURE AT PROPOSED SITE "A". KEEP YOUR
PROMISES TO THE CITY OF SEATAC. !! THE CITY
KEPT ITS PROMISES NOT TO FIGHT THE THIRD RUNWAY
IN EXCHANGE! ASK GINA MARIE ←

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: BRETT FISH
Address: 19236-35TH AVE. S.
SEATAC, WA, 98188

Fax: 513.530.2201

Email: SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEAp150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

b.1 Am very disappointed THAT There WAS NO public hearing to night. This WAS A show and Tell, no ability to hear comments from my neighbors.

1.1 I live below third runway noise esp AT night right before 10:00pm my television has to be turned up so I can hear anything.

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: MARIANNE MARKKANEN
Address: 20613 12th Ave SO
Seattle, WA 98198

Fax: 513.530.2201
Email: SEAp150comments@landrum-brown.com

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

THE GARE PROPOSAL CALLS FOR A OPTION
TO FACE THE FACILITY TO THE WEST OR
SOUTH, WHY IS THE WEST DIRECTION
2.2 EVEN ON THE TABLE AS THAT IS WHERE
THERE ARE MORE RESIDENTS, IT WOULD SEEM
TO ME THAT THE ONLY OPTION SHOULD
BE TO THE SOUTH SINCE YOU HAVE TO GO
MUCH FARTHER TO FIND RESIDENTS TO BE
EFFECTED

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: MARLYN R. WAHLSTROM
Address: 19233 7TH PL S.
DES MOINES, WA
206-824-2927

Fax: 513.530.2201
Email: SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

3.1

Exhibit 6-1 shows/implies the remedy
boundary shrinking. It should stay
the same since air traffic will
increase, not decrease.

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: _____

Address: _____

Fax: 513.530.2201

Email: SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com

COMMENT FORM

PUBLIC HEARING

SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

PART 150 STUDY UPDATE

May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEAp150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

1.2 I am very distressed about the increase in flight traffic over and near my home. The increase started around Christmas and is now nearly unbearable. There are many nights when sleep is impossible as traffic starts between 9 & 10 pm and continues WITHOUT interruption all night. The jets are very loud and seem to be echoing off the water & hillsides of the ^{project} sound, often the jets seem to be passing nearly over our roof-tops. This new development is terrible! I can't sleep, I have increased anxiety and panic attacks, and I no longer have peaceful quiet at my water-front view home. I am also concerned about the huge fall in value of my home now that we are under a flight path.

7.1 Submit comments to: ~~My home is being ruined~~ I'm angry. Why did you do this flight path change?!

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: _____
Address: Cynthia Linden
15218 26th Ave SW
Burien, WA 98146

COMMENT FORM

PUBLIC HEARING

SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

PART 150 STUDY UPDATE

May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

3.2 I understand boundaries but the pilots disregard them. I live in an area that is considered not to be noisy the home insulation project ended on the east side of 12th S. I live on 9th Ave So. I should not have airplanes flying over my house practically ready to land in the school field between me and 12th So. no trees etc to help with the noise either. I also get fuel dumped on us as well and if you hang clothes outside to dry they get coated with black soot of fuel.

5.1 If we live in a quiet zone why are we being awoken in the early AM with noise from planes.

1.1 Submit comments to: Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: BQ Durante
Address: 10254 9th Ave So
Seattle 98168

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEAp150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

3.3 Just bought my home it was a banked own
And I've notice some houses near by
mine have doublel panel windows.
I want to know if there's a program
to get I have old windows you can
hear airplanes 24/7

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: Yvette Garcia
Address: 17005 Des Moines Memorial Dr
Burien WA 98148

Fax: 513.530.2201
Email: SEAp150comments@landrum-brown.com

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

3.4

CAN AIR CONDITIONING BE INSTALLED TO
HELP OUT DURING WARM DAYS/NITES BECAUSE
EVEN WITH SOUND PACKAGE IF WE OPEN WINDOWS
ITS THEN USELESS AND WE DESERVE TO LIVE
IN (SEMI) COMFORT LIKE ANYONE ELSE JUST BEING ABLE
TO OPEN WINDOWS WHEN ITS HOT OR AC WOULD BE
BEST SOLUTION FOR THE NOISE.

7.2

noise even bothers my dogs ears at times
need to get rid of the old plane's
hurts the ears

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name:

RICHARD ENGEL

Address:

11043 14th AVE. S.

SEA, WA. 98168

Fax: 513.530.2201

Email: SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

3.5 What is the Point to these Meetings? If a house was constructed
in 1954, is within the existing boundary, and a new boundary isn't
proposed to go into effect until 2018, which the house appears
to have the original windows why would the Port not
still be eligible for the next 5 years to have sound reduction
windows & insulation installed regardless of who owned the
home. Again, ~~the~~ my home IS within a current boundary
& is going to remain within the boundary for the next 5
years -

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: Brett Davis
Address: 18703 36th Ave. S.
Seattle, WA 98188

Fax: 513.530.2201

Email: SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

3.6 I am interested in the Voluntary buyout program
for residential/mobile homes on private land within
the boundary. My property is next to a Park N Fly Lot
with 463 cars. It was also changed from Residential
to Commercial and my property has decreased so low
that I can't afford to move or sell. I moved on this
land in the 1970's. Since then I am between Runway
7.2 2 + 3 and me, my roommate, my cat are deaf & my dogs
seem to be losing their hearing. When they put in the
2nd runway - the port bought up to 128th Street - we are
1.3 so screwed - we can't use our back porch, can't enjoy the
outdoor. I have been coming to the meetings for years & nothing
has ever happened. Why do we waste our time.

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: Nelody Chresman
Address: 1405 S 128th St
Seattle, WA 98168

Fax: 513.530.2201

Email: SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

- 1.2 Though airplanes have over the years become much quieter, there are still occasions when some fly too low with too much noise.
- The bad offenders are the supertankers from Alaska during the hours of the night, disturbing working people's sleep.
- 1.1 Several late offenders come to mind: on May 8th 2013, a plane flew so low and loud above the Des Moines Academy Ctr. at 12:25 p.m. shaking the building. A moment later a second plane coming over did the same. Then today at 12:58 p.m. a very similar case happened here. The plane came in too low and too loud.

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: Lewell & Remade Wines
Address: 22300 7th S, #110
Des Moines, WA 98198

Fax: 513.530.2201

Email: SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com

PORT OF SEATTLE

SEA-TAC AIRPORT

PART 150 NOISE STUDY

OPEN HOUSE AND PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC COMMENTS

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2013

6:00 P.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

Cedarhurst Elementary School
611 S. 132nd Street
Burien, Washington 98168

MARY ANN PENNINGTON, CVR, CCR 3016

1		
2	PUBLIC COMMENT SPEAKERS	
3		PAGE
4	ANTHONY CURRAN	6
5	KATHY HOPT	7
6	DALE RILEY	9
7	JANICE STEWART	10
8	CARMEN RODRIGUEZ	12
9	JIM JOLLIMORE	14
10	MARIANNE MARKKANEN	16
11	TRACY BJORK	18
12	BRETT FISH	20
13	LIZ INMAN	21
14	JOHN OCHOA	23
15	MARLYN WAHLSTROM	25
16	RENATE WINES	27
17	LOWELL WINES	28
18	REVEREND JON CORTESE	29
19	KERRY TINKER	30
20	MARY JANE ANDERSON	32
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PUBLIC HEARING INTRODUCTION

2 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: My name is Margaret
3 Norton-Arnold. I'm not with the Port of Seattle. I'm an
4 independent facilitator, so I don't work for the airport. I'm
5 the hearing officer for tonight's public hearing. I would like
6 to welcome you to the public hearing for the Draft Part 150
7 Noise Compatibility Study and State Environmental Policy Act
8 Determination at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. That
9 was a lot of words to try to get out.

10 The Port of Seattle is providing citizens an
11 opportunity to comment on the Draft Part 150 Noise
12 Compatibility Study and the SEPA Determination. All of the
13 comments along with the prepared responses will be included in
14 the official public record on the final Part 150 Noise
15 Compatibility Study document.

16 In addition to making oral comments at the hearing
17 tonight, written comments will also be accepted through May 30,
18 2013, when the official comment period will be closed. Comment
19 forms are located at tables in the workshop room. If you wish
20 to complete the form at home or want to send a letter, the
21 mailing address is provided on the comment form.

22 Now let me read to you the process for tonight's
23 proceedings. We will listen to each and every speaker, and the
24 hearing will remain open until everyone who has registered to
25 speak has had the opportunity to do so. In keeping with the

1 hearing protocol, each speaker will be allocated up to three
2 minutes. Speakers desiring more time may register to speak
3 again and will be given another opportunity after all of the
4 registered speakers have had the chance.

5 To help you keep track of your time, Fala is here
6 with a three-minute -- actually an amazing app on her cell
7 phone that is like a stopwatch.

8 MS. FRAZIER: And it was free.

9 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: And when you have a
10 full three minutes, she'll flash a green card to let you know
11 that it's time to go. When you get to a minute and a half,
12 she'll flash up this yellow card, kind of a little caution
13 sign. And when the three minutes is up, she'll flash up the
14 red card to let you know that it's time to stop.

15 The order of the people who will speak tonight, I
16 will call on you in the order in which you've signed up. And
17 I'd also like to state that we don't mean any disrespect, but
18 we will cut off after the allocated time after the three
19 minutes has been spent. Guests can sign up right here.

20 PUBLIC SPEAKER: So our sign up out here
21 isn't part of that?

22 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: No. Sign up again to
23 speak.

24 PUBLIC SPEAKER: How about I sent in an
25 e-mail, and they sent me back a notice that they'd gotten it,

1 does that count?

2 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: That counts. That's a
3 part of the comments, yes.

4 PUBLIC SPEAKER: So that's already in
5 there?

6 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Yes, it's already in
7 here. If you want to comment in this room, sign up on this
8 sheet. You can make any comments you wish on the Draft Part
9 150 Study and the environmental process.

10 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I guess I'm still in shock
11 that there's no formal presentation tonight.

12 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Yes. It's a different
13 format than we've had in the past. This is true.

14 Now, when you come up to speak, we have a court
15 reporter here, and the first thing to do is to give her your
16 name and address so she can get that down correctly. And
17 you're invited to sit in this chair. If you want to stand, you
18 can stand up. You can do whatever you like. We just didn't
19 want to make it so uncomfortable that people felt like they had
20 to speak to the whole gymnasium. So you can sit in the chair
21 if you like to talk to the court reporter.

22 And so far, I have two people who have signed up and
23 I see that more are signing up. So let's start with Anthony
24 Curran. Anthony, if you'll give us your full name and address
25 and then go ahead with your remarks.

1

2

PUBLIC COMMENTS

3

4

ANTHONY CURRAN: Anthony Thomas Curran.

5

Address is 21222-14th Avenue South, Des Moines, Washington

6

98198.

7

My comment is in regards to the proposal is

8

currently 78 percent of the aircraft take off to the south and

9

arrive from the south. The proposed 2018 65, if you look at

10

the geographical current buyout right now, to the north it goes

11

to roughly 146th, which does not -- is not equal to the land

12

that's been purchased, residential land that's been purchased

13

to the south that could be used for commercial property. It's

14

just not equal, and you have more planes arriving and departing

15

to the south than you do to the north with more property being

16

purchased at the north end of the airport than there is to the

17

south. And the streets that I'm affected is 13th, 14th, and

18

15th off of 216th.

19

And that's all I have to comment today. Thank you.

20

MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Kathy Hopf.

21

22

23

24

25

3.6

1 KATHY HOPF: H-O-P-F. Henry, Oscar, Paul,
2 Frank. Kathy with a K and a Y. My address is 168 Southwest
3 200th Street. I live in Normandy Park, 98166.

4 My comments are: We're under the Des Moines Five
5 Departure, and there is a considerable amount of noise in the
6 run-up area at the end of the runway. I was requesting more
7 information on the blast screens, which apparently will be
8 useless for our area.

9 Also the aircraft tend to be a little bit lower than
10 the restricted amount of height they're supposed to be. If we
11 are in the swimming pool, we can see them put their wheels back
12 up into the aircraft, which is a bit lower than it should be.

13 My other comments are: I used to live in an
14 apartment at the northeast end of the runway years ago, and
15 that's when the FedEx freighters used to do their run-ups
16 there. My landlady was kind enough to take advantage of the
17 insulation and window program, which helped. But the major
18 impact for us was when they put the blast screens up. That's
19 why I was hoping they were going to have them here at the south
20 end.

21 I understand with Part 150 there is eminent domain
22 and that the increase in the traffic is just going to continue.
23 I was hoping there might be something for seniors who have lost
24 value in their homes at our end of the runway and in the Des
25 Moines area as well. I don't see anything like that mentioned

1 in here.

2 I do see that someone has mentioned about the noise
3 limitations that other airports are using, particularly like
4 Long Beach, California. I realize that Long Beach is not an
5 international airport, but their restrictions are well enough
6 that the residents there do not feel the impact that we are
7 feeling. I would like to see something like that looked into a
8 bit more.

9 And I'm sure in the years to come there'll be other
10 technologies that may be able to help the run-up noise at the
11 end of the runway. I'm hoping that it will happen that they
12 continue to look into the new technologies that would assist us
13 and not just cut it off with the funding that they have right
14 now.

15 I don't really want the buyout program because I
16 like where I live, but I would like to see it where I could
17 live there comfortably like I did when I first moved in 12
18 years ago.

19 And that's pretty much the end of my comment. How
20 much time did I have left?

21 MS. FRAZIER: 45 seconds.

22 KATHY HOPF: I did pretty good.

23 MS. FRAZIER: You did good.

24 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Dale Riley.

25

1 DALE RILEY: My name is Dale Riley, and I
2 live at 13426 Fourth Avenue Southwest.

3 And my problem is with the noise. My house is
4 facing -- or my patio doors are facing the east. And when I
5 have those open and I hear the airplane noise coming by, if
6 we're holding a conversation, we can't hear each other talk.
7 Or if I have the TV on, I can't hear the TV. So I have to go
8 over and shut the patio doors to reduce the noise.

9 I went -- I called and made an appointment this week
10 to have the energy company to come out, Puget Sound Energy.
11 They came out and looked at the windows and gave me an estimate
12 on how I could reduce the noise of the windows. And I came
13 today -- I got this in the mail, and I came today to look and
14 see what the barriers were, where the lines were drawn. And so
15 I guess it stops on this side of 509, and I'm on Fourth Avenue
16 Southwest, which is on the other side of First Avenue. So I'm
17 not even in that area. But I don't know.

18 All I'm doing is coming to complain about the noise
19 that I'm having and to try to get some type of help. So I
20 think that's about it. Just trying to get the noise reduced
21 within my house.

22 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Thank you.

23 Janice Stewart.
24
25

1.4

1 JANICE STEWART: Is it okay if I read what
2 I e-mailed in?

3 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Yes. Yes, that's fine.

4 JANICE STEWART: Start? My name is Janice
5 Stewart, and I live on the corner of 12th and 136th South.

6 The following is my comment: When the issue of the
7 third runway first came up and someone did a study, they came
8 back and said it would not be feasible to build a runway there
9 because of the lay of the land. We are much higher than the
10 land in front of the first two runways on the north side of the
11 airport. But you went through with it anyway. Myself and my
12 neighbors felt that you would then come in and buy us out up to
13 128th like you did with the first and second runways.

14 Do you realize how low they fly over us? It's
15 incredible, and the turbulence breaks off the tops of the
16 trees. And if you are outside, it is scary. Someone will be
17 hurt one day. Also, the fuel that sometimes gets dropped is so
18 strong and I wonder what it's doing to our health.

19 I know what you are thinking: Why didn't you sell
20 out? My husband was ill, and I was a full-time caregiver and
21 didn't want to upset him. So he's gone, so now I sit here and
22 would like to sell my home, but both you and I know that no one
23 would want it. I joke sometimes that the pilots say, "Oh,
24 there's the Stewart chimney. Head straight for it."

25 Also, why haven't you come back with the offer to

3.13 1 pay the difference of what we could sell our homes for in
2 another area away from the airport? You had that program
3 before.

6.2 4 I've been to many meetings and felt like no one
5 cares at all about any of us. It's frustrating. I plan on
6 being at this last so-called meeting, and I hope I get some
7 answers from you.

8 Thank you.

9 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Thanks, Janice.

10 JANICE STEWART: So what happens now? Will
11 we hear back?

12 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Everything that gets
13 recorded tonight will all go into part of the record that then
14 gets submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration along
15 with the Draft Part 150 Study.

16 JANICE STEWART: But will we personally get
17 an answer back?

18 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: I don't know, but I'll
19 check for you. I don't know if they're responding to everyone
20 individually or how that will work, but I'll double-check.
21 We've got one more person commenting right now, and then I'll
22 go check for you, Janice.

23

24

25

1 CARMEN RODRIQUEZ: Hi. We were thinking
2 that we are going to find, you know, a solution for this
3 because we've been --

4 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Could you start by
5 giving us your name and address?

6 CARMEN RODRIQUEZ: Yes.

7 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: And then you've got
8 three minutes. Fala will hold up the green card when you have
9 a full three minutes, yellow card when you're at a minute and a
10 half, and a red card when your time is up. But start by giving
11 us your name.

12 CARMEN RODRIQUEZ: Carmen R. Rodriguez.
13 The address too? 12824-12th Avenue South at Seattle.

14 And I'm here because I've been there since '76, and
15 we got old there. And at night we cannot see TV because that
16 noise, very loud noise. And it starts at 9:00, an hour when we
17 want to watch TV. So we thought we're going to have a solution
18 tonight, but they say, no, they're not going to buy out. But
19 we would like to move, sell and move, because it's bad. It's
20 bad there.

21 And now they rent houses with a lot of rooms, and we
22 have to pay for the parking there that they have to park. And
23 our cars are in the back. And I've been fighting so they won't
24 park there, but that's the solution that we have to live with.

25 But I would like out because I have -- I just had a

3.6 1 stroke in November and my husband has dementia. So there's no
2 point for us to be there. So hopefully the airport will buy us
3 one day.

4 What do you think? No?

5 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Yeah, I'm not sure what
6 the actual -- where the boundaries are that they've set up, but
7 did you ask about that out there?

8 CARMEN RODRIQUEZ: Yeah. But they said no,
9 not yet. Yeah, uh-huh. That's why we came to the meeting
10 because I thought we will have good news, but no.

11 Thank you very much.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 JIM JOLLIMORE: My name is Jim Jollimore.
2 The last name is spelled J-O-L-L-I-M-O-R-E.

3 And I'd like to comment on the new 2013 noise
4 boundaries. And it's my feeling that the homes that are
5 sandwiched between any of the three runways, either the first
6 and the second or the second and the third, all those homes
7 should be included in the 65 DNL zone to the southern or
8 northernmost extent of the noise boundaries. That is that the
9 noise boundary should be more or less square on either end
10 instead of contoured into an arrowhead shape at the end of the
11 runway.

12 And the reason I say that is some of the areas
13 within those boundaries are -- have a lot of contour and are
14 fairly high. And so, consequently, they suffer an inordinate
15 amount of airport noise. And so therefore I think those people
16 should be given consideration.

17 If you're sandwiched in between any of the runways,
18 I think you should be included in the noise program. And
19 that's about all I have to say about it. I thank you for the
20 study.

21 I think -- I think we could have used a lot more
22 on-the-ground type coming out and looking at individual
23 situations and maybe actually experiencing some of the noise
24 firsthand. I think there's been a lot of formulas and figures
25 thrown around, and they look great on paper. But when you

6.3

1 really get out there and watch the airplanes go overhead and
2 listen to the noise, it's a little bit different situation
3 actually on the ground than sitting in an office figuring out
4 something on a formula.

5 Okay. Well, thank you. That's all I have to say.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 MARIANNE MARKKANEN: My name is Marianne
2 Markkanen, and I live at 20613-12th Avenue South.

3 I'm here tonight because I feel that the noise study
4 needs to hear from citizens. I live under the third runway.
5 It's affecting my life greatly, my sleep at night. Usually,
6 after midnight, even though they say that there's no airplane
7 noise after a certain time, like 10:00, there is often airplane
8 noise in the middle of the night. And I understand that.
9 Nothing's perfect.

10 But planes come so low. In the summertime,
11 especially when the other two runways were being refurbished,
12 which I think was last summer, I couldn't even use my patio the
13 noise was so bad. If I sat out there with people, we couldn't
14 hear each other talk. The planes come that low.

15 And when I bought the property, I knew I was in the
16 range of runways, but I really had no idea about the third
17 runway. And until you've really lived below a runway, it's
18 hard to really understand the impact to your life, let alone
19 the air that we're breathing in the neighborhood.

20 So the properties on my street do not sell. My
21 house has gone down in value. And that's what I'm here tonight
22 to see what the game plan is for this area because it's just
23 not right. Something needs to be done.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Thank you.

1 Can you spell your last name for us, Marianne?

2 MARIANNE MARKKANEN: M-A-R-K-K-A-N-E-N.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 TRACY BJORK: My name is Tracy Bjork, and
2 I'm at 27024-13th Avenue South in Des Moines, Washington.

3 We're about three blocks off of where the original
4 noise abatement boundaries were. But what I'm disappointed in
5 is here the facility has grown, you know, one runway bigger
6 with more air traffic, yet they've shrunk the noise abatement
7 boundaries into where -- you know, it's -- I understand the
8 technology and stuff, but I think we're going to end up with
9 more air traffic.

10 And I think it's going to be just as loud, and I
11 believe it is. Instead of having airplanes just in the back of
12 our yard and over our house, we've got them in the front of our
13 yard and, you know, in the back and then overhead too. So
14 we've got that much more traffic going over.

15 And we've got two coming in at the same time
16 sometimes. And you can't have your windows open because you've
17 got noise coming from all sides of the house. Where it was,
18 you could have the front windows open.

19 It's just I think that it's an encroachment from the
20 Port onto our properties flying airplanes, you know, at like a
21 thousand feet above our house where it wasn't there and there's
22 no compensation for it. I feel as though, you know, we haven't
23 been properly compensated.

24 And they did have a noise abatement just three
25 blocks over, 16th and -- actually, it went farther back than

1 272nd. It went back as far as, probably, 280th. I don't know.

2 I'm not sure what the streets are.

3 But they closed them in to like 240th or 245th or
4 something is what they're at now. And instead of expanding on
5 the west side, they shrunk it. Shrunk it down. So I'm
6 thinking I don't see justification for them shrinking it when
7 it could have, you know, easily been justifiable to expand it a
8 little bit to the west. And that's where I'm at.

9 So that's my little 2 cents. That's it. Either
10 way, I don't care too much, you know. I'll live either way,
11 but I just don't see the justification how they came up with
12 less noise when I think there's actually more.

13 Okay. Thank you guys.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 BRETT FISH: My name is Brett Fish.

2 B-R-E-T-T, F-I-S-H.

3 The City of SeaTac's first mayor, Frank Hansen, and
4 Gina Marie Lindsey made a deal, agreement, to not site a GRE,
5 ground run-up enclosure, at the proposed Site A. Keep your
6 promises to the City of SeaTac. The City kept its promises not
7 to fight the third runway in exchange. Ask Gina Marie.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2.1

1 LIZ INMAN: My name is Liz Inman,
2 I-N-M-A-N, and I live in Des Moines, Washington on 224th
3 Street.

4 And the airplanes with the third runway go directly
5 over our home, and they're very loud. They start sometimes at
6 3:30 in the morning. I have documentation. And they go
7 sometimes every two minutes, and they shake the house. I have
8 cracks. I have -- I called it fuel spills, but the gentleman
9 with the Port decided it was exhaust, maybe exhaust fumes,
10 because it's black-looking.

11 Anyway, I have -- my home is a 1993 home. Everyone
12 around me has the Port package where you get the new windows,
13 insulation, et cetera. And I've called several times and
14 e-mailed to try and get the new package, noise, and they've
15 told me from the Port that my home is too new. So I'd wait a
16 few years thinking, Oh, it's getting older. I'll call them or
17 e-mail them again. Still the same answer.

18 Finally, the last correspondence I got is saying,
19 You need to talk to the City of Des Moines because they had
20 codes back, like I think 1986, that your house should be in
21 code with the airport. Well, that may be true then, and they
22 are nice windows I have. But the third runway was not going
23 over my house when it was built. And I'm sure it was to code
24 then.

25 But the problem is now. The environment, the noise,

1 the airplanes, et cetera, is really making -- plus it has
2 depreciated our home immensely because of the airplanes. So I
3 am supposed to be out of luck, but I am in the flight path. We
4 decided that. But out of luck as in my home is too new and it
5 should be to code.

6 Well, I've seen some of the people with this noise
7 package around me, and they have triple-pane windows. Mine are
8 just double. And they have double sliding doors. They get the
9 insulation, but they won't come over and even look at my home
10 to see where -- you know, how noisy it is.

11 So I'm very upset and feel I deserve this package.
12 The end.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

3.2

1 JOHN OCHOA: My name is John Ochoa. First
2 name is John, J-O-H-N. Last name is Ochoa, O-C-H-O-A.

3 And I came here expecting something a little bit
4 different, which there would be speakers at the front and the
5 public seated so that they could make comments to the speakers
6 at the podium. But anyway, I, for one, was a little bit
7 disappointed.

8 But anyway, I only want to comment that in looking
9 at the information that is provided by the Port of Seattle, I
10 still find it -- let me see, what's the right word -- to the
11 benefit of the Port of Seattle rather than to the residents in
12 the community. This affects not only the residents of Burien,
13 the City of SeaTac, and the City of Des Moines.

14 It's known through the newspaper media that the last
15 litigation that was put forth by the cities, which was Des
16 Moines, SeaTac, and Burien, the attorneys were in litigation
17 with the Port of Seattle and they actually dropped the
18 litigation because they ran out of monies for the attorneys.

19 I have also an old Des Moines news clipping dated
20 1992 and the notation here is: "Airport Called Health Disaster
21 for Community." This was done by the Highline Community
22 Hospital doctors, and it was presented to the Port of Seattle
23 commission. And it shows that the residents in certain
24 boundaries near the city, the Port of Seattle, as far as the
25 runways, it shows that the health of the community or the

5.2

1 residents are at risk. And the Port has so much influence that
2 it is like a strong-arm, and it can pretty much do what it
3 wants to do without too much resistance from the communities as
4 far as not going forward and following up on programs to
5 safeguard the health of the residents in the area.

6 So that's pretty much all I have to say at this
7 point. Thank you.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 MARLYN WAHLSTROM: I have two thoughts. In
2 looking at the hush house plan --

3 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: First, will you give us
4 your name and address?

5 MARLYN WAHLSTROM: My name is Marlyn
6 Wahlstrom. I live at 19233 Seventh Place South in Des Moines.
7 And just a little bit southwest of the Prince of Peace Church
8 out there on 192nd.

9 On the hush house design, I noticed they were
10 considering two exposures, one to the south and one to the
11 west. It doesn't make any sense to me why they would even
12 consider doing it to the west because that's where people live.
13 If they push it south, you've got all kinds of land out there
14 they've already purchased for the runway. So my concern is why
15 even think about pointing it toward where people are living
16 right now instead of all that open land they've already got to
17 the south of the runway. That doesn't make any sense to me why
18 they should do that. It should be an option on the thing right
19 now, anyway.

20 Number two, when they did the Part Study that's now
21 a noise study, they had sound collection equipment placed, part
22 of it, near the church there on 192nd and Eighth Avenue South.
23 However, when they put the data in, they didn't use any of that
24 temporary data coming out of there. They used only the old
25 sites they had when they did their previous study back in 1985.

2.2

6.5

6.5
1 They made no attempt to put noise -- noise recording studies
2 anyway near that third runway in order to take up the impact of
3 what that is. And the sites under which they picked up the
4 noise were so sparse that I don't know how they get that data.
5 They didn't make any attempt to --

6 Well, they put temporary sites up and ignored the
7 data. I don't think that's good engineering. I don't think
8 that's good sound, you know -- it's a flawed -- it's a flawed
9 process, if they don't come out there and make an attempt to
10 measure what impact that third runway has on anybody. All they
11 did was measure from the previous sites. It's a way to do it,
12 but it doesn't support, you know, good science nor good
13 engineering, period.

14 That's all. Thank you for listening.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 RENATE WINES: I'm on a limit too. I'm a
2 recent four-times cancer patient, so I don't have much time. I
3 just want to bring two particular things to your attention.

4 We're Mr. and Mrs. Lowell and Renate Wines, 22300
5 Seventh South, Des Moines, Washington 98198. Phone
6 206-851-8186.

7 And I would like to just bring two incidents to your
8 attention although we have a long history of things with the
9 Port, but just the recent. On May 8th at about 12:25, we were
10 in the Des Moines Activity Center. We were having lunch there.
11 And that is about 216th and 22nd, I believe the address. And
12 at 12:25 p.m. two overly loud planes flew extremely low over
13 the building, literally shaking the building. First one, and
14 then it was followed by another one.

15 And today, again, at 12:58 p.m. over the same
16 building an overly loud plane, very low, very noisy, shook the
17 building. We were in the company of a retired Boeing test
18 pilot and flight test engineer. And he just looked up and he
19 said, "These idiots apparently don't know how to fly planes."

20 So that's a comment I have for today. I don't have
21 any the last few years. I've been fighting a very bad stage 4
22 cancer up to the last five years. We were very active in case
23 meetings. We hosted them for 20 years. We're friends of
24 Brett, Brett Fish.

25

1 LOWELL WINES: Lowell Wines, W-I-N-E-S.

2 And I live -- we have a house at 16226-13th Avenue Southwest,
3 Seattle, Washington 98166.

4 RENATE WINES: That's our home, but we live
5 in Des Moines the last five years while I had cancer.

6 LOWELL WINES: Three minutes. At the time
7 of the discussions about should we or should we not, it came up
8 that the third runway is going to be very expensive, that it
9 will be paid back if all goes well by the fees charged to the
10 airlines for passengers they fly in and out of Sea-Tac.

11 Now that we've had it for all these years, are they
12 on schedule to pay off the bonds or are we in a potential
13 situation where Seattle -- I mean, King County may become
14 obliged to pick up the rest of the cost? And that's it.

15 RENATE WINES: And now we gave two
16 addresses. Our actual home in Burien. I signed as our recent
17 Des Moines home.

18 LOWELL WINES: I'm just keeping us honest.

19 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: We've got your address,
20 and we'll make sure that we note it for the both of you.

21 RENATE WINES: We have both. We still have
22 our home, but because we had serious illness we temporarily
23 spent a few years in Des Moines. But we still have our home,
24 so two addresses. I put our Des Moines address and he gave
25 verbally the other one, other home.

1 REVEREND JON CORTESE: Well, my name is Jon
2 Cortese, and I live at 512 South 150th Street in Burien.

3 And I'm the pastor of the Burien Free Methodist
4 Church, which is at 520 South 150th Street. I live in the
5 parsonage, so it's part of the same property. The house was
6 the benefit of noise reduction work some years ago in the early
7 part of the program. And from previous meetings, I see the
8 churches were to be included in this. The church never was.
9 And now with the recommended boundary change, the church will
10 be outside of the boundary. And I think that's an oversight by
11 the Port.

12 The church has been there much longer than the
13 airport's been there. The church probably predates flight,
14 well over a hundred years. We lost several families with the
15 previous projects. We've endured a lot.

16 But as far as church meetings, we use -- we have
17 meetings every day and evenings. Particularly in the summer,
18 the noise is more than distracting. And I think that if
19 somebody were to take a closer look, they'd find out that
20 there's a situation here that really should be addressed. I
21 think it's an injustice. So I just want to, as a matter of
22 record, request that they take a closer look at the Burien Free
23 Methodist Church's situation.

24 That's it. Thank you.

25

3.8

1 KERRY TINKER: My name is Kerry Tinker,
2 T-I-N-K-E-R.

3 And I'll give my comment about the third runway,
4 about the airport and what the Port of Seattle is doing today.
5 My honest opinion of living in the Sea-Tac Airport for -- I
6 mean, living in the northwest corner of the airport for 33
7 years, I can honestly see that over and over, years and decades
8 of development over and over again with more airlines coming
9 in, it's all about money. It was -- this third runway was not
10 about fog.

11 Flyers were sent out in '99 to tell us about -- to
12 tell everybody about how they were offering, were willing to
13 give you a home for the same price of your home, and we'll give
14 you something just as good. And they wanted it so bad. But it
15 wasn't because they needed it because of the fog. It was
16 because they needed it for the business. It was all about
17 money. It was not about fog.

18 And they also promised us -- trying to tell
19 everybody that the runways were going to be built on 12th
20 Avenue. If you look at a map, a satellite map, the runways are
21 actually built on 14th Avenue, on the equivalent to 14th
22 Avenue. At the bottom of the hill is 12th Avenue. The bottom
23 of that runway hill is 12th Avenue.

24 And I think that they could have had a -- the Port
25 of Seattle could have made it much nicer for everybody in

7.6

7.6
2.4
1 Burien as well as in most of Normandy Park and on the north
2 side over here of the airport. They could have made it nicer
3 for everybody. Nobody would be arguing. They had a beautiful
4 Payne Field to make a second runway just like another JFK and
5 their second airlines over there -- second airport over in New
6 York. They could have done the same thing.

7 They just totally have dominated the neighborhoods,
8 the people, the residents, everything for their own good. And
9 they haven't done anything for the benefits of the people.
10 They haven't done anything for the benefits of the people. And
11 now I see, alls I'm seeing the Port of Seattle doing today is
12 making all sorts of excuses and reasons. But if you go through
13 the years, the more we go through the years, you can clearly
14 see that it's all just a bunch of phony excuses.

7.6
15 Thank you.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 MARY JANE ANDERSON: Mary Jane Anderson,
2 S-O-N. I live down here on Seventh Avenue.

3 And I know for years with the old runway they had --
4 Eighth Avenue was the boundary for help to get soundproofing
5 put in the houses. I went ahead and got windows put in my
6 house. It didn't seem to really help that much, especially
7 when the third runway started running. It's very loud.
8 Everything in my house rattles when they're landing and taking
9 off now.

10 I just really feel they need to expand it instead of
11 making a less amount to get that done, soundproofing in the
12 walls. Like I said, I already got windows put in that I paid
13 for myself, but it really didn't help. I've got a triple-pane
14 window in my living room, and it still doesn't help.

15 Ever since the third -- I almost could tell the
16 minute they opened that third runway 'cause when they were
17 landing this direction, it's just very loud in my house. The
18 windows can be closed, the doors closed, and it's just
19 everything rattles. You have to turn the TV up, down, up,
20 down. It's awful.

21 I used to like when they were landing from the north
22 to the south because they were quieter, and it didn't really
23 bother me. But as soon as that third runway opened, there was
24 a big difference because they're letting their jets -- slowing
25 their jets down or whatever to slow the planes down, so it's

3.1

1 very loud over our house. And I just really feel they need to
2 expand it and not decrease their boundaries. Take it out to
3 509, maybe, to be a boundary along 509 on the east side -- or
4 west side.

5 Is that good? Thank you.

6 MS. NORTON-ARNOLD: Your comment will be
7 part of the official record now.

8 [Public comments concluded at 8:00 p.m.]

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

C E R T I F I C A T E

[illegible]

I, Mary Ann Pennington, a Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing public hearing was taken before me at the time and place therein set forth;

That the hearing was recorded by voice recognition by me, and thereafter transcribed under my direction;

That the foregoing transcript is a true record of all the comments made at the time of the hearing, to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am in no way related to any party to this matter, nor do I have any interest in the matter.

Witness my hand and CCR seal this 17th day of
May, 2013.

Mary Ann Pennington, CCR 3016
in and for the State of Washington,
residing at Renton.
My certification expires
July 2nd, 2013.

Part 150

Jeffery Howard [jeffery.w.howard@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, March 09, 2013 11:35 AM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Dear Sir/Ma'am,

[1.] We live west of the Seatac airport in Blakely Manor. As far as I am aware, the third runway has been in continuous use day and night since it opened, not just in bad weather.

Will this situation continue?

Regards,

Jeff Howard

Re: Part 150

Jeffery Howard [jeffery.w.howard@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 1:09 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Dear Sir/Ma'am,

4-15-2013

[17] We live in Blakely Manor which is just west of Des Moines Memorial Drive approximately mid-way of Seatac airport runways. We have looked at the runway usage data and by our own experience have determined that the third runway is in virtually continual usage year-round, day and night, good weather and bad. The notion that the third runway is used primarily during bad weather and daytime operations is erroneous in our opinion. It is quite common to hear arrivals coming on the third runway at 10 and 11 at night one after the other. In addition arrivals on the third runway are fairly noisy because the runway is shorter than the other two and airplanes use their thrust reversers at high power to assist in braking. It seems the FAA is free to use the runways however they want for traffic flow regardless of any noise abatement.

[17] In addition we have looked at the noise remedy boundary and are unable to determine from the diagrams if our home is inside the boundary or not. We have not had any sound insulation added because our home did not qualify during previous noise studies. We do not know if it qualifies now.

[17] Our experience is noise is increasing in our area due to the third runway and not decreasing as been suggested by some of the written material provided by the Port of Seattle. Based on the past runway usage we don't see this situation changing.

Sincerely,

Jeff and Carol Howard
202 S 167th St
Burien, WA 98148
425-301-6649

sea 150 comments**Ron Wilson [ronald392@centurytel.net]****Sent:** Thursday, May 30, 2013 10:54 PM**To:** SEAPart150 Comments

From

Ronald Wilson

21612 161st Ave E

Graham WA 98338

To whom it may concern.

I live 25 miles from the airport and 65 db is not being observed in this location and never has. I live near the Summa 7 departure path. Many times aircraft are over my house and close nearby. Alaska airlines is the biggest culprit, although there are others. The general procedure is low power and rate of climb until just before Orting and then the power comes up and the noise is EXPORTED to the Orting Graham area and beyond.

During clear weather when they can be seen, the power is usually kept down and they look to be at 6-7 thousand feet. When the weather is overcast, it changes to higher power and elevated noise that is greater than 65db and it seems to be higher flow. When this started in 1996, I was told they were over 10 thousand feet. They were lying then and will now. It appears that the FMS system is being used to export this noise. This information is missing from the public sight. Is this legal to cloak this information on power settings, rate of climb and phys!

ical points??

Why are we subjected to greater than 65db that the in city people are afforded ??

As for solutions, keep the power at airport area settings until passing 10,000 ft. Circle the city until passing 10,000 ft and then increase power like San Jose CA used to do and probably still does. Scatter all departures so as to not concentrate the noise. flights start at 7am and cease at midnight. Anchorage Shuts down at midnight, and why can't SEA. Your noise monitors end in federal way., Install a noise monitor past Orting on the summa7 departure and keep the db's at 65db max or give them the fine. End of comment.

Comments on Part 150 Study

Scott Chase [scott.a.chase@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 7:55 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

I just don't understand why the Port of Seattle is treating the City of Federal Way so poorly. Even though all major flights, either arriving or departing SeaTac Airport go right through the residential core of Federal Way, the City of Federal Way was not part of the Port of Seattle's noise study boundary. I've been told that there are no noise sensors installed by the Port in Seattle anywhere in the city limits of Federal Way, even for this study. Also, the Port appears to favor the City of Seattle, weaving jets through the Duamish Waterway and out over Elliot Bay to gain a much higher altitude before they can turn east over Seattle; but the preferred southern route flies jets straight through the residential core of Federal Way to the south, instead of over I-5. Even though my house is already at a 400ft elevation, the Port of Seattle still allows planes at 2000ft above sea-level at my address, which is only 1600ft over my house. There was only one open house for this study held to the north of the airport in Burien, but no open house for this study anywhere to the south of the airport. The preferred southern flight route should be pushed east over I-5, far away from the mass residential core of Federal Way. There should be an extended blackout/curfew at night, from 11pm to 6am, for all louder jets. Takeoffs to the south should be conducted at a steeper rate of climb, as with many other international airports throughout the world, to help reduce the jet noise in more of the outlying residential areas to the south and throughout Federal Way.

Scott Chase

212 SW 327TH PL

Federal Way, WA 98023

Seatac Part 150

Emma Jones [emmaj113@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 7:41 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Mr. Rob Adams,

I have lived in my home for 40 years. Since November 20, 2008 the use of the third runway has destroyed my quality of life. I have begged, screamed, and pleaded with the Port of Seattle to reevaluate the soundproofing that was installed in my home and has never adequately protected against the noise levels (98 decibels). Now with the jets coming within a few hundred feet of my home the sound insulation that was installed over 20 years ago is worthless. I have now contacted the FAA, the Port of Seattle, Governor Gregoire, Senator Patty Murray, Senator Maria Cantwell, and the City of Seatac, in order to request help. The only response I have received was from Governor Gregoire in January of 2009 advising me to hire an attorney. I have since retained counsel.

The noise has made my home uninhabitable. The Port of Seattle has been deceiving the people of this community for decades. It is time someone stands up. My children and my grandchildren say that the sound has completely ruined the experience they once had at their grandmothers house. Living in my home is a torturous environment. No human being should be exposed to this treatment. At this point in my life, as the spouse of a disabled Vietnam veteran and a part time worker at a local business, we do not have the resources to start our lives over. The use of the third runway was conveyed to be used only during inclement weather. This is not the case.

Very Respectfully,
Georgia Filipowicz
20717 13th Ave S.
Seatac, WA 98198

Part 150 study airport noise SEATAC

mark brady [bradymarka@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 7:26 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Study Group,

I live in Federal Way Washington in a non compensated area 9 miles or so from the airport.

The obvious and straightforward solution to noise are to route the planes over I-5 and Pacific Highway particularly on incoming flights.

Also for incoming and outgoing flights, when possible have them do the turn to/from the west before Poverty Bay over the sound instead of Federal Way/ Dash Point.

Of course if you can fly higher over Federal Way that always helps, some planes particularly from foreign airlines and cargo fly way too low.

At night there is far less aircraft and opportunities for more creative approaches and departures, we are sleeping and this would definitely be a quality of life enhancer.

You have some simple options that everyone can see are possible, please use them.

Thank you,

Mark Brady

841 S 315th St
Federal Way
98003

comment on Part 150 study airport noise SEATAC

leah boehm [leahboehm@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 1:14 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

hello,

I live in Federal Way, 10 MILES from the airport. I live in a residential neighborhood with thousands of homes.

The planes fly directly overhead all day long. When they fly over I-5 or Pacific highway the noise is much reduced.

Please have them not "line up" so early, the impact on non compensated individuals is huge.

Thank you,

Leah Boehm
841 S 315th St
Federal Way
98003

FW: Third runway

Douglass, William G [william.g.douglass@boeing.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 1:09 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Well here it is the last day to comment and I finally write to you. I moved into my house at 22814 12th ave. so. in Des Moines in May of 1997. I knew that the third runway was going to be built. The house was not fully insulated and I knew that also. At the time there was still some insulation happening in some areas around the airport I believe. Although there was never anything in writing I was led to believe that it would be possible to receive some late funding for the insulation. Everywhere I turned there was another roadblock and gave up after a few years. There was a reason that the house wasn't fully insulated, the previous owner it seemed, didn't do all that was needed to get the work done. Meanwhile when the third runway is being used for landing from the south, we are BOMBARDED with about 100 decibel noise. I would welcome anyone to try and sleep in these conditions. The ironic thing about the whole situation is that whenever the subject was brought up in the media, the statement was always that the third runway would be primarily used during poor weather and that would be when landing from the north. I am just writing now to see if there is any way that our situation can be looked at again. Thank you, Bill Douglass

Airport Noise

Marilynn T [mtulipgram@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 11:28 AM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Rob Adams

Part 150 Project Manager

Landrum & Brown

11279 Cornell Park Dr.

Cincinnati, Ohio 45242

To: Seattle Tacoma International Airport

My husband and I have lived in our home on South 200th St., south of the airport, for over 50 years. When we moved here there was only one runway with quiet prop airplanes. This was great; we could live here in peace. Then came the second runway and jet engines, totally annoying and ear stressing. A good portion of the surrounding neighborhood was bought out by the port back then and it became a sad neighborhood.

We were in the noise abatement program several years ago. The improvements work well when the windows are closed. We can't even think of opening them in warm or hot weather or even to let in some fresh air or we will be attacked by the horrible noise. They also insulated some of the walls & ceilings inside the house. That somewhat protected us with noise coming from the east of us, as long as we stayed inside our home & didn't open any windows. Because of my husband's severe illness, we were unable to attend any of the community meetings. It was very difficult to get information regarding this situation.

Now we have the third runway, which comes in just to the west side of our home. That side was not insulated for noise, so even with the windows closed we are bombarded by noise.

When we go outside now, at any time, nice weather or not, the sound is almost deafening. Come barbecue with us sometime!. When a plane goes over, all conversation has to cease, in person or on the telephone. Even worse, the larger planes have a large air wake. When some fly over, the wake breaks small branches off of our many tall fir trees. Now I am afraid to let my grandchildren play in the yard for fear a branch may drop on them. Many have already broken off and fallen in the wind from the wakes. The jet wake constantly blows leaves off of my many small plants. The wind also blows an abnormal amount of pine cones, even green ones to the ground and they have to be picked up almost daily.

I really would rather not live in this neighborhood anymore. But because of all other noise and runways on both sides of my home, we are unable to afford to move. Who would buy a home here? The runways have severely affected the value of our home. Our house value is way down while prices of places we would move to have gone up. We live on small pension and social security. With all the care and bills from my husband's illness, we are stuck here. We can't afford a new mortgage.

Even friends don't like to visit if we will be outside, because the planes come in every three minutes. The last we heard, the third runway was to be used for emergency use only! Apparently that was just another lie put out

6/6/13

Airport Noise

by the Port of Seattle. What a shame. This situation is causing a lot of stress for us.

We love our home. Our yard is like a park, even with a waterfall and brook, which my son built. Our yard looks like a beautiful picture in a magazine. But because of the many planes and terrible noise, and plane air wake, we just can't enjoy it - more stress. It's just a shame our home life has come to this! Once, it was a dream come true, now it has turned into a nightmare that doesn't end.

Please help. Do the right thing and buy out the homes severely affected, like ours. At least do us the courtesy of coming out and seeing for yourselves. We are not complaining needlessly.

Sincerely
Marilynn Thulin
1241 S 200 Street
Seatac, WA 98198-3310
(206) 878-3994 (206) 999-8864

Request for Reconsideration of Alternative M-A

Joseph Gleason [gleasons5@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 3:29 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

I have done a quick review of Chapter 5 (Alternatives) and my conclusion is that this study recommends that my family simply continue to tolerate airport noise in our home, which is within the 65 DNL exposure contour. I am particularly distressed that Noise Compatibility Program Alternative M-A (Retrofit Positive Ventilation for Previously Attenuated Single Family Residences) is not being recommended except for homes that were not previously insulated.

Let me explain our circumstance – Our home is on 15th Avenue South, with the first two runways on the east and the third runway, which was constructed after our home was insulated, on the west. Our home had a positive ventilation system installed, but it is so loud that it is like the sound of a take-off, so we prefer not to use it. Our family room is in the basement with a sliding door opening to the west and before the completion of the third runway we were able to open the door to cool the house without substantial noise impacts. Now, with the third runway in use, we have to keep the door closed to watch TV and visit in our family room while tolerating the uncomfortable heat and lack of air flow. Opening the door makes our family room unusable.

Air conditioning, which could easily be installed in place of the existing positive ventilation system, would be a large step towards mitigating the impacts of living within the 65 DNL exposure contour and particularly the impact of the third runway. Please reconsider Alternative M-A and find some way of providing air conditioning. We would gladly volunteer to be part of a pilot program to make this happen as quickly as possible.

Thank you.

Joe Gleason
21249 15th South
Des Moines
206-878-1574

concerns about air travel and noise

Suzanne Tone [set-the-tone@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, May 27, 2013 11:04 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Dear Mr. Adams

I am writing to let you know of my concerns regarding the airport noise and travel. This is what I have observed in the last year.

First off I live off of 360th St. in Federal Way. (Wild Waves basically.) We have lived in this home for twelve years now. Last summer the neighbors and I all noticed a significant increase in the amount of airplanes overhead as well as the noise increase. I spend a large amount of time outside and am quite aware of what is normal for our neighborhood. As one reader pointed out getting any sleep after five in the morning is not an easy one. I sleep with my windows open and get woken up by the noise. I am concerned at the level at which the airplanes are starting their descent. I live twenty miles from the airport, and the airplanes have never caused us concern all these years. I am not sure why now the South portion of Federal way is now suffering for your need to try to appease the Marine Hills area? Some of the planes are so low, that I can make out numbers on the plane. This causes my house and the ground at times to shake and rattle. We have noticed a definite shift in our house, ironically in the last year. While outside, conversations come to a halt until the plane has gone by.

I worked at the airport for over ten years, and had to leave because of an allergy I had developed to petroleum. This obviously was in abundance at the airport, and my health began to suffer greatly. I never thought living so far away from the airport, that I would have to be subjected to petroleum dumps as the planes make their descent, twenty miles away. Our house is on a very busy road, and we can see thousands of cars a day. So to have even more noise, and physical vibrations from air travel, is unhealthy for us as citizens, but just as important...our homes.

I would very much like to be a part of this process. I have tried to read what the papers have provided, but am sure I need to be more informed. Perhaps you could point me in that direction.

I appreciate you hearing my views on this matter.

Sincerely

Suzanne Vargo

Part 150 Study comments: Huge increased air traffic noise in 98118

Nancy Siegel [siegelnancy@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, May 26, 2013 11:42 AM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Attn: Rob Adams, Part 150 Study Project Manager

We are writing because of our strong concerns about the increased air traffic over our neighborhood since late September 2012 to the present (as of this writing, May 2013). **Return aircraft take-off departures to their previous corridors further west (instead of turning so quickly east over 98118) as per historical patterns and agreements by the Port with the No-Right-Turn decision 10 years ago.**

With the implementation of the Greener Skies flight path corridors last year, Seward Park residents have become subject to a huge increase in airplane noise and disruption. According to your last public information session, Greener Skies allows aircraft to land more slowly at lower altitudes, and take off in vectors much further east than in the past. This has had two major results for our neighborhood:

1. With planes landing at **much lower altitudes** (visibly low enough to see the carrier logo, around 2500 ft. with landing gear out), the result is a **very large increase in noise**.
2. With **planes taking off much further east than before**, we are **subject to new and constant increases in noise** as they turn over our neighborhood.

Tracking the data over the last 6 months, we have seen that these changes have not been due to specific weather conditions or other natural factors over this period. With a large variety of weather and wind conditions for take-off, the residents of Seward Park and Mt. Baker have nevertheless seen flight paths moved consistently MUCH further east so that they are directly over us. This has impacted us in the following ways:

1. Noise disruptions take place constantly, with planes departing and flying over every 2 minutes. Because the Rainier Valley naturally echoes with sound (as per your own study analysis), this causes loud thundering and echoing as the planes fly over the neighborhood and then turn right over Mercer Island. In fact, we get the reverberation twice because of this factor.
2. It is difficult to go about daily life without constantly being interrupted by loud aircraft sound as planes take off throughout the day.
3. It is hard to sleep at night because planes are taking off until 12AM and resume at 6AM. In fact, recently there have been nightly planes at 2AM and 4AM as well.

With the advent of the third runway, and the implementation of the Greener Skies corridors and lower altitudes, South Seattle residents are now more deeply impacted than ever by the profoundly increased aircraft noise, causing disruption to our daily lives.
We request that you:

1. **Return aircraft take-off departures to their previous corridors further west (instead of turning so quickly east over 98118) as per historical patterns and agreements by the Port with the No-Right-Turn decision 10 years ago.**
2. Expand landing corridor options to allow for more equitable shared impact across all Seattle neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Nancy Siegel, Marmot Snetsinger
5134 South Morgan Street, Seattle, 98118

6/6/13

cc: Patty Murray, Maria Cantwell, Adam Smith

Part 150 Study comments: Huge increased air traffic noise in 98118

Airplane Noise in South Seattle

McCormick, Scott [Scott.McCormick@pccsea.com]

Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2013 6:17 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

I am very concerned about the impact of the increased airplane traffic over South Seattle. Planes are constantly flying over my house creating a disturbing level of noise that disrupts our household environment every couple of minutes. This affects my sleep and when I am awake. This recent and sudden degradation of my neighborhood is not acceptable.

Please return aircraft departures to their previous corridors further west as per historical patterns and agreements by the Port with the No-Right_Turn decision 10 years ago and expand landing corridor options to allow for more equitable impact across all Seattle neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Scott McCormick

Fax 513 530-2201

LETTER TO PORT OF SEATTLE

To whom it may concern,

My wife and I purchased our first house at 14426 5th south back in 1982. We bought the house before we were married and I had two of my close high school friends living with me until Liz and I officially tied the knot. We were married on January 23, 1982 Liz moved in and friends relocated. It was quit a nice neighborhood with good neighbors. The one big issue was the flight path. It happened to be right above our house and it was loud.

3.3

We were able to get through the noise until we had are first child in in January 1987, Liz and I were on the Port Of Seattle noise abetment program waiting list for at least 4 years. It was frustrating for are family because of the smell of JP-5 fuel and jet noise. You could not have a conversation outside the house without being interrupted on continuous basis. We could not wait any longer for the port abetment program.

7.11

Liz and I knew we needed to look for another house before we could have another child. The noise was unbearable. We loved the Burien area because of local family and friends. We found the perfect house at 223 so 172 pl. Burien WA. Its price was a stretch but Liz and I fell in love with it. The number one criteria for buying, was the impact of the airport. The location was cut into the hillside and there was very little noise impact. Liz and I kept going back at different times to monitor with are ears the noise from air traffic.

Liz and I bought the house at 223 so 172 pl. on 8/8/88 wont ever forget it. It was perfect. We had another child and life was blessed. Liz and I had no idea of the flight plan study of 1989 or the third runway. We were not aware there was going to be a third runway.

4.2

I can't document my hearing loss was caused in part by air traffic noise or just occupation hazard. I don't know if it's affected my wife and children's health. I do know it now effects the quality of life for my wife and I. what I hope the Port of Seattle will do is sound proof my home at 223 so 172 pl. My windows are ruined; the nails that hold my siding to my house have vibrated outward. I've had to replace my gutters because the nails had come out of roof line.

3.3

I have not kept good records pertaining to communication with the port, I have emailed three or more times over the past 5 years to monitor my particular house for noise abetment. We can not open the bedroom window at night or have it open in the morning because of the effect of plans on the tarmac with there jets idling or takeoffs. This is a great neighborhood in Burien, I am confident you will bring are home and quality of life back to normal.

It is my wife and my hope the Port of Seattle will qualify our home for the sound abetment program this time around in 2013. We believe it's a fair deal for the Port and the Yellam family. Thanks for your time.

Marty Yellam- 223 South 172 Place Burien Washington 98148 Phone 206 300-7802

Project 150 comment

Anderson, Stacey [Stacey.Anderson@ChasePaymenttech.com]

Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2013 3:52 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Cc: staceyalehmann@hotmail.com; Chad Anderson [chaander@seattlesbest.com]

Dear Mr. Adams,

Good afternoon. I have been closely listening to the airplane noise, since I moved into my house on 2020 S. Charles St., Seattle, WA 98144. I live 17.2 miles away from the SEATAC Airport, but I am close to one of the main 150 Noise Abatement Study landing courses. I've noticed a significant increase in airplane noise, mostly due to the fact that the airplanes are putting their landing gear and flaps down prior to flying over my house. After reviewing the study documents, I was under the impression that the goal of the study was to reduce noise, by creating a noise corridor, and procedures for planes to reduce their noise output by gliding in, and not using their flaps and gear so far from the airport. I am a regular caller to your noise complaint line, and I was told that the individual airlines provide pilots with instruction on when, during a landing, they should put their gear and flaps down. I've noticed an increase in planes using their landing gear and flaps, and landing in a consistent sequence (every ten minutes), between the hours of 7:30 - 10:30 PM, with a few hours of quiet time, until I am woken up again at 2:00 AM. As a result, I think that your noise abatement project hasn't reduced noise, but has simply moved it to a more concentrated area. Unfortunately, the new noisier area is directly over my house.

I am a former Naval Officer, with flight training, and I have lived in over fifteen major cities including: New York, San Diego, Pensacola, Jacksonville, Virginia Beach, Washington D.C. - to name a few. I have often lived near Naval Bases, close to airports and in flight landing paths, but Seattle is the loudest city I have lived in with regards to Aircraft noise. I am hoping that you take my observations into consideration when deciding if the 150 Noise Abatement Project should continue, and when making additional procedures for reducing incoming airplane noise. I really hope, that you can come up with a plan, that will discourage the airlines not to use their flaps and landing gear, so far from the airport.

Sincerely,

Stacey Anderson

Stacey Anderson | Account Executive, Middle Market **Chase Paymentech**

2020 S. Charles St., Seattle, WA 98144 | T: 206 577 0322 | C: 206 678 6317

stacey.anderson@chasepaymentech.com

J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.

Learn more about Chase Paymentech Solutions, LLC payment processing services at www.chasepaymentech.com.

6/6/13

Project 150 comment

THIS MESSAGE IS CONFIDENTIAL. This e-mail message and any attachments are proprietary and confidential information intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not print, distribute, or copy this message or any attachments. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender by return e-mail and delete this message and any attachments from your computer.

INCREASED AIRPLANE NOISE 98118 /SEWARD PARK

Lynda Collie Johnson [lcolliej@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, May 24, 2013 12:52 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

As the weather warms, it is natural to open windows at our house. Spring brings the rude awakening to the departure and arrival of planes. We can hardly hear the tv program we were watching. So we must turn up the volume to the level of the previously irritating commercials. As I write this at 9:38 am, another plane is flying overhead.

We will be embarrassed to welcome guests to our yearly summer parties because the enjoyment will be interrupted by the sight and sounds of airplanes flying too low.

Our daughter reports being awakened and startled in the middle of the night. Her windows actually rattle.

There must be a solution to this, a return to routes further west. It's 9:43 am and yes, I hear the roar of yet another plane. UGH!

9:47 am - more engine noise

It's 9:51 am, guess what?

Lynda Collie- Johnson
Ernest Belford Johnson, PhD
Sumaiya Johnson, our daughter

Increased Air Noise over 98118

Sheri Richardson [dsrichardson@mindspring.com]

Sent: Friday, May 24, 2013 12:45 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Cc: dsrichardson@mindspring.com

I am very concerned about the increased noise from aircraft over my home in the 98118 area. When I moved to the Seward Park neighborhood seven years ago, one of its main attractions to me was the overall quietness. I am totally blind and very sensitive to loud noise.

Over the past several months, I have noticed a significant increase in noise from airplanes landing and taking off. The increased noise level is more than an annoyance to me; it often interferes with my safety by making it more difficult for me to hear my surroundings. This is particularly true when I am crossing streets.

I sincerely hope you will consider options for mitigating the noise level over my neighborhood.

Thank you.

Sheri Richardson

Aircraft Noise

TGEES@aol.com

Sent: Friday, May 24, 2013 10:28 AM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

2.6 [I live in the Twin Lakes area of Federal Way. In the last few months the noise from departing aircraft has significantly increased. The planes are coming directly overhead at low altitudes. The departure routes seem to have changed. I would hope they could go back to the older routes where the planes would initially gain altitude over the I-5 corridor before turning westbound.

Thank-you for reading my comments.

Tom George

3818 sw 313th st

Federal Way 98023

253-838-4867

tgees@aol.com

SeaTac Airplane noise impacting south Seattle neighborhoods

Robin Cole [tahuyarobin@msn.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 11:50 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

We are noticing lower and louder planes over our Lakewood/Seward Park neighborhood, because the increased air traffic from the 3rd runway and the new take-off and landing corridors implemented this past fall by the Port of Seattle have negatively impacted South Seattle residents yet again. We have been subjected to huge increases in noise and also in flight patterns that are much further east than previously and are now directly over us. As a south Seattle neighborhood, we continue to get the short stick. Please balance increased impacts among ALL neighborhoods, not just the south end.

Airflight noise over zip 98118,, Lakewood-Seward Park

Ken Nelson [k_n_nelson@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 6:46 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

In connection with neighborhood complaints (98118) about increased noise from takeoffs and landings with 3rd runway in use at SeaTac, I'd like to add my comment to those, if any, who do NOT feel that the level of increased disturbance, if any, is worth a complaint.

Admittedly I do live further to the east (52nd Ave. S.) than some correspondents who mentioned living near Rainier Valley. But I have lived here for fourteen years, and have not noticed ANY significant increase in noise levels from takeoffs or landings in that time period.

Thank you for your attention. Kennard Nelson, 5115 South Alaska Street, Seattle 98118.



FREE Animations for your email [Click Here!](#)



6-1

Concern for air traffic over 98118

Lopez, MaryJoy [mlopez@fhcrc.org]

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 4:41 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

We are writing because of our strong concerns about the increased air traffic over our neighborhood since late September 2012 to the present (as of this writing, May 2013). With the implementation of the Greener Skies flight path corridors last year, Seward Park residents have become subject to a huge increase in airplane noise and disruption. According to your last public information session, Greener Skies allows aircraft to land more slowly at lower altitudes, and take off in vectors much further east than in the past. This has had two major results for our neighborhood:

1. With planes landing at **much lower altitudes** (visibly low enough to see the carrier logo, around 2500 ft. with landing gear out), the result is a **very large increase in noise**.
2. With **planes taking off much further east than before, we are subject to new and constant increases in noise** as they turn over our neighborhood.

Tracking the data over the last 6 months, we have seen that these changes have not been due to specific weather conditions or other natural factors over this period. With a large variety of weather and wind conditions for take-off, the residents of Seward Park and Mt. Baker have nevertheless seen flight paths moved consistently MUCH further east so that they are directly over us. This has impacted us in the following ways:

1. Noise disruptions take place constantly, with planes departing and flying over every 2 minutes. Because the Rainier Valley naturally echoes with sound (as per your own study analysis), this causes loud thundering and echoing as the planes fly over the neighborhood and then turn right over Mercer Island. In fact, we get the reverberation twice because of this factor.
2. It is difficult to go about daily life without constantly being interrupted by loud aircraft sound as planes take off throughout the day.
3. It is hard to sleep at night because planes are taking off until 12AM and resume at 6AM. In fact, recently there have been nightly planes at 2AM and 4AM as well.

With the advent of the third runway, and the implementation of the Greener Skies corridors and lower altitudes, South Seattle residents are now more deeply impacted than ever by the profoundly increased aircraft noise, causing disruption to our daily lives.

We request that you:

1. **Return aircraft take-off departures to their previous corridors further west (instead of turning so quickly east over**

98118) as per historical patterns and agreements by the Port with the No-Right-Turn decision 10 years ago.
2. Expand landing corridor options to allow for more equitable shared impact across all Seattle neighborhoods.

Part 150 Study Sea/Tac Airport April 15 to May 30, 2013

Alex [aderiugin@msn.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 7:52 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Cc: Alex Deriugin [aderiugin@msn.com]

Importance: High

To: Rob Adams, Part 150 Project Manager, at Landrum & Brown

Dear Rob,

My name is Alex Deriugin. I live at 28057 13th Ave South (Redondo) Des Moines, WA. I would like to voice my concern as I have many times to the Port of Seattle regarding the overhead aircraft noise I experience daily which has substantially increased and getting worse.

On "clear days" I watch day in and day out flights overhead heading for the third runway, one after another and no other runways are being utilized for landing. On cloudy, rainy wet days when aircraft are taking off to the south, they stay low and are very loud making turns to the west and east giving extra power.

Recommendation: aircraft should gain altitude as soon and as high as possible to mitigate the noise as well as turn east as soon as possible over nonresidential areas like I-5. Create flight paths both landing and take-off east over I-5 nonresidential areas and not as under the current plan. Use the third runway for bad weather conditions only as it was proposed from the start.

I would appreciate anything that can be done with the recommendation above that would greatly improve the current environment.

Thank you,

Alex Deriugin

28057 13th Ave South

Des Moines, WA

E-mail: aderiugin@msn.com

Airport Noise Comments

M Haney [haneys44@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 7:41 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

I would like to comment about the Sea Tac Airport Noise. I live in a Condo at 2409 S 222nd in Des Moines WA. While we did get the port package for our windows due to the 3rd runway, we can still hear the airplanes go overhead and we experience vibration/noise of our household items when the airplanes go over. We are awakened early on most Saturday mornings by a particularly low flying very loud airplane.

On nice days when our windows are open we cannot hear our television set when the airplanes go overhead. If we are outside on our small deck, we cannot hear each other talk.

I feel that we can no longer enjoy our home the way we want to, especially during good weather. My quality of life feels greatly diminished due to the airplane noise that we endure each day. If I knew this was going to happen, I would have never bought our condo. I would like to give up my condo to you folks and move somewhere further away from the runway path. I don't know if that will happen. I hope you make some laws so we have less noise. Putting in more insulation would be is nice, but it doesn't make up for the noise we have to endure when the windows are open. We can't enjoy the fresh cool air anymore when we're at home.

Thanks!

Dave and Michelle Haney

SeaTac Airport noise study

Brian and Carolyn Kraemer [bckraemer1@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 2:35 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

To Whom It May Concern;

Thank you for soliciting public commentary on the SeaTac noise issue. We do not live directly in the south flight path, but live close enough that airplane noise is a regular part of our environment and we take a strong interest in seeing that noise level diminish.

One commenter on this matter, Scott Chase of Federal Way, recently suggested in a Federal Way Mirror article that routing air traffic over the I-5 corridor would help move airplane noise away from neighborhoods. What he actually seems to be claiming is that a relocated flight path would move the noise further from his own neighborhood; the section of I-5 he wishes to see the planes re-directed to runs through many other residential areas and these would most certainly be impacted. Mr. Chase's situation is unfortunate; we once lived in Des Moines, WA directly under the SeaTac flight path and it was very noisy. It was one of the main reasons we sold our home and moved to the quieter West Hill area in Kent, which is incidentally one such neighborhood Mr. Chase's proposed I-5 flight path would impact. Mr. Chase is free to move out from under the flight path as we, and so many others, did if he feels strongly enough about the noise.

If the path is to be relocated for noise reduction, it makes more sense to send the planes over Puget Sound. Wherever the path is located, it's inevitable that neighborhoods will be adversely affected by noise as the area surrounding SeaTac is highly residential; however it seems that the least number of people would be impacted if the planes were sent out over the water. Number of people impacted by noise should be, and probably is already, a strong consideration.

Finally, we would also suggest that SeaTac consider relegating heavy cargo planes to daytime hours, as they seem to fly lower on take-off and make a horrendous amount of noise that greatly exceeds that of smaller planes. One in particular used to fly out nightly around 3-4 AM (perhaps it still does), practically shaking us from our bed on a regular basis. Everyone in Des Moines knew about that plane.

In closing, thank you for attention to, and work on, these issues. They matter very much to the surrounding communities. It seems likely that the noise situation should improve for most neighborhoods surrounding SeaTac in the coming years given the advancements and modifications that are being considered. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Carolyn and Brian Kraemer, Kent, WA

Part 150 Study comments: Huge increased air traffic noise in 98118 Zip code (Seward Park)

hannahsalia@comcast.net

Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 12:35 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Attn: Rob Adams, Part 150 Study Project Manager

We are writing because of our strong concerns about the increased air traffic over our neighborhood since late September 2012 to the present (as of this writing, May 2013). With the implementation of the Greener Skies flight path corridors last year, Seward Park residents have become subject to a huge increase in airplane noise and disruption. According to your last public information session, Greener Skies allows aircraft to land more slowly at lower altitudes, and take off in vectors much further east than in the past. This has had two major results for our neighborhood:

1. With planes landing at **much lower altitudes** (visibly low enough to see the carrier logo, around 2500 ft. with landing gear out), the result is a **very large increase in noise**.
2. With **planes taking off much further east than before, we are subject to new and constant increases in noise** as they turn over our neighborhood.

Tracking the data over the last 6 months, we have seen that these changes have not been due to specific weather conditions or other natural factors over this period. With a large variety of weather and wind conditions for take-off, the residents of Seward Park and Mt. Baker have nevertheless seen flight paths moved consistently MUCH further east so that they are directly over us. This has impacted us in the following ways:

1. Noise disruptions take place constantly, with planes departing and flying over every 2 minutes. Because the Rainier Valley naturally echoes with sound (as per your own study analysis), this causes loud thundering and echoing as the planes fly over the neighborhood and then turn right over Mercer Island. In fact, we get the reverberation twice because of this factor.
2. It is difficult to go about daily life without constantly being interrupted by loud aircraft sound as planes take off throughout the day.
3. It is hard to sleep at night because planes are taking off until 12AM and resume at 6AM. In fact, recently there have been nightly planes at 2AM and 4AM as well.

With the advent of the third runway, and the implementation of the Greener Skies corridors and lower altitudes, South Seattle residents are now more deeply impacted than ever by the profoundly increased aircraft noise, causing disruption to our daily lives.

We request that you:

1. **Return aircraft take-off departures to their previous corridors further west (instead of turning so quickly east over 98118)** as per historical patterns and agreements by the Port with the No-Right-Turn decision 10 years ago.
2. Expand landing corridor options to allow for more equitable shared impact across all Seattle neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Hannah Salia
Baba Salia

cc: Patty Murray, Maria Cantwell, Adam Smith

6/6/13

Airport noise

Airport noise

vivian everts [dancingneedle2000@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 3:00 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

 I live in a four plex apartment. There are five buildings total and the planes fly right over us, yet we do not have the port package. Is there a reason? The address of the building is 12227 Des Moines Mem. Dr. How do we apply for the port package?

noise impact comment and request

wesnsue@bleachgarage.com

Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 8:10 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Rob Adams:

2.7
[I have had many sleepless nights while the airplanes are sitting on the runway revved up during their maintenance repairs. I respectfully ask that you develop some kind of an en-closer to use for the planes so the noise cannot be heard.

I know I am not the only one affected by this noise. We do have sound insulation but it does not stop the noise from coming through. Thank you so much in your efforts to help us living near the airport to reclaim our quality of life by having the noise around us reduced substantially.

Sue Smith

Aircraft noise comment

John Margarita Cruse [mjcruse@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 29, 2013 12:23 AM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

9 [Noise recommendation. Buy out all residential property to south 272nd street in Des Moines. Redevelop and sell or lease for industrial use. Done right
m | you can make money.

John Cruse

24212 13th Ave South

Des Moines, WA 98198-7802

My name is Joe and Jean Sullivan we live on DesMoines Memorial Drive, facing Sunset Park at 13615 Des Moines Memorial Dr. **3 miles north of the Airport.**

The following is my comment:

1.3 We bought our house in August 1968 ten years later the noise from the airplanes were quite loud and very distractive if you were outside (have you ever try talking when the airplanes are flying on top of your house we had to stop talking and give the airplanes the right away). Now 44 years later the planes are in front on top and back of our house (1, 2 and 3 run ways) the noise is so bad that you cannot use the back yard in the summer time or have people over for a barbeque. I have 3 bichons dogs and when the airplanes fly in the back yard they are flying low and you can see gas being empty while flying and then the turbulence whooshing sound is so loud like and echo and that scares my dogs and I when we are in the back yard, this is how bad it is. I can even see a person sitting in their seats while airplanes fly that is how close these planes fly.

7.2 My husband Joe thinks that you will be buying us out sometime soon, but as I see it we will be missed again and again. We did get the Port Of Seattle package but our house still shakes and you can still hear the noise.....Yes we could have sold out but we are waiting for you to buy us out we have stuck it out this long.

3.6 Our house can use some repairs my Husband Joe doesn't want to put money into the house if you are planning to buy us out. I need new flooring and update kitchen that would cost us about \$20.000. We have seen the buy outs up and down and across the street. I feel the Port of Seattle is not being fair to us. We lived in our house for the past 44 years and for that last 30 years we thought we would get bought by now I've have been to many meetings and felt like no one cares at all about any of us. It's has have been very frustrating.

.....I want to know if we are or we are not ever going to be bought out.

A Port of Seattle and Airport neighbor:

Joe and Jean Sullivan
13615 DesMoines Memorial Drive
Burien, Washington 98168

5-29-17

To: Rob Adams

1.1 I wanted to say that the planes flying over the condos (Quiet Forest II) off of 1st Ave in Federal Way wake me up all the time. It is very stressful. I bought here in 2006 after my husband passed in order to downsize.

If you can do anything to remedy this it would be great.

Yours truly,

Mary C'Neal

32615 3rd Pl. So.
Federal Way, WA
98003

COMMENT FORM
PUBLIC HEARING
SEATTLE TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY UPDATE
May 15, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Cedarhurst Elementary, Burien

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. This event also serves as the Public Hearing for inviting comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for the Part 150 Study. Public comments are an integral part of the Part 150 Study Update process. This comment form is provided to receive your input and ensure that your concerns are considered. Please use this form to submit written comments, attaching additional pages if necessary. Either place the form in the comment box, provided here at the meeting, or mail to the address below. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com. **Comments must be postmarked or emailed by May 30, 2013.**

Statement Attached.

- 1. Third Runway use*
- 2. Prior property buy-outs*
- 3. Night flights*
- 4. Ground run-ups*
- 5. Part 150 & quality of life*
- 6. Flight patterns and noise data*

Submit comments to:

Mr. Rob Adams
Consultant Team Project Manager
Landrum & Brown, Inc.
11279 Cornell Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Name: *Carl Mealy*
Address: *21634 - 3rd Ave S*
Normandy Park WA
98198

Fax: 513.530.2201
Email: SEApartment150comments@landrum-brown.com

1.7

1. The original case for SeaTac needing a third runway was to handle and provide needed capacity during adverse weather conditions. The usage statistics indicate that it has been used as just like the other runways. This is despite that it has a far shorter safety area and much less buffer. If noise buffer and safety areas are still needed then this should indicate principle use for the runways until such time as they are equally covered. If that is not the case then the Port and the FAA have been holding land under false or no longer valid pretense for some time which could be consider fraud.

3.12

2. In prior buy-outs, the Port bought flat land adjacent to 24th Ave S. But failed to buy out properties closer and more directly under the runways. Why? The port should be held accountable for why this land was acquired. Based upon the noise and safety applied to Third runway this area appears to no longer be required. If that is the case, said lands should be put back in private hands to generate money and taxes for the public good.

1.1

3. Night flights and operations should only be allowed to increase if the resulting noise can be decreased in proportion to the increase in flights and or operations. Example: quieter take offs or trade less take offs for more landings. It is not just the level but also frequency.

2.18

4. If a ground run-up area is going to be pursue, it should be located and positioned such that the least amount of noise goes out of the airport as possible. It should introduce no additional environmental impacts beyond the airport or into prior noise buffers. It should not be allowed on any land purchase as a buffer zone for the airport. To do so would be a kin to obtaining land under false pretense.

6.14

5. Part 150 needs to address the impacts on the quality of life around the airport rather than just speak to monitoring and mitigating measures.

6.16

6. Flight pattern data should provide delineation by the level of ground noise created and not just the pattern of the flights.

Carl Mealy

City of Medina Public Comments on Draft Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study

abjack5@comcast.net

Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2013 8:26 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Cc: shepherd.s@portseattle.org; dhanson@medina-wa.gov

May 28, 2013

Mr. Rob Adams

Consultant Team Project Manager

Landrum & Brown, Inc

11279 Cornell Park Drive

Cincinnati, OH 45242

SEAPart150comments@landrum-brown.com

Dear Mr. Adams,

At the start of the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study, the City of Medina provided suggestions on scope to the Port of Seattle and the Part 150 Study team.

This letter represents the City of Medina's public comment on the 2013 Seattle Tacoma International Airport Draft Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study.

Comments on 2013 Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) Recommendations :

Measure: A-12 and A-19: Fly Quiet Program and Measure P-1: Upgrade Noise Monitoring and Flight Tracking System

The City of Medina supports the continued operation and expansion of the Fly Quiet Program and the continued operation and upgrades to the Noise Monitoring and Flight Tracking System.

One of the primary objectives of the Fly Quiet Program is to "monitor adherence to ideal noise abatement flight tracks" and provide incentives that encourage airlines to utilize these tracks. Additionally the Port publishes this data to publically demonstrate compliance to its own noise abatement procedures. As such, the accuracy of the data is a critical element in the process. Upon review, it appears that the Port's noise abatement compliance tracking parameters may be inconsistent with the FAA flight procedures that are specifically defined and established in the 1999 Four Post EA and ROD.

The Four Post EA and ROD outline specific procedures for south flow arrivals and north flow departures. The flight track procedures set forth in this EA/ROD resulted from the comments and input received from more than ninety public meetings and formed the environmentally approved framework for all arrivals and departures into Sea-Tac. Additionally, this FAA action canceled all previous facility directives and practices regarding noise abatement, thereby establishing itself as the basis for all future noise abatement activity at SeaTac. It is Medina's understanding that NEPA and the FAA's own policy mandate that any change to the procedures set forth in an Environmental Assessment and Record of Decision require additional environmental review.

Medina is aware that the Port, as airport proprietor, has no independent jurisdiction over aircraft in flight, and that the FAA has exclusive control in that realm. However, as the airport proprietor and agency with responsibility to the public, the City of Medina expects that the Port would have some interest in ensuring that the Port defined noise abatement corridors match those that the FAA is required to adhere to through the 1990 Four Post Plan EA and ROD.

Therefore, Medina requests that the Part 150 A-19 recommendation be amended to include that the Port of Seattle conduct a review of its noise abatement corridors and compliance tracking parameters to ensure that they are consistent with the 1990 FAA Four Post Plan (EA) and (ROD) and that the Port's compliance tracking parameters are updated to reflect any changes necessary to bring the two into alignment.

Measure: A-13 Increased Use of Duwamish/Elliott Bay Corridor

We recognize that the FAA studied this option in 2000 and determined that increased use of the Duwamish/Elliott Bay Corridor was not feasible at that time due to a negative impact on efficiency.

At the beginning of this Part 150 study the City of Medina requested that the scope include a review of whether newer technology could potentially change the results of the now thirteen year old Duwamish Study and whether the nighttime curfew that currently routes flights down the Duwamish between 10 pm and 6 am could be extended at a minimum on weekends so that east turn departures could use the Duwamish corridor until 8 am on Saturdays and Sundays.

The Duwamish departure track is one that in the past has been highly favored by all communities because is it the only flight track that does not severely impact residential populations. We are disappointed that this Part 150 team chose not to relook at the Duwamish Industrial Corridor for increased use, to assess whether newer technology may make it a safe and efficient corridor for increased volumes of traffic.

With regard to extended curfew, Medina was informed by the FAA that between 5/26 and 11/26/2011, the FAA did in fact conduct an evaluation of extended curfew to determine if traffic volumes were light enough in the late night and early morning to safely extend curfew. Medina was told that the results of the evaluation showed that volumes are low enough on Saturday night and Sunday morning to justify extending curfew such that it would

begin at 9 pm on Saturday night and last until 7 am Sunday morning. In March 2012, Medina was informed that although testing had shown that volumes are low to extend the curfew hours, the FAA had decided not to implement the change.

Since the 1990 EA/ROD states that the curfew provisions should be maintained during those late night hours *when traffic is light enough to permit safe use*, the **City of Medina requests that Measure A-13 be amended to include** the results of the already completed FAA study and that the Duwamish/Elliott Bay Corridor be utilized for extension of curfew on Sat nights and Sun morning when traffic is light enough to permit safe use. Medina also recommends that this measure be carried forward as part of the Part 150 2013 Noise Compatibility Program Recommendations. This requested amendment falls within this Part 150 screening guidelines which require that new measures provide benefit within the 65 DNL contour. Additionally, the Duwamish is an established noise abatement industrial corridor and therefore extending curfew hours does not shift any flight tracks, nor does it impact new populations to noise impacts.

Measure P-3: Continue to operate the Noise Office.

The City of Medina supports the continued operation of the Noise Office to initiate, implement and monitor the various abatement actions included in the NCP and to monitor and track actual runway use in comparison to the Runway Use Letter of Agreement that was developed as part of this Part 150 study. **Additionally, Medina requests that this measure be expanded** to include that the Noise Office be chartered with the following responsibilities:

- Review and assess data acquired through this Part 150 process to develop additional recommendations for improving the noise environment in the region specifically for areas outside the 65 DNL contour.
- Form a Follow-up Public Committee to support their efforts in accordance with the model utilized in past Part 150 programs. The Noise Office in conjunction with this consensus based Follow-Up Public Committee would then be responsible for carrying forward agreed upon recommendations to the FAA for review.
- Initiate a review of the Port's noise abatement parameters to determine whether they are consistent with the FAA's Four Post procedures as defined by the 1990 Four Post Plan EA and ROD (as outlined in the section above).

Other general comments:

Section 1.6: Noise Complaint Data.

The City of Medina would like to make several observations about the relevancy of this section.

First, although the Port does an excellent job of tracking complaints and providing information to the public about specific complaints, the data does not appear to be used to resolve issues, create recommendations or have any meaningful purpose in developing the Part 150 noise compatibility recommendations.

Unfortunately the public is aware that filing a complaint does not result in positive, meaningful change. In our community, residents have given up on using the complaint hotline. "It does not good," is the common quote we hear. Therefore, this data should not be considered to be representative of the public's true "annoyance" levels with airport noise.

Second, Exhibit 1-11 Noise Complaints/Inquiries by Time of Day is very misleading for, as is noted in the Part 150, in some cases the time of the complaint may not directly correspond to the time of day of the actual annoyance and therefore the table is not representative of the times when the public is most annoyed by airport noise.

The City of Medina encourages the Port to find ways to utilize this data so that it can actually be used to support meaningful recommendations and positive change.

Conclusion:

Finally, the City of Medina applauds the Port of Seattle for completing the Part 150 study and attempting to address the most egregious noise issues within the 65 DNL contour. However, we would like to emphasize that residents outside the 65 DNL contour also experience significant negative noise impacts from the airport. We remain hopeful that the Port will take its regional responsibility one step further by taking advantage of the expertise and data made available during this study to look at alternatives to improve the overall Puget Sound noise environment. If the Part 150 study is not the vehicle to accomplish this goal, we urge the Port of Seattle to provide appropriate direction and authority to its Noise Office to develop positive noise reduction recommendations for the region and ensure that the Noise Abatement Corridors that are tracked are consistent with the 1990 Four Post Plan EA and ROD.

Sincerely,

Allyson Jackson
City of Medina
Part 150 Consultant
206-954-6175

cc. Stan Shepherd, Port of Seattle; Donna Hanson, City Manager City of Medina

May 26, 2013

Rob Adams

Part 150 Project Manager
Landrum & Brown
11279 Cornell Park Dr.
Cincinnati, Ohio 45242

SEApert150comments@landrum-brown.com

Dear Mr. Adams:

5.4 I have reviewed the Determination of NonSignificance (DNS) issued by the Port of Seattle for its Sea-Tac International Airport Part 150 Compatibility Planning Study. The Port has not properly complied with the State Environmental Policy Act on either the scope of the study, alternatives, or mitigation. The Port should prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

The State Environmental Policy Act regulations provide: "In assessing the significance of an impact, a lead agency shall not limit its consideration of a proposal's impacts only to those aspects within its jurisdiction, including local or state boundaries (see also WAC 197-11-330(3) also)." *WAC 197-11-060(4)(b)*.

5.7 The Port's DNS violates the SEPA regulations by ignoring the noise nuisance on new areas in northwest Seattle from the Port of Seattle's decision to construct and operate its "third runway" at Sea-Tac Airport.

Please respond in writing to the following comments:

- 5.5
- Aircraft noise from Sea-Tac Airport has an actual significant adverse impact on the human environment. As a result, the Port should prepare an environmental impact statement that would examine alternatives, including FAA traffic control measures that reduces noise, and alternative airport locations in the future, such as Joint Base Fort Lewis/McCord.
- 5.6
- The DNS addresses aircraft noise in a very limited area around Sea-Tac Airport. The DNS fails to address the fact that traffic landing patterns into Sea-Tac Airport have changed significantly, and for the worse, since the Port began using its "third-runway," advertised by the Port to allow two runway landings during bad weather conditions.
- 5.7
- The DNS fails to adequately describe the existing and recommended noise remedy boundaries (Figure 1). It appears from the scale given that the recommended remedy boundary is approximately 15,000 feet south of the south end of the "third-runway",

5.7

10,000 feet north of the north end of the “third-runway”, and 4,000 feet west of the edge of the “third-runway.” If aircraft landing and taking off from Sea-Tac are a noise problem 4,000 feet west of the airport, than aircraft on a landing pattern into Sea-Tac at an altitude of less than 3,000 feet is also a noise problem. This is what occurs in northwest Seattle.

5.8

- Why does the FAA continue to create noise problems over north Seattle (16 miles north of Sea-Tac Airport) for landings into the Port’s “third-run away”, under the following circumstances:
 - Asia or Alaska in bound flights heading south to Sea-Tac that are vectored directly over northwest Seattle at altitudes under 3,000 feet from 4:30 AM until at least 1:30 AM? Why can’t FAA vector these aircraft into Sea-Tac by shifting the flight path slightly to the west so that they come into Sea-Tac over Elliott Bay and avoid all the residential population of northwest Seattle?
 - California/Oregon in bound flights heading north to Sea-Tac that are vectored northbound up Puget Sound and then make a right hand turn over northwest Seattle at altitudes under 3,000 feet from 4:30 AM until at least 1:30 AM? Why can’t FAA vector these aircraft into Sea-Tac by making their right hand U-turns over Elliott Bay and avoid all the residential population of northwest Seattle? This would have the added benefit of aviation fuel savings.

5.9

- Why does the FAA continue to create noise problems over northwest Seattle (16 miles north of Sea-Tac Airport) by directing outbound flights to the southeast United States to head north from Sea-Tac, then vectoring to the west over Elliott Bay then making a right hand turn over northwest Seattle particularly from 10:00 PM to 1:30 AM to destinations such as Atlanta and Florida? This, again, causes significant noise nuisance particularly after midnight and results in increase aviation fuel usage.

5.10

The Port has also violated WAC 197-11-330(2)(c), which provides: “Consider mitigation measures which an agency or the applicant will implement as part of the proposal, including any mitigation measures required by development regulations, comprehensive plans, or other existing environmental rules or laws.”

5.11

The Port has not provided any mitigation for northwest Seattle from the noise nuisance created by the use of the Sea-Tac “third-runway.” Mitigation should include making U-turns over Elliott Bay not over north Seattle, bringing in Alaska Airlines and other inbound flights from the northwest over Elliott Bay and not over northwest Seattle, and looping outbound flights to Atlanta and Florida to the south, not to the north.

5.12

The Port’s “third-runway” and the FAA’s landing and take-off patterns continue to have a significant adverse impact to residents in northwest Seattle. The SEPA environmental checklist specifically requires that noise be addressed:

5.12

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: *WAC 197-11-960.B.7.b.*

7.1

The King County Department of Assessment has already made a ruling that noise nuisance from Sea-Tac lowers property values in northwest Seattle. See attached property value appeal decision.

5.4

In summary, the Port should prepare an EIS to properly scope the noise impacts of Sea-Tac Airport on surrounding residences, examine alternatives that would avoid the impacts, and mitigate for the impacts. Please provide a written response to these comments.

David E. Ortman
7043 22nd Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117
(206) 789-6136

Attachments

Part 150 comments

D Wagner [dwagner007@msn.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 12:38 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

Cc: aviationjustice@googlegroups.com

May 15, 2013

Landrum and Brown:

I would like to comment on the draft study and recommend further mitigation measures not covered in the draft study and would like these comments to become part of the public record.

Two years before the Part 150 process began, I requested a noise berm on the west side of the airport consisting of dirt/trees and/or a noise attenuating wall. The Port commission and the airport environmental manager Russ Simonsen believed this was an idea that should be carried over into the Part 150 process. My greater concern beyond the new noise intrusion of the expanded airport into Burien's environment was the emissions of toxic, criteria, soot, black carbon and particulates from jet operations in much closer proximity to schools, homes and other sensitive land uses on the west side of the airport.

An earthen hill and treed berm that once offered some protection from direct exposure to these chemicals was removed to build the third runway plateau. A noise wall/berm would greatly reduce the known, studied and documented risks of cancer, respiratory and brain injury from this large array of dangerous emissions. I have also pointed out in the process that even ICAO admits the emission reduction qualities of a hush-house. At the FAR 150 meeting held at the Tukwila Community Center, I spoke with FAA representatives who acted like they were unaware of even FAA's own regulations requiring workers at an airfield to stay clear of jet emissions. There are children attending OSC who are, at times, closer than FAA's own regulations allow. The reasoning the FAA gave to me at that meeting for not carrying the noise wall/berm over into the recommendations is because FAA regulations do not allow structures that close to the runway. I contend that this is nothing but an excuse because FAA's own regulations are compromised all the time in the case of bird attractant water bodies. And I also contend that it is more dangerous to have a 200 foot drop off to the west of the third runway than to have a wall. It would be far more difficult to rescue victims that have careened down a 200 foot hill into homes than on the airfield after a crash into a wall. I believe FAA is able to adjust their regulations to allow a compromise which would further protect residents from noise and emissions and be a better common sense approach to aircraft and passenger safety. Further, if a noise wall/berm is a life saving construction, it should be required. There are now cases of auto-immune disorder, cancer, lymphoma in adults who grew up in the flight path whose whole households are similarly affected who have only one environmental factor in common, exposure to emissions and noise from Sea-Tac Airport. Finally, FAA is able to extend the plateau to place the wall far enough away from the runway for safety

I am outraged by the lack of informed consent the population has been given. Risk has been proven. Emissions have been studied.

Higher cancer rates around Sea-Tac have been documented (WDOH 1998-2001). The industry has been injuring citizens of the United States with dangerous chemicals and aware of these risks. The following is an overview of discovery:

- The Port of Seattle and FAA have known since 1969 that people at ground level were being exposed to dangerous levels of toxic emissions from overhead jets. (Commerce Department, Wallace Donaldson)
- In 1973 this risk was analyzed by King County during a study of emissions in neighborhoods. The findings were alarming enough to cause one legislator who had monitoring done in his driveway, to immediately move away. The recommendations from this study included a moratorium on any further development in the area. (ESL, California)
- The serious risks were then discussed extensively in air force jet engine emission testing in the mid 1980's. (AirRisk)
- In 1991 DOE modeled emissions and reported they were "surprised" by the high rates of emissions in the neighborhoods around the airport.
- In 1993 both a short-term monitoring around Sea-Tac and a risk analysis by EPA in Chicago confirmed a cancer risk to adjacent communities from jet operations. (McCulley Frick & Gilman/EPA Midway Airport)
- In 1995 the airport EIS for the expansion program could not be approved because of modeled exceedances of the federal air quality standards.
- In 1996 NRDC found that airports in major cities across the US were contributing some of the highest rates of emissions compared to steel mills, refineries and incinerators. (Flying Off Course)
- In 1998 DOE discovered Sea-Tac operations were contributing the highest annual regional level of NO₂ ever recorded.
- In 2004 NESCAUM reported that aviation emissions of ozone precursors have gone up by 133% from 1978 to 1998 when compared to automobiles and industry risking by 3% or less in the same time period.
- In 2008 DOE found jet operations at Sea-Tac were contributing 22% of the King County total of greenhouse gas emissions, the single highest contributing facility at 4.3 mmty in the county.

I have attended the meeting times and places of the Part 150 process and continued to request this noise wall/berm mitigation. During the pre Part 150 period, a community representative Stuart Jenner took noise readings in the community and found that noise events to the west of the airport in Burien were above the threshold triggering the need for mitigation.

There are two major problems with the Part 150 process and the way FAA and airport sponsors handle impacts and mitigation:

1) **Mitigation should be done before the impacts occur.**

FAA knows full well what the impacts will be and who those impacts would affect. This foresight was included in the EIS in 1995 when they first offered to buy homes in the new flight path to the north and south of the 3rd runway. The consultant, at the direction of the Port and FAA inadequately informed and knowingly misled the public as to the use of the third runway to minimize the true impacts. Noise is an environmental hazard to health and welfare. Residents waiting for the Part 150 process to run its course have now been harmed by this

intrusion into their lives for 5 years and have accrued damages. Additionally, FAA has failed to warn these people in the flight paths about the known risks to their health of extremely fine particulates, soot, black carbon, air toxics, etc., from jet engine emissions overhead. These emissions are expected to have a ground level impact and human health impact for 12 miles from the runway end on approach. Again, no warnings of possible health impacts have been given to the unsuspecting public by the offending industry. When defending themselves, the industry claims these impacts are no different than that of trucks, busses and cars. This is false and misleading. The emissions from jets are far more harmful, at much higher rates and these extremely dangerous particles and toxic constituents are sprayed on the population like crop dusting. Children playing outside under this blanket of toxins are the most at risk.

2) The process itself is flawed and biased.

There is far too much emphasis placed on cost. For instance, the hush-house has been discussed for over 20 years. Each time the FAA determines it is either too expensive or not needed enough to warrant the cost. Cost should never be the primary determinant factor for mitigating environmental hazards caused by an industry. The use of this reasoning has not afforded any consideration for other industry compliance with the law.

The process is biased because other airports in the United States have hush-houses. If they are needed there, they are needed everywhere run-ups occur. There are significant noise and emission impacts that can be minimized by its use.

An agency holds all the cards at the table. People have to beg for basic humane treatment that should be regulated by an outside source like EPA. Since FAA is in charge of evaluating their own impacts, measuring at their own discretion and writing the regulations they will abide by, victims of operational impacts can be and are abused. Most people are unaware that airports are not subject to the same rules as other industries. Airports are exempted from air quality regulations and at the same time are one of the largest producers of dangerous emissions. If one airport has a 64,000 acre buffer from noise and emissions (DIA) and another has an 18,000 acre buffer where mitigation for noise impacts occurs outside that buffer (DFW) then that should be the standard for all airports. Sea-Tac's entire noise remedy area is less than either of these. If one airport (Dulles) has a nighttime curfew then all airports should have them. FAA has been running the program in a way that discriminates between states and therefore, discriminates between citizens of the United States where some people are granted a better quality of life. This process is subjective and arbitrary based more on power-brokering than on what is best for the health and welfare of citizens.

In conclusion, in my opinion, airports and FAA continuing to ignore these facts, dispelling risk, downplaying danger, and failing to warn the public is an injustice.

Debi Wagner
aviationjustice.org

6/6/13

Airplane Noise in South Seattle

Airplane Noise in South Seattle

McCormick, Scott [Scott.McCormick@pccsea.com]

Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2013 6:17 PM

To: SEAPart150 Comments

4-21-13 I am very concerned about the impact of the increased airplane traffic over South Seattle. Planes are constantly flying over my house creating a disturbing level of noise that disrupts our household environment every couple of minutes. This affects my sleep and when I am awake. This recent and sudden degradation of my neighborhood is not acceptable.

2-11 Please return aircraft departures to their previous corridors further west as per historical patterns and agreements by the Port with the No-Right_Turn decision 10 years ago and expand landing corridor options to allow for more equitable impact across all Seattle neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Scott McCormick

To: Rob Adams

Fax Number: 1-513-530-2201

Date: 5/29/13

From: Tanya Engeset

E-Mail: tanyate@hotmail.com

Direct Line : 206-243-3456

Number of pages including cover: 2

Regarding: Hush House

HUSH HOUSE

Port officials,

This paragraph is taken from Eric Mathison's column on 'Comment period---' in the Highline Times:

"The draft report also calls for evaluating the feasibility, possible locations, costs and impacts of building a ground run-up enclosure---"

2.7 Surely, in 25 years this is ready to be built! We invited an airport employee to a meeting to explain about a hush house in 1988. I was not affected by noise until 1991. It was horrific. That must have been the year you cut down all the trees.

It is imperative you build a hush house! This would help all of us who are outside, and have always been outside, your noise contours.

Remember, we were here first.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion,
Tanya Engeset, Burien.

Part 150 Comments

From Stuart Jenner
200 SW 178th Street
Normandy Park, WA 98166

May 30, 2013

I attended several of the workshops for the Seattle – Tacoma International Airport Part 150 process and have read the draft Part 150 report. Here are my overall comments, overall questions and then specific comments and questions.

Overall Comments

This process has been frustrating and disappointing.

6.6 In 2008, when the Port and FAA announced the use of the third runway from bad weather only to all weather, the response was always “we will address the noise in the upcoming Part 150 process.” Well, here we are. I look at the map showing the location of the noise complaints, and then the location of the contour maps that define “noise impacted areas eligible for mitigation.” There are far more complaints from locations outside the lines than from those inside the lines. A hush house, if built, may provide some assistance in reducing noise but otherwise there’s no help at all for people who live outside of the area defined by the noise – makers as the “noise impacted area.” This seems like a scam: the polluter gets to define what the polluted area is!

3.9 This process has also been exasperating because many of the comments and suggestions people had were not addressed with specific analyses. The assessment of the noise walls and berms in the report may be good enough for government work, but I highly doubt any grad student would get a passing grade if they did the type of assessment used to dismiss a request for noise walls from a former lead pilot for a major carrier, who presumably knows a thing or two about what works at reducing noise.

2.14 My own request for a different type of noise mitigation was completely ignored. I even find it in one of the appendices, but nowhere is there a discussion of the idea. To repeat what I’d handed in at the initial kickoff meeting to Margaret Norton Arnold: the idea is to put noise absorbing materials on the current walls that are at the north end of Seatac, and possibly walls at the west and south sides, and also, put some type of dampening material on the walls of the airport buildings. Instead of those walls reflecting noise, they would absorb it.

6.8 One of the oddest things about the Seatac Part 150 is the lengthy delay of communication to the community and to local electeds. Between summer 2011 and spring 2013, there was a gap of nearly two years with zero notice of what was happening.

6.9 One final element is the utter passiveness of the report. There is no evidence of proactivity at reducing noise at the source. For example, there is a forecast of additional night time flights. Those are the major source of noise. How about if the Part 150 would say "this is what could happen, and this is what we will do to make it really, really noticeable to whoever would operate this flight that it is annoying, irritating, noisy – how about it you operate it instead during day time hours?"

The Bottom Line

I realize this is a necessary process in order to get money from the FAA to help address the noise problems caused by operating airports in a residential neighborhood. I realize the statue does not have anything related to air pollution.

Yet:

6.10 Will this process actually going to make any difference for people who are impacted by airport noise, especially if they live outside the area you say is "impacted"?

If the purpose of this report is only to help people in a 65 dnl contour as determined by measurements , then what process will help everyone else?

When I look at pages 23– 28 of the 456 page PDF, I see lots of requirements with a "yes". Conspicuously missing though is this simple question: what programs are going to reduce noise?

A second set of questions has to do with the timing of the report and data used:

There has been a nearly two year gap since the last communication to the public. Why is the report and program implementation so far behind schedule?

6.8 Also I wonder if the lag is so great that some of the data is no longer relevant on which the report was based. The temporary noise monitors were set up a very long time ago. Most of the data used ends in 2011 or even 2010. For example, pages 62 and 65 have flight operations and passenger data through 2011, but not 2012. I even noted some instances when the "future tense" is used for events that supposedly would happen in 2012.

Why the lag between the report authorship? Why isn't the data up to date?

2.15 A third question is what is the timing of measures to reduce noise. For example, "Measure M-2b: Insulation of Schools " on page 89 mentions that noise mitigation is in process for schools. Fyi: Highline does not have enough bonding ability to pay for its share of the schools any time soon. When the noise agreement was signed between the

2.15

Port, the FAA, and Highline School District, the State of Washington was supposed to kick in money also. Well, per email in the last week, no one is planning on this happening going forward, and I can't find any answer of how much the state has actually kicked in. Reading the Part 150 would lead one to a far rosier point of view than is actually the case.

Specific Comments

7.13

1. I disagree that people who rent are less impacted by noise than people who live in a condo. Condo owners want to turn a profit when they sell. "Measure M-2c: Multi-Family Developments" on page 90 ignores the social justice reality that apartment renters tend to be poorer than non renters.

2. Exhibit 1-9 with the information about the number of noise complaints is quite interesting. There appear to be many complaints that are not inside the boundaries of 65/70/75 dNL.

A request for the report is to produce a chart with both the number of complaints and the contour lines, then create a table showing how many locations of people filing complaints are outside of the boundaries.

I think we would see the majority of sites complaining are located outside the contour lines. Do these people get any improvements in noise impacts? It would be interesting to compare. Also, why does the data only run through May 2011?

6.7

I would also suggest graphing the individual types of complaints. For example, what can we tell about the fuel smell complaints: where were they, what time of day, etc? 173, which is 1% of the 17,330 complaints logged, may be enough to show some real issues that should be examined more closely.(page 101 is the source of 1%).

3. Exhibit 1-11 seems designed to "dumb down" night time noise complaints. It should be feasible to graph when the complaints that were reported actually occurred, not just when the complaints were filed.

Exhibit 1-14 also seems designed to dumb down the noise complaints. There have been plenty of complaints from areas outside of the study area. Are there any compatibility issues in these areas? Could someone build a mobile home park for example in the areas of Federal Way that have complained about airport noise? (Steel Lake, Marine Hills). The impacted area seems too small.

6.17

The forecasts of future growth are quite interesting. Was this the same methodology used to justify the third runway? One oddity is seeing, in April 2013,

6.17 "Two additional weekly non-stop flights to Latin America are forecast to be in place by 2011 using narrow-body jet aircraft" .

This section appears a few years out of date. I read about two forecasted daily flights to Haneda "in 2012." Well, here it is 2013 and we don't have 14 flights a week to Haneda! Or even one. So, is this forecast based on current data? It appears not. While the lack of these flights means less noise, it makes me wonder just how carefully the Part 150 study has been proof-read, and whether maybe there are some other omissions or dated material that are going to result in problems for us later that no one wants us to see now.

More specifics:

Page 161: if flights can be forecast out to 2021, why can't airport noise be forecast to at least that year, as opposed to 2018?

Page 166: here's another "forecast" that appears to be three years out of date: "decrease from 154 seats in 2009 to 150 in 2010"

Page 170: did this happen: " In 2010, Northwest/Delta is replacing all of the A330-200 aircraft from its international fleet at Sea-Tac Airport with A330-300 and B767 aircraft."

Page 176: I am very surprised by the drop in air cargo. What is going on? And how could a drop of 3.3 percent per year for several years suddenly turn around and start growing by 2.1 percent starting in 2009?

7.14 I have no idea what is driving the air cargo market, and there's nothing in the report to say why cargo would increase except that Boeing says it will. We need to look carefully at the makeup of cargo: what components are dropping? Is this somehow related to a specific market sector, for example, the transition of software to being downloaded instead of being shipped out on a DVD?

Earlier in the report there was a snide comment about how growth in GDP would not be correlated to a drop in air traffic, but actually maybe there is some logic to this assertion: increased income leads to increased use of advanced technology (web casts, web conferencing etc) and similarly growth in GDP leads to increased consumption of intangibles, not items shipped as air cargo. Maybe the drop is due to post office issues.

It would also be very interesting to know if any of the drop in air cargo is on flights at one time of the day vs another. If there's a drop in night time air cargo flights, the noise disruption during the night could be much improved. This is another reason to segment the air cargo traffic and figure out what is going on.

Page 187: the comparison of actual vs forecast stops in 2009.

7.14 Pages 191 and 192: the data tables raise an interesting question: are we actually trying to reduce noise during the night? Look at Table 2009 Average Annual Day Departures. At the 4, 5 and 6 am hours, there are 2 All Cargo Departures per hour. In 2018, there are 2, 3 and 3 departures during those same early morning hours. In 2021, there are 3, 3 and 3 departures. WHY THE INCREASE??? WHAT'S THE NOISE IMPACT??? Is this increase occurring despite the efforts of the Port to reduce noise? Or is it occurring because the Port is trying to recruit more air cargo in the belief that it fosters economic development. (Whether it does is hard to know, it depends on what the break out is of the cargo. Some cargo generates a lot more jobs than other). I notice a similar trend with night time international departures.

6.18 Sections 3.3.1 – 3.3.4 seem written in a way to dumb down noise impacts. The reality is: some people are a lot more bothered than others. The question should not just be “what is typical”, but rather “what can help the people who are outliers in the way they are impacted by noise?” I read in 2011 in the Wall Street Journal about a study done in Germany. I see no reference of this study in the Part 150 report. Maybe 2011 was too late for it to be included, given how much of the data used ends in 2009. But anyways, here is the study:

<http://www.research-in-germany.de/news-archive-january-2011/58898/2011-01-11-why-we-wake-up-the-impact-of-traffic-noise-on-sleep-patterns,sourcePageId=66914.html>

I found a reference to this study that is worth noting as well. I thought the Part 150 at Seatac was supposed to review new noise study impacts, but I do not see any references in the Seatac Part 150 to these studies. In this sense, the Seatac Part 150 has fundamentally failed in one of its supposed key objectives.

<http://www.noiseandhealth.org/article.asp?issn=1463-1741;year=2012;volume=14;issue=61;spage=297;epage=302;aulast=Hume>

excerpt:

6.18

Noise policy and legislation are most often based on average noise levels (like L DEN or L night). Obviously, a lot of information about traffic noise patterns and sound levels of individual vehicles is lost in this process. [1] A noise protection concept based on single aircraft noise events that explicitly limits the number of additional awakenings induced by aircraft noise was first published in 2006 and is used at airport Leipzig/Halle. [13] The concept has recently been adopted by Zurich airport [14] and Frankfurt airport, [15] where additional awakenings are used in the framework of noise effect indices. These indices are noise assessment instruments that express the effect of aircraft noise either as a figure that equals the amount of people that are relevantly affected by the noise, or, in the case of night noise, the total number of awakening reactions elicited. Also, more complex Markov state transition models that can be used to predict the effect of different traffic patterns on sleep structure, not just awakenings, were recently published. [16] The authors showed that high traffic volumes during the shoulder hours of the day are detrimental for people who go to or have to go to bed either early or late (e.g., children, shift workers).

7.18

The Part 150 for Seatac refers to a FICAN study of 1997. I read in the Noise and Health article that Fican has published some research since then.

“This focus was broadened in 2009 at Euronoise in Edinburgh and Inter-noise in Ottawa where an International Forum on Aircraft Noise Impacts was held and further developed with Annual Research Roadmap Meetings in Washington in 2010 and 2011 (see www.fican.org/faaworkshop.html for details). “

2.16

Page 223 has another one of those annoyingly dated references. Has anything happened on stage 3 since 2010? “No action had been taken by the

end of 2010 to establish a phase out schedule for Stage 3 aircraft.” The page later mentions Dec 2011, but this still is over a year old, and again raises the question of whether the report has been adequately proof-read.

1.1

Page 230 and vicinity has a lengthy defense of DnL and of 65 dBA as a threshold for problems. The Noise and Health paper mentions

A further review funded by the Partnership Program in the US and Canada concluded that aircraft noise can cause sleep fragmentation which can involve increases in the number and length of awakenings, reduced slow wave (SWS) and rapid eye movement (REM) sleep, and increased heart rate and blood pressure, reduced subjective sleep quality, increased sleepiness and annoyance, but only a small effect on performance next day

The source is footnote 40. "Swift H. A review of the literature related to potential health effects of aircraft noise. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Insititute of Technology; 2010"

Since this is from 2010, maybe it is too late to be included in this Part 150?

6.5 Page 236 has a table showing noise levels at the monitoring stations. I had previously asked how it was possible for a location that is literally a stone's throw from the edge of Puget Sound, site H, to have a very high level of community noise and a very low level of aircraft noise despite being a close to Seatac and far from the normal sources of noise, such as roads. (Highway 509 is quite a distance away). I had asked one of the experts at a workshop if perhaps there was a lawn mower running continuously for the entire length of the study (July 2 – 5, 2010) that was close enough to cause a reading of 60.8? The expert was not sure what would cause such a high level of background noise. I see in the footnotes a mention of the rain on Vashon that threw off the noise meter readings there (the rain landed on a hot tub cover and was quite loud), but no discussion of whether the reading at Site H shows that just perhaps there were some other problems with the noise measurement as well. While Normandy Park does have fireworks, these are typically only loud between 8 pm and midnight on July 4. This is four hours out of 63 hours the meter was set up.

6.20 INM Flight tracks – south flow – page 151 – shows several flight tracks over Normandy Park from the third runway. I believe these are new since the third runway opened. I would like to request Part 150 include a comparison of flight tracks before and after the third runway opened.

I would also like to see a comparison table of Table 3-10 of actual vs forecasted in the third runway planning documents, specifically the EIS main parts (not some random footnote no one was told about).

6.21 It is impossible to compare the flight track data of forecast vs current with the way the data is set up. I would request a comparison of large jets. Where is large jet usage going to increase? Why? What are you going to do about that increase?

6.22 Page 304- futures – all depends on whether the data used was correct. As noted above, there seem to be a lot of assumptions about what "would" happen in 2010-2012, but no

6.22

actual checking for all of the years. So, I have very little confidence the estimates on page 304 are current.

2.14

Table 5-1 summarizes many of the suggestions citizens submitted. It did not include my request for noise insulation to be placed on airport buildings, such as the central terminal. These noise absorbing materials would block reverberations of noise off the terminal buildings.

6.24

Hush House – page 363 – shows A, B and D. Where is site C?

Page 375 – the “drawback” seems to be from the Port’s point of view. They seem to be upset they give but don’t get any “consideration” in return. Ahem. Shouldn’t any drawbacks be from the standpoint of the person who is getting the reduced noise? The drawbacks include the cost of electricity to run the air conditioning, and possibly other items as well. What type of warranty does the equipment have and will the homeowner have to replace it when it wears out? Here is the comment:

3.10

“The residences that might be included in this program are already considered to be compatible with aircraft noise by virtue of their inclusion in the sound attenuation program in past years. Homeowners would not be providing any consideration for the cost of installing new equipment.”

I disagree with the conclusion. You can live in a noise insulated house according to someone’s standards, but if the house is all sealed up on a hot summer day, IT IS NOT HABITABLE. The \$100K cost for a pilot is laughably small.

7.15

On page 377 (Page 5-35), I would like to request the Port lobby the legislature to modify RCW 53.54.030(5) from “one time” to “one time in 10 years”. I read the Port is making oodles of money with the new parking structure and with the shops in the main terminal. These funds could be used to help with the cost of replacing worn out noise insulation.

6.11

I somehow had the impression the Part 150 would be looking at further out years than one that is just five years away. I thought there was at least a 10 year time horizon. Five years is "blink of an eye".

Appendix A: Public Involvement Plan

This plan certainly looks reasonable, but the reality is quite different. Reading the plan, we see the final technical review committee was supposed to be in August 2011. Instead, we're probably looking at July or August of 2013, two years late. Why the delay?

Public involvement is wonderful when citizens feel they are heard and when their input is actually incorporated into the questions that are asked, as well as on the margins. However, my sense is most citizens did not feel they got straight answers. Their cynicism towards the FAA and the Port has certainly not been reduced by the Part 150 process.

6.12

One thing that would have helped is better "feedback loops." I attended several workshops where the surveys did not get to everyone, and those who did tended to ignore them, because the way the workshops were handled made them think it was a waste of time to fill out responses.

I have no illusion that writing these comments will change anything about the current Part 150 process. I do hope that at some point Congressional Staffers will take a closer look as a part of an overall review of the FAA, or that these comments may be helpful to the Inspector General of the FAA.

My suggestion would be to have a third party research company conduct a survey of all people who have attended Part 150 meetings. It would be very interesting to know how many describe the process as excellent or very good. My guess is 10 – 20% of attendees might give this response.

It is not just citizens who have been in the dark for the past two years. Several times, I contacted city officials who were in the Highline Forum or who were listed as Local City Contacts. They were in the dark as much as I was, that is, they had zero updates from the Port, FAA or consultants.

Appendix B

2.14

I participated in Group 14 with Margaret Norton Arnold. I see the summary includes some of the ideas I handed in writing to the moderator. Much to my frustration, my suggestion of adding noise absorbing material to existing materials was completely ignored in the review of options included in the main report. The review did refute the noise wall idea. I have no idea whether the refutation in the main document is a typical Port job of creating a straw man then demolishing it, or whether it is actually based on facts about how noise absorbing walls actually need to be built. I flew into Zurich's airport a year ago and they did seem to have noise absorbing walls around their airport that were not super high and super distant from the runway.

Unfortunately, there seems to have been an attitude of 'let's find reasons to kill the idea', not 'let's find a way to make things actually work.'

Many other specific comments listed in the QA as well as in the summary comments were ignored or not specifically addressed.

Overall, I feel like citizens are no further along:

- 6.10 --people who don't live inside the 65 dnL contour as defined by the Port and FAA apparently get zero help in reducing noise or in dealing with the impact of airport noise
- 3.10 --people who are hiring a contractor for windows work have zero guidance of what to look for, and how to tell whether windows or good or not
- 3.10 --people who have had port windows packages fail are on their own, as far as I can tell.
- 6.7 --people who are trying to find out how much incremental noise is associated with a given activity and ask that the Port consider that incremental noise in its decision making get no help at all. For example, the tables of increased night time flights do not show what the noise impact of those increases would be.

Conclusion

I hope future Part 150s are not a miserable failure the way this one has been. It uses dated information, uses data that is dubious (site H for example) to support the noise contour model which in turn makes the models suspect, makes lots of dubious assertions, ignores many citizen comments, presents data in a way that is difficult to understand and dumbs down airport noise impacts, takes a passive approach, not a proactive one, to actually reducing airport noise, and appears very unlikely to have a positive impact at actually making people's lives better.