



The Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP)  
 10 SAMPLE QUESTIONS AND RELATED SCOPING REQUESTS

→ NAME of ORGANIZATION

Welcome to the SAMP scoping meeting! We're providing a list of sample questions – questions we certainly have for the Port of Seattle. Ask the Port personnel these, or any questions you want. We also want to make sure YOUR voice is heard. If you want the subject matter of any of these questions included in the scope of the environmental review, for each question we've added a related sample "scoping request." Just initial any request you want, sign at the bottom, and find QSPS volunteers will collect and provide them as a matter of public record to the Port.

QUESTION	COMMENT	SCOPE REQUEST	INITIAL
<b>Why No Study of What's Already Happened?</b> How does Port intend to study the human health and environmental impacts of the 97,000 new flights already added in last four years?	Four-year increase raised annual overflight total from 316,000 to 413,000.	Please include a complete assessment of the human health and environmental impacts, including from noise and emissions, resulting from the additional 97,000 aircraft overflight operations growth from the last four years.	MA
<b>Why No Study of Your Own Long-Term Plan?</b> Why not study of the human health and environmental impacts of the Long-Term Vision anticipated to begin when capacity is reached in 2027?	SAMP Executive Summary; Port's own consultant says long term study is "key." But Port's will not be studying total growth plans for potential harms.	Please include a complete assessment of the human health and environmental impacts resulting from additional aircraft overflight operations for the Port's post-SAMP Long Term Vision projects and Century Agenda growth plans.	MA
<b>Adequate Geography?</b> Will Port study unique human health and environmental impacts from aircraft noise and emissions, in all of the six south-end airport neighbor cities?	The Port has not committed to study all of Des Moines, Federal Way, Burien, Tukwila, Normandy Park, and SeaTac.	Please include a complete study of all of the human health and environmental impacts for all of Des Moines, Federal Way, Burien, Tukwila, Normandy Park, and SeaTac, resulting from aircraft overflights, from 2013-present; for the Near-Term Projects; and for Long Term Projects.	MA
<b>Use Current Science?</b> Will Port review all studies from around world relating to human health and environment impacts from aircraft noise and pollution?	Studies around the world now exist on harms and potential harms from aircraft noise and emissions.	Please include all studies (worldwide) from at least the last ten years, to the extent such studies explore, find, suggest, or hypothesize any association, correlation, causation, or other potential linkage between aircraft overflights and impacts on human health or the environment.	MA

<b>Wait For Pending New Science?</b> Why is Port proceeding without waiting for the results of the pending studies in the State of Washington directly relating to Sea-Tac Airport?	Regional studies underway, include ultra-fine particle study from UW and the airport mitigation study from Department of Commerce.	Please include a review and assessment of the results of critical Sea-Tac Airport studies now underway before proceeding with the environmental review for the SAMP.	CA
<b>Sensitive populations?</b> Are you studying the unique impacts of aircraft noise on elderly citizens and children?	Studies have found risk of harm to elderly citizens and children from aircraft noise.	Please include a complete assessment of the unique human health impacts from noise on elderly citizens and children.	CA
<b>What About Overnight Flights?</b> Will Port collect and assess global scientific studies relating to impacts from <i>overnight</i> flights noise?	Studies have concluded increased risk of human harm from overnight flight noise.	Please include a complete scientific study review and assessment of the unique human health impacts from noise from overnight flights.	CA
<b>Unique - Full Time 3<sup>rd</sup> Runway Use.</b> How will Port separately assess the impacts of the full-time usage of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Runway?	Despite historical statements, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Runway now full-time.	Please include a complete study of the unique human health and environmental impacts from the exponential increase in overflights over neighborhoods beneath and near the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Runway.	CA
<b>What if Your Projections Are Wrong?</b> How are you accounting for the impact if your estimates of growth are too low?	SAMP Executive Summary inaccurate; est. 398,910 flights by 2019; we are at 413,000 now.	To determine the risks of error in Port projections, please include a study of the health and environmental impacts from increased aircraft operations that exceed estimated Near Term Operations.	CA
<b>Regional Airport Now?</b> Are you studying the benefits of a regional airport?	The Port has refused to join calls for siting a regional airport now.	Please include a study of the benefits to human health and the environment in the six airport neighbor cities if growth is more fairly distributed throughout the entire region.	CA

**Please include the requests I have initialed above in the scope of the SAMP environmental review. Deadline for commenting September 28<sup>th</sup> 2018.**

Name: Carla Anderson Signature: Carla Anderson

Address: 12640 12<sup>th</sup> Ave So. Sea WA 98168

E-mail: rambleron2017@gmail.com

Submit form on your own/add comments at: [SAMP@portseattle.org](mailto:SAMP@portseattle.org)

comment submitted was reviewed, summarized, and identified with a Comment Topic from one of the categories above.

For example, Comment S3-1 was "Concerned about increased flights and air emissions as a result of the proposed action." This issue was commented on by numerous individuals in both written and oral testimony. This comment is directly related to the scope of the environmental review process for SAMP so it is denoted with an 'S'. Additionally, it focuses on the broader topic of Air Quality, which is denoted by the '3'. In every written or oral comment, this specific comment is identified as S3-1 and is addressed in the response to Topic 3 – Air Quality/Climate.

Agencies and organizations that submitted comments were given a unique alpha identifier before the comment number. For example, Comment PS-1 was submitted by Puget Sound Regional Council, and Comment AA-1 was submitted by Alaska Airlines. There were 12 agencies and organizations that submitted written comments, and their unique alpha identifiers are as follows:

<b>Comment Identification</b>	<b>Agency/Organization</b>
AA	Alaska Airlines
CST	City of SeaTac
DM	City of Des Moines
DoE	State of Washington, Department of Ecology
ECR	El Centre de la Raza
EPA	US Environmental Protection Agency
FW	City of Federal Way
JC	Joint City Comments (Des Moines, Burien, Normandy Park, and Sea-Tac)
PS	Puget Sound Regional Council
ST	Sound Transit
TU	City of Tukwila
WSD	Washington State Department of Transportation

Written and oral comments appear in the following order:

Agency and organization comments

Public comments

- Handed in at public scoping meeting, provided through oral testimony, emailed, or mailed
- Online comments
- Fight the Flight form letter
- Vashon Island Fair Skies form letter

This summary includes agency, organization and individual comments that were received during the Scoping period. The Scoping period extended from July 30, 2018 to September 28, 2018 and included four public meetings, one agency/organization meeting, and an online open house. In total, 344 people

attended the public meetings. The Port and FAA received approximately 760 comments from the public, agencies and organizations regarding the SAMP Near Term Projects environmental review. One hundred thirty-three comment sheets were handed in and 43 people provided oral testimony at the public meetings. An additional 141 comments were submitted online through the Online Open House. Fight the Flight and Vashon Island Fair Skies also created form letters for individuals to submit, with 360 and 16 respectively emailing or mailing those to the Port. In addition to the public comment, 12 agencies/organizations submitted written comments to the Port and the FAA.

Below is an index of commenters with their comment codes. Following that is a matrix of topical comments, along with responses to the most common comments.



Quiet Skies <quietskiespugetsound@gmail.com>

---

## SAMP Public Comment Scoping

1 message

---

**Quiet Skies** <quietskiespugetsound@gmail.com> — *from*  
To: samp@portseattle.org, ramblinon2017@gmail.com

Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 4:13 PM

Dear Mr. Steve Rybolt,

Please accept the public comments attached by Ms. Carla Anderson of Burien, Wa, regarding the NEPA EA/SEPA EIS SAMP 2018 Scoping Comment Review. Per the Port of Seattle's website, email of public comment to this address is one of the 4 acceptable ways of filing.

We believe the 10 comments below pertains to "Are There Other Impacts We Should Be Looking At"? As stated on the Port of Seattle's own online comment form.

Should us forwarding comments on behalf of Ms. Anderson be deemed unacceptable, please reply to all in this email chain immediately as to your reasons why.

Kind Regards,

Quiet Skies Puget Sound  
Team Member

---

 **Scoping\_Comment\_Carla\_Anderson.pdf**  
1784K