

# THE BRIEFING

THE BRIEFING YOU ASKED FOR BUT DID NOT RECEIVE –  
IN TWO MINUTE PUBLIC COMMENTS

PORT OF SEATTLE COMMISSION MEETING  
MAY 8, 2018  
STEVE EDMISTON

## Episode 6 – What Went Wrong, Part III

1. The mitigation boundary slight of hand:
  - Pay no attention to how we spend our \$72 million tax levy, it's not the federal money you're looking for.
2. Failing to turn in your homework – is the noise abatement program \$1.5 billion behind?
3. NextGen – all the burdens, none of the benefits.
4. Is a noise briefing on community impacts, with no discussion of community impacts, a briefing at all?

## **THE BRIEFING EPISODE 6 – WHAT WENT WRONG, III**

Thank you. I'm Steve Edmiston. I'm the creator of The Briefing Project. I'm here to continue the briefing this Commission asked for but did not receive last year on the impacts of NextGen and increased community overflights.

Today I'll conclude what went wrong with your staff's noise briefing. Your staff addressed six topics. I've covered the first three.

To your staff's fourth point was that residential sound mitigation [windows and insulation] only occurs within the Noise Remedy Boundary per FAA eligibility rules. What went wrong is that this perpetuates a relentless Port slight-of-hand: it suggests that the only homes that can receive mitigation are those that inside the boundary. But as even your 2018 budget notes point out, this is not true. The Port is and has always been free to spend its own money, including our \$72 Million annual tax levy, to protect more of the homes outside the boundary that are getting pummeled by increased noise. But the Port chooses not to.

Point five. Credit was claimed for \$400 million spent on Port noise abatement programs since 1985. This is like finding out your child has earned top grades on her homework assignments, but she's failing because she's only turned in half them in. \$400 million is a lot. But isn't the more accurate frame that the Port has spent less than 25% of the \$1.9 billion in mitigation that was estimated in the 1997 SeaTac mitigation study?

Point six. The use of NextGen technology for SeaTac arrivals. Here, it was confirmed that when aircraft are actually over our heads on final approach, they shift to a conventional approach. The problem? This means none of the supposed NextGen benefits apply to us. Over our heads, here is no idle, no gliding, no fuel savings, no emission reduction, no noise reduction. We just get more planes, noise, and emissions.

The ultimate problem with the entirety of your staff's briefing was this: your staff never talked about the potential adverse impacts from NextGen and increased overflights on human health or quality of life. Not once.

Thank you for giving a citizen two minutes to comment.

Item No. 3c supp  
Meeting Date: April 25, 2017

# Noise Programs & NextGen Briefing

Arlyn Purcell, Director Aviation Environmental Services  
Stan Shepherd, Manager Airport Noise Programs  
David Suomi, FAA Deputy Regional Administrator  
Steve Karnes, FAA Senior Technical Advisor



Port   
of Seattle

# Presentation Overview

- Noise Information Hotline
- Increased Operations
- Economic Impacts
- Noise Contours
- Noise Mitigation Programs
- Fight Procedures

# **SEA-TAC INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IMPACT MITIGATION STUDY**

---

**INITIAL ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
FEBRUARY 1997**

**PREPARED UNDER A GRANT FROM  
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR THE:**

**CITY OF BURIEN, WASHINGTON  
CITY OF DES MOINES, WASHINGTON  
CITY OF FEDERAL WAY, WASHINGTON  
CITY OF NORMANDY PARK, WASHINGTON  
CITY OF TUKWILA, WASHINGTON  
HIGHLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT  
HIGHLINE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL**

**PREPARED BY:  
HELLMUTH, OBATA + KASSABAUM, INC. · DALLAS, TEXAS  
RAYTHEON INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES, INC. · DENVER AND PHILADELPHIA**

**IN ASSOCIATION WITH:  
THOMAS/LANE & ASSOCIATES, INC. · SEATTLE, WASHINGTON  
MICHAEL J. MCCORMICK, AICP · OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON**

---

**SEA-TAC INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT  
IMPACT MITIGATION STUDY**

Mitigation of potential impacts was based on the preservation and protection of neighborhood integrity. The consultants conducted an independent investigation into the potential impacts of the proposed project and how these potential impacts could be most appropriately mitigated.

Several other parameters guided this study:

- The basic premise of this study was that the Third Runway project would be constructed. This premise was clearly stipulated in the State grant which states that the funding for the study could not be *"expended directly or indirectly for litigation, public relations, or for any consulting services for the purposes of opposing the construction of the proposed Third Runway"*.
- Neighborhood boundaries were established by each community through their comprehensive planning process.
- The economic importance of Sea-Tac International Airport was never questioned. The Airport is an important economic factor to the Seattle metropolitan area, the Puget Sound Region, and the State of Washington.
- Given the study's budget and schedule, the consultants agreed to utilize as much existing information as possible. No new data was developed as part of this study. Information was primarily taken from the Master Plan Update Environmental Impact Statement, with additional information coming from other agencies including King County, the Puget Sound Regional Council, and various State and Federal agencies.
- The study investigated potential impacts associated with the proposed Third Runway and its associated facility improvements. Mitigation for existing impacts associated with the existing runways and airport operations were not included.

During the course of this study (April 1996 through March 1997), the consultants conducted over 100 meetings, interviews, presentations, workshops, and question-and-answer sessions with: local elected and appointed officials and staff members; the Port of Seattle staff and its consultants; County and State elected officials; representatives from various City, County, State, regional and Federal agencies; and the general public.

**Potential Environmental Impacts**

The study examined 8 general environmental areas and 26 specific potential impacts.

**Potential Environmental Impacts Studied**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Specific Impact</b>
<b>Noise and vibration</b>	LDN SEL Overflights (TA) Vibration
<b>Air quality</b>	Air emissions (aircraft) CO emissions (vehicles) HC emissions (vehicles) Air toxics Fugitive emissions Point source pollution
<b>Surface water quality/hydrology</b>	Runoff volume Erosion and sediment Spills
<b>Ground water quality/hydrology</b>	Aquifer recharge Contamination
<b>Wetlands</b>	Wetlands
<b>Floodplains</b>	Encroachment Reduced flood storage capacity Increased flow rate and volume
<b>Aesthetics and visual</b>	Ground shadow Visibility (aircraft) Visibility (fill)
<b>Other</b>	Special status species habitat Cultural resources Coastal zones DOT Section 4(f) resources

Of these 26 parameters, the consultants estimated the costs of mitigating the potential noise and vibration impacts. These costs are estimated to be approximately \$2.4 billion, which primarily occur in 5 neighborhoods in 2 communities.

**Neighborhoods Identified for Potential Acquisition and Redevelopment**

<b>City</b>	<b>Neighborhoods</b>
<b>Burien</b>	North East
<b>Des Moines</b>	West Central North Central East Central South Des Moines



---

**SEA-TAC INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT  
IMPACT MITIGATION STUDY**

Mitigation of these neighborhoods are estimated to be approximately \$1.9 billion - 80% of the total environmental impacts. These 5 neighborhoods are the closest to the proposed project and will experience significant impacts, due primarily to noise and vibration of aircraft operations. The \$1.9 billion figure represents the cost to relocate neighborhood residents and redevelop the area.

Acquisition and redevelopment is the most far-reaching mitigation measure for these areas, but it will also fundamentally change these neighborhoods. The study recommends that a "specific area plan" be developed for each of these 5 neighborhoods in order to determine if other mitigation measures are appropriate. Acquisition and redevelopment is recommended only if all other mitigation measures are unsuccessful.

For the other communities, it was estimated that Federal Way would require mitigation due to LDN contours and overflights (\$148 million), and that Normandy Park and Tukwila would require mitigation due to LDN and SEL noise, and overflights (\$56 million and \$114 million, respectively). Mitigation in these 3 communities would involve primarily sound abatement insulation and the purchasing of aviation easements.

The study also recommended the replacement or relocation of 8 schools in 3 communities.

**Schools Identified for Potential Replacement or Relocation**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Elementary Schools</b>	<b>Middle Schools</b>	<b>High Schools</b>
<b>Burien</b>	Sunnydale Cedarhurst	(none)	(none)
<b>Des Moines</b>	Midway	Pacific	Mount Rainier
<b>Unincorporated King County</b>	Beverly Park White Center	(none)	Satellite Alternate

Twenty-six other schools in the Highline School District were identified for sound abatement insulation and aviation easements. Costs involved with both the replacement and insulation/easement programs were not estimated by this study. Additional structural studies will be required in order to determine the costs involved with school mitigation.

Given the amount of information available and the project's budget and time constraints, it was not possible to calculate the mitigation costs for potential impacts associated with the remaining environmental measures (wetlands, floodplains, aquifer, air quality, etc.). Additional studies should be commissioned to determine the potential impacts associated with the Airport's proposed project.