

April 14, 2020 public comment Regarding item 6f on the April 14, 2020, PoS
Commissioner's meeting

Hello, I'm Bernedine Lune, resident of Federal Way and member of QSPS and 350
Seattle

The large downturn in aviation over the last two months has an unknown timeline for recovery. It does not seem the time to advocate for a \$4 million contract for capital improvements, even when no money is committed. Any actions you take to change or improve the airport appears to be preparing it for more growth.

History shows that companies that depend on unlimited growth are not sustainable. They can run out of resources, be overtaken by other businesses, or be harmful to their own staff, customers, and the public. This happened to the tobacco and asbestos industries, is currently happening to industries such as the oil and gas industries. And it has already started with the airline industry. Noise and use of leaded fossil fuel for small aircraft and pollution caused by jet engines are already having a negative impact on the population and on the climate change. Biofuels are also not sustainable as a fuel substitute with continued growth.

To add to the issue of pollution and noise, some industries, such as Boom industries, are looking to reintroduce supersonic flights as evidenced by the FAA's streamlining of supersonic applications (see <https://nbaa.org/aircraft-operations/airspace/faa-heads-toward-development-supersonic-flight-regulations/> and personal comments submitted Aug 2019 to FAA in response to the proposed changes) and an FAA Press Release on 3-30-2020 titled "Supersonic Aircraft Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" to add landing and takeoff noise standards for a certain class of new supersonic airplanes (see https://www.faa.gov/news/press_releases/news_story.cfm?newsId=24796&fbclid=IwAR2PYTzRIHMAgyRdIrQGxR32itl4afov2QT2FZEhagsPrpW8OGfqPHhPejI

Aviation needs to look for alternatives to increasing the number of flights. There are many talented and innovative in the aviation industry and they could be asked to look at ways to reduce the need for the flights. One web site 'www.aviationJustice.com' lists several alternatives to flights, including:

- Teleconferencing, examples include Skype and Zoom (Zoom not Boom has been suggested as a catchy phrase support Zoom)
- Express Buses
- High Speed Rail, including Hyperlink, as is being developed in the mid-west, India, and China
- Amtrak – if as much money had been spent on Amtrak as on airports, runways, etc. for the aviation industry, Amtrak would be safer and better used.
- Slow Travel

Rather than spending millions of dollars on further enhancements to SeaTac, you could be using the money to plan for alternative methods of travel. The airport facilities have the space and technology to become a hub for these different types of connecting people. Just look at all that has happened to replace flights in just 1-2 months. Business that currently support the airlines and change to also support the new activities.

Posted on FAA Website in response to request to review FAA's proposed Special Flight Authorizations for Supersonic Aircraft

8-19-2019

Phillip and Bernedine Lund, Federal Way, WA 98003

We are opposed to the FAA's proposed Special Flight Authorizations for Supersonic Aircraft.

By streamlining the application process for supersonic flight, the FAA is suggesting to that developing supersonic flights is an acceptable endeavor. It is not. Excessive noise has already been identified as one of the major health hazards in our modern world. Adding supersonic noise in a testing phase is irresponsible. Instead, the FAA should be saying that supersonic flight should not be undertaken. For this reason we are also opposed to removing the provision to "require public protection from 'measurable' sonic boom." (See pg 30964, 2nd column.)

The NPRM for FAA-2019-0451 also states that aircraft "speeds slightly above Mach 1 are often the least fuel-efficient and may have the most negative effects on an aircraft." The statement indicates that you are more concerned about the well being of the aircraft than you are of the people who will have to live with the noise and emissions from the 'least fuel efficient' flights.

The previous attempts at supersonic flight were not successful because there were directed primarily at the wealthy. It seems that the FAA's streamlining of supersonic transport is aimed at making it easier for development of transport that the majority of people will not be able to afford, but these same people on the ground will have to pay for with exposure to excessive noise, further emissions, and changes in climate.

The FAA has to be aware that aircraft flights are the fastest growing source of emissions contributing to global warming. Rather than looking for ways to increase flights, the FAA should be working with the Dept of Transportation to look at other modes of transportation. For example, trains can transport people at 10% of the cost of aircraft. If as much money had been directed towards trains, including hyperloop trains, we would be much further along with reducing transportation emissions.

Finally, we and our local communities no longer trust the FAA given the disaster of the FAA's NextGen implementation. Starting about 3 years ago, we started to have flights over our house. Using data the local airport has posted on its website, we find that in July 2019, there were 16,000 flights registered on a noise monitor 0.22 miles from our house. That is about 500 flights a day or 1 aircraft every 2 minutes for 16.5 hours a day. In addition, the FAA had not completed the development of a new noise measure as directed in the 2018 FAA Reauthorization bill.

Overall the FAA has not been honest nor transparent with the public about the costs of flying, and it is primarily the non-flying public that is paying the costs.

cc: US Representative Adam Smith