

# **Read this, to Start Understanding the 'Greener Skies' Fraud**

Posted on

Click [here](#) to read an interesting article about the 'Greener Skies' program fraudulently pushed by FAA, Port of Seattle (POS), and industry, and approved by FAA in late 2012.

'Greener Skies' was pitched, but it actually never

really happened. David Suomi (now FAA Regional Administrator) admitted as much when doing his 4/25/2017 spiel for the Port of Seattle Commissioners. Conspicuously, 'Greener Skies' was focused ONLY on west-side arrivals. Why? Because if FAA had tried to create similar concentrated arrival streams over Bellevue, the entire proposal would have been killed by the residents below.

'Greener Skies' was supposed to bring enormous impact reductions. The key design element was to flow more than half of all Sea-Tac arrivals in over Elliott Bay, miles from homes, thus with almost no noise impact. Are they doing that, nearly six years later? No, not at all, not even in light traffic, and not even on clear Fall days perfect for flying. Why are the Elliott Bay arrivals so rare? Because the air traffic controllers have to fit all arrivals together, into the final landing flow; i.e., they need to merge both the west flow (especially the HAWKZ arrivals over Vashon Island) and the east flow (the CHINNS downwinds coming up from the southeast entry post near Mt. Rainier, as well as the GLASR feed from the northeast entry post near Leavenworth). The 'Greener Skies' design was fatally flawed, by the simple fact it intentionally DID NOT try to create RNP procedures for all the arrivals on the east side. The net result is kind of like having the tires

# **FAA/Industry's Own Data Exposes 'Greener Skies' as an Environmental Fraud**

Posted on

This Post looks at data in two online documents, presenting further evidence of the 'Greener Skies' fraud that FAA, Port of Seattle, and industry players are foisting on the Public. For all intents and purposes, this is the same fraud

being pushed throughout the U.S., and by industry and as well, under the NextGen label.

The data are at:

- pg.18 of , which states that in 2014, 487.1 million gallons of fuel were pumped at Sea-Tac; and at

- pg.177 of , which claims two figures:

1. Projected average day fuel burn on approaches, with no change: 2.64M lbs
2. Projected average day fuel burn WITH RNAV/RNP changes: 2.61M lbs.

These figures were presented in units (pounds) that make the numbers impressively 'bigger', but also make it harder to intuitively comprehend. To correct this, the figures are converted in this table (to gallons, then to annual consumption):

<b>Fuel burn (lbs)</b>	<b>Converted to gallons</b>	<b>Gallons per year</b>
----------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------

No	2,640,000	388,200	141.7M
Change			
'Greener Skies'	2,610,000	383,800	140.1M
Difference:	30,000	4,400	1.6M
		gal/day	gal/year

So, the proposal is expected to achieve a savings of 1.6 million gallons annually ... at an airport that sold 487.1 million gallons that year. In other words, **this proposed savings is less than one third of one percent of total fuel sold at Sea-Tac**. Now, to the airlines, this (~0.3%) translates to more profits; indeed, the two dominant players at KSEA, Delta and Alaska, might each save around \$1,000,000 per year in fuel. But, the costs shifted onto neighborhoods and health far exceed these added corporate profits.

A little deeper research reveals another interesting fact: the alleged fuel savings of Greener Skies are massively dwarfed by annual increases at an airport scheduling more arrivals than the gates can handle. Here's the data, from page 18 of the 2016 Annual Report for 'Sea-Tac Fuel Facilities LLC', showing year-to-year changes far greater than the comparatively measly 1.6 million gallons saved:

	<b>Gallons Consumed</b>	<b>Year-to-year Change</b>	<b>1.6M as a percentage...</b>
<b>2014</b>	487.1M		
<b>2015</b>	544.8M	57.7 (a 12% increase)	2.8% of increased consumption
<b>2016</b>	586.3M	41.5 (an 8% increase)	3.9% of increased consumption

The improvements are nothing when compared to the consumption growth trend. Here's a chart showing the trends, in both annual fuel consumption and annual operations:

Year	Gallons	Annual Change	Average Annual Change vs 2003	Annual Commercial Ops	Change vs 2003	Average Gallons pumped per departure
2003	437,548,054			17,186		2,546
2004	446,552,918	2.1%	2.1%	18,067	5.1%	2,500
2005	435,993,201	-2.3%	0.4%	19,117	10.5%	2,574
2006	441,414,181	1.2%	0.6%	19,704	14.0%	2,630
2007	454,018,686	2.9%	3.8%	21,339	24.8%	2,657
2008	455,493,807	0.3%	4.1%	21,875	27.0%	2,672
2009	425,577,161	-6.8%	2.6%	20,802	21.4%	2,704
2010	418,119,119	-1.8%	1.8%	21,576	25.6%	2,693
2011	427,873,734	2.3%	2.2%	22,408	30.8%	2,751
2012	427,107,910	-0.2%	2.0%	22,359	30.7%	2,753
2013	451,110,910	5.6%	3.1%	23,236	35.8%	2,877
2014	487,128,110	8.0%	11.3%	24,124	40.9%	2,898
2015	544,806,648	11.8%	24.5%	27,124	58.4%	2,885
2016	586,300,186	7.6%	2.0%	34,075	53.9%	2,867

**NOTE 1: 2016 fuel flowage is 40% higher than 2012.**  
**NOTE 2: 2016 departures are 34% higher than 2012.**

And, here's an analogy: imagine the public view if we were funding a drug-treatment program that was successfully helping 3% of addicts while the number of addicts was growing at

such a huge rate. Would we smile if, for every three treatment successes, there were 97 new addicts? Of course, we would not. Only an idiot (or a con-artist) crows 'success!' about a failure.

Three realities stand out from this:

- A. The enormous sums spent pitching Greener Skies and eventually signing off on the proposal were all framed around being pro-environment. It was a massive marketing/propaganda campaign to get out into the communities, present alleged benefits, pretend to engage people to 'help' identify and resolve problems, all while parading the idea that FAA, POS and industry care deeply about the environment, air quality, climate change, etc. And yet, these numbers show clearly: there were to be no meaningful environmental improvements. FAA, POS and industry players all knew this fact, even before the Greener Skies briefings and publications that wrapped up in 2012. They also knew (and still know!) that this was all just a big dog-and-pony show, funded by the people and served onto the people.

- B. A full five years after the FONSI signoff, FAA's controllers at Seattle TRACON are not even using the RNP procedure down the center of Elliott Bay that was the key component of Greener Skies, the one element supposed to enable the bulk of the environmental benefits. It is as if the entire Greener Skies public engagement process was just an exercise in propaganda.
- C. The figures presented in the 2012 Greener Skies EA may not even reflect reality. Look closely. The data source documents used in this Post, when combined, show FAA/POS claimed that 487.1 million gallons of jetfuel were pumped in 2014, while also claiming 141.7 million gallons were consumed by west side arrivals on the short descending flight portions between the arrival gates (HAWKZ to the southwest, and MARNR to the northwest). Carefully note, these estimates were ONLY for west side arrivals, and did not look at fuel consumption for east side arrivals. Now, here's the problem: these portions of these flights are the most fuel-efficient phases for each flight, and are allegedly flown at or



close to engine-idle; these portions also represent a small fraction of total flight distance. And yet, the numbers used to calculate potential fuel savings declare the fuel consumption on these relatively short descending flight segments represent nearly a third of the fuel pumped at Sea-Tac? And, bear in mind, Sea-Tac is a major international hub, serving flights across the Pacific Ocean and to Europe. It defies logic; there is no plausible explanation. FAA and POS need to confirm the numbers, and they need to explain: how is it that the airlines operating in and out of Sea-Tac can allegedly burn so much fuel on these arrivals yet so little fuel on climbouts and enroute to and from all other airports around the world?

Greener Skies was (and still is) both a fraud and a side-show 'act', using erroneous estimates while pretending to create benefits that **STILL** do not exist! And the impacts, using the questionable numbers provided by PoS/FAA, are astounding: they are saying, in 2014, **arrivals to Sea-Tac consumed 2.6 million pounds of**

