

Email on 10/18/17 to Nancy Tosta and Debi Wagner regarding redrafting of the draft Council resolution

Hi Nancy,

I redrafted paragraph 5 to read as follows:

"5. Whereas the BAC examined Sea-Tac growth projections and determined that, if recent actual, annual operational growth rates of 7-12% (a 9% average annual increase from 2013-2016) continue—incidentally an amount 51% greater than projections contained in its 2013-2018 Part 150 Study--Sea-Tac will be dramatically constrained to **safely** provide any additional capacity beyond 2025 and...."

The point being made in this paragraph is that we **now know** that Sea-Tac's Part 150 projections severely underestimated annual operations. Remember that an operation is a landing or a departure and involves an aircraft flying over our neighborhoods. According to Sea-Tac's own handout and presentation to BAC on 4/18/17, they projected that by 2034 there would be **an additional 1,479 flights/day**; and BAC concluded this level would occur by 2025. Consequently, residents in South King County, including Burien, will experience a dramatic increase of nearly 1,500 **ADDITIONAL flights/day** within eight years (actually more like seven since this year is almost finished).

The reason I get "fired up" about these statistics is that:

Sea-Tac hired nationally-recognized consultants costing tens of thousands of dollars to accomplish the task of estimating operations for its Part 150 Study to cover a period from 2013-2018. (A Part 150 Study by Sea-Tac probably costs between \$1-2 million.) Either the consultants are no better than weathermen in forecasting temperatures, or their estimates missed the mark by 51%. Operational levels are critical because **mitigation is based upon projected operations**. By underestimating projections, the resulting mitigation is minimized. Also, I've been baffled by Part 150 noise exposure maps (NEMs) that are titled 2013-2021 because these studies normally cover a five-year projection (i.e. 2013-2018); however, by labeling the NEMs differently and adding three years, was SeaTac downsizing its mitigation even further knowing that the expansion would be completed by 2021? The reason I am suspicious is because by labeling the NEMs for a longer duration, it postpones (or grants them the excuse to postpone) further noise modeling that, no doubt, castd their existing 2013-2018 Part 150 Study as **already obsolete and outdated** (which it is) because of the 9% average annual growth that is occurring **now**.

Ultimately, the goal of the BAC as related to noise is to

1. **reduce operational levels at Sea-Tac by adding airspace capacity at a new airport or a regional airport,**
2. **stop the flights over Seahurst, and**
3. **require new noise modeling that takes into account these increases in operations that are not correctly reflected in their 2013-2018 Part 150 Study.**

Until there is updated noise modeling that reflects *existing* increased operational levels, mitigation is not possible under FAA regulations for perhaps another ten years. Delayed until after 2021, these additional years of no mitigation saves the Port thousands of dollars, but subjects residents to noise from an additional 1,500 daily flights that deserve to be mitigated sooner!

It's easy when w're drafting a resolution to lose sight of the fact that the Port has committed a sort of fraud on our residents by intentionally or not, underestimating operational levels, which is the basis of all mitigation. Residents will notice, and have already, when flights multiply, but there is no acknowledgement or public outreach to communities from the Port that this is occurring or mitigation considered. In fact, I think Matthys was correct last night, we need to add an "ask" that the Port start NOW planning on updated noise modeling. Until that happens, the Port's easiest excuse is that the "end" of the Part 150 Study has not occurred yet (2018 or 2021); therefore noise modeling at this time is unnecessary. In fact, that was what Stan Shepherd told me that evening (4/18/17) when I asked.

I still need to review the Port's letter and get back to you both. My quick scan of it last night was that it's more blah, blah, blah Port propoganda as if it was copied from their website.

Sharyn