

Port Letter**From :** Sharyn Parker <sparkerward@comcast.net>

Wed, Oct 18, 2017 01:12 PM

Subject : Port Letter**To :** Nancy Tosta <nancyt@burienwa.gov>**Cc :** Debi Wagner <debiw@burienwa.gov>, lucyk@burienwa.gov

Hello ladies!

Overall

Just finished reading the letter from Tom Albro. I'm surprised that the Port chairman would take the time to write a three-page, single-spaced letter to a 'little 'ol advisory committee where he clearly wants us to change our minds about the white paper. He references inaccuracies, but I didn't see any; although I admit, I don't have the background Debi has in the area of air pollution. Mr. Albro's "clarifications" are really nothing more than Port hype and he provides no in-depth analysis about the white paper's so-called inaccuracies.

Capital Funding Sources

This paragraph is confusing and contradictory. A PFC is a fee authorized by Congress, but the amount and use of the fee (as Mr. Albro later admits) is set by the Port and is one of the funding sources for noise mitigation. Apparently, the Port has decided it won't use PFC revenue for infrastructure improvements at the airport facility. (This is a port policy, not dictated by Congress even though he leaves that thought lingering as if it were true.) Basically, Mr. Albro does not adequately reveal how the current expansion is being funded. For example, what level of federal funds are anticipated and what are the other fee charges that will be used for expansion purpose? Finally, what are their financial assumptions? If their large capital improvements were subject to voter approval (i.e. Sound Transit, another special purpose district), we would know these things.

Mr. Albro reports that "King County residents pay the PFC", but so do all travelers at Sea-Tac so I don't understand his point. It sounds like the Port has made a policy decision not to use property taxes for airport projects (I presume for infrastructure projects?), but PFC funding has been used for noise mitigation--another policy decision? Without demonstrating how the current expansion is being financed, and, without revealing their contingency plans to address funding gaps, couldn't the policy be changed by a simple vote at a Port Commission meeting?

Port Noise Mitigation/Abatement

These paragraphs contain blah, blah, blah historical information easily read on the airport's website; but it does not address the current increase in flight operations and resulting noise and air pollution; or how these increases might be mitigated. Furthermore, there is no accommodation for updating noise modeling to replace the airport's **outdated and obsolete Part 150 Study, even though their operational projections are 51% below actual current operational levels** (reference my previous resolution email). In other words, there's nothing the Port wants us to see here, so let's move on to aviation health impacts.

Aviation Health Impacts

I have no comment about paragraph one since I know Debbie does. The second paragraph reads like a promotional brochure to the "world." His willingness to "following the science toward consistent outcomes in the health impacts discussion" is an almost incomprehensible sentence. The white paper didn't accuse the Port of not protecting the health and environment for all Washingtonians, but it clearly referenced continuing degradation of noise and air pollution levels in surrounding communities given dramatic increases (i.e., annual average flight increases of 9%--that's more than a little bit off the mark), which **he does not acknowledged at all in his response**. In other words, the Port thinks it's doing a marvelous job so there's nothing more to see here either.

Regional Aviation Capacity

Now these paragraphs are where Mr. Albro "breaks his arm patting the Port on the back". It is to the BAC reader, after all, a very condescending section of the letter that contains self-congratulations for **ALL the Port** has done to be an "efficient and valuable gateway for Washington State" and alludes to the futility of attempting to control the **positive demands for air travel**. However, in reality **if** there are discussions about regional aviation capacity, the Port is committed to leading the discussion at one or more of its organized forums for local stakeholders! But what is the Port doing about increased flights and their unwillingness to provide outreach to surrounding communities about the negative health impacts of these flights that **could likely occur ten years earlier than their public pronouncement of 2034?** The Port's last expensive and exhaustive outreach to the public on issues that matter to the residing public was their 2013-2018 Part 150 Study; **and their recent flight patterns and increases render it irrelevant as a basis for current or future planning!**

Summary

I hope the Council does respond to his letter and call out his lack of candor or attempt at intimidation. Were the underestimates of flights a mere mistake or miscalculations by nationally-recognized expert professionals? How is it that real estate developers, international construction companies, and other businesses in the state have been projecting growth increases, but the Port didn't know that there would be a commiserate demand for air travel? Either they are dishonest or incompetent; I'll defer to others to decide. Personally, I believe their underestimates of projected flights was intentional in order to save money from inevitable demands for sound and air mitigation. And even if it were not intentional, why haven't they responded by preparing local communities about the effects of increased flights using their own recent calculations? Oh, now I remember, they give small grants to local communities for environmental projects; maybe that's how mitigation is supposed to be funded until the next noise modeling is accomplished in a future Part 150 Study? By 2050, we should know!

Sharyn