

SHARYN PARKER <sparkerward@comcast.net>

10/27/2019 12:12 PM

Re: Fwd: Request for input on the StART Airfield Noise Analysis Scope

To Larry Cripe <larrycripe@comcast.net> • Debi Wagner <debi.wagner@icloud.com> • Jeff Harbaugh <jharbaugh@msn.com> • Javier Tordable <jt@javiertordable.com>

HMMH is a credible firm; I've worked with them in the past, although I have not worked with this analyst; HOWEVER, the consultant has the cart before the horse!

The noise monitors don't all operate well according to Bernadine Lund who carefully tracks these monitoring details every day. Without knowing every neighborhood or monitoring station myself, this is what I do know about noise monitors based upon my experience:

1. The consultant first needs to do their homework before asking any StART member the source(s) of ground noise. The consultant needs to correlate noise complaints to noise monitor stations (NMS) and then correlate those results with the timing of engine run-ups on the airfield. I believe they are required to maintain records of those events and the locations where they occurred. Then they can identify the NMS results to confirm the decibel level of each event. This is important because the Growth Management Act (GMA) contains environmental noise limits contained in WAC 173-60-040, maximum permissible environmental noise levels during 10 pm-7 am period and not to exceed 1.5-15 minutes in any one-hour period of the day) governed by DOE. In the case of engine run-ups, they normally last from 20-45 minutes. There is also WAC 173-60-050 that provides "that aircraft testing and maintenance shall be conducted at remote sites whenever possible." The recent epistle from the Port claimed they are already doing that now, but I think records should be requested to confirm their declaration because where the hell are they engine testing off-site if not on the airfield?
2. Reverse thrust is a little trickier because I don't know if anyone at Sea-Tac records how many times/day or at what decibel levels they occur. Again, noise complaints correlated with NMS records will reveal some trends and patterns. Remember too that reverse thrust and engine run-ups have been "priority" issues from the public to the airport since 1996 and contained in the last two Part 150 Studies; yet they've not taken time to "study" and analyze these data sets?
3. On NOAA's website, historic data is available so that correlated NMS data can be compared to atmospheric and weather conditions; however, I discount the weather angles some because I think it is a diversion from the real noise issues, which are better identified by the data sets I already mentioned because it grants the airport the opportunity to say "they can't control the weather" when it is not the fault of weather that these noise incidents occur. Their Record of Approval for 2013-2018 Part 150, element #3 also states that "Engine run-ups necessary for maintenance checks above idle power not to exceed a total of two (2) minutes per aircraft." Airport records should be requested to verify that this actually occurs and NMS data would either support or deny their claims.
4. I'm confused by this ground-noise study; is it the same noise study identified in the SAMP (in the Leigh/Fisher executive summary) to identify construction-related noise tied to near-term projects? If so, some airfield/flights noise is supposed to be included in that study. Is there duplication of effort happening? Will one study cancel the other?

5. Consultant should complete these exercises and present results before asking for community input unless they want to validate some preliminary findings first. Bernadine also knows which monitors that have mysteriously not worked for quite some time and do not produce any measurements. She is a good resource for StART members to consult.

Sharyn

On October 27, 2019 at 9:46 AM Larry Cripe <larrycripe@comcast.net> wrote:

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Brian Wilson <BrianW@burienwa.gov>
Date: October 27, 2019 at 9:36:14 AM PDT
To: Larry Cripe <larrycripe@comcast.net>, Terrance Plumb <tmcp123@hotmail.com>
Cc: Lori Fleming <LORIF@burienwa.gov>, DL - Council Members <DL-Councilmembers@burienwa.gov>
Subject: FW: Request for input on the StART Airfield Noise Analysis Scope

Larry, Terry:

FYI reference this request from StART.

Brian J. Wilson
City Manager

City of Burien
(206) 248-5503 office
(206) 376-7102 cell
BrianW@burienwa.gov
Burienwa.gov

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Phyllis Shulman [<mailto:pshulman82@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2019 3:35 PM
To: Brian Wilson <BrianW@burienwa.gov>
Cc: Marco Milanese <milanese.m@portseattle.org>
Subject: Request for input on the StART Airfield Noise Analysis Scope

CAUTION: This email originated from **outside** of the City of Burien. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and have verified the contents are safe.

Hi Brian,

The StART Aviation Noise Working Group recommended that the Port hire a consultant to analyze ground noise at Sea-Tac Airport and provide recommendations, based on the analysis, for ground noise reduction. Brad Nicholas, noise consultant with HMMH, attended the October 23 StART meeting to begin the process of getting feedback from StART on the scope of the analysis. I have attached his presentation for your review.

The study could provide much greater clarity about the causes of airfield noise and lead to some potential promising efforts. Even though your city has made the decision to suspend your membership in StART, we felt that it is important to involve your city in the process of scoping the analysis and ask for your comments/feedback.

Specifically, the consultant is asking feedback for these two topics:

1. Identification of which sources of ground noise you would like to see included as part of the analysis; and
2. Suggestions for specific locations ground noise monitoring should occur (for example particular neighborhoods), and whether there are times of day that are most important for monitoring.

Please email me with your feedback on the scope by November 8.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Phyllis

Phyllis Shulman

Civic Alchemy

(206) 446-8788

Aircraft Noise Effects on Human Activity

- Speech interference may occur
 - Outdoors with sound levels of 60 – 65 dBA outdoors or higher
 - Indoors with windows open at sound levels of 70 – 75 dBA outdoors or higher (outdoor to indoor level reduction is approximately 15 dB with open windows)
 - Indoors with windows closed at sound levels of 75 – 80 dBA outdoors or higher (outdoor to indoor level reduction is approximately 25 dB with closed windows)
- Sleep interference may occur for ~ 2 % of people
 - With windows open and exterior sound levels of 70 to 75 dBA, Lmax
 - With windows closed and exterior sound levels of 80 to 85 dBA, Lmax