

**1. WHAT WE NEED – PART I – THE REAL “LAY OF THE LAND”**

- a. Port needs to fully respond (one way or another) to long outstanding city/citizen requests for action. Inexcusable to pretend Port doesn't know what is requested.
  - i. Burien resolutions seeking Port action - 2019
  - ii. Des Moines letters to Port - 2019
  - iii. Federal Way task force report recommendations - 2018
  - iv. Port of Seattle Airport Neighbor Community Accords - 2018

**2. WHAT WE NEED – PART II – BETTER PROCESS + COMMITMENT**

**TRANSPARENCY/ACCOUNTABILITY**

- a. Participation by Elected's
- b. Audio-visual recording – red line on transparency and accountability at this point Now – after Lance Lyttle's comments verbally and in writing, alleging that unnamed citizens acted in some non-explained bad faith – StART is no longer a safe space for citizens without full audio-visual recording. No justifiable reason for objection.
- c. Reboot/define specific mission/goals – not diluted into meaningless incrementalism useful only for marketing. Incrementalism must be byproduct of the defined consensus larger and specific, measurable objective. Like in the Century Agenda.
- d. Consensus on larger mission/goals priority, over incremental projects
- e. Agenda-setting not silo'd in practice
- f. Advance materials – no longer excusable as it undermines credibility and efficacy
- // g. Speakers = diverse perspective must be priority; Port must accept and assist in bringing in counter viewpoints

**3. CHARTER REVISION - START NOT A MARKETING ENGINE – MEDIA RELEASE/PR REQUIRES CONSENSUS – members agree no PR absent consensus**

**4. CHARTER REVISION - START NOT “CHECK THE BOX” FOR LEGAL COMPLIANCE – agreement by members that no member will claim that participation or convening of StART = is evidence of, or satisfies, any engagement obligation for legal processes.**

**5. INDUSTRY MUST ENGAGE – NOT PASSIVE OBSERVATION (no “pick-apart” game)**

- a. Decision making – FAA and airlines are plainly not at the table
- b. FAA and airlines not bringing ideas –playing the “pick apart” game.

**6. SCIENCE**

- a. StART must begin including how policy should be made based on new public health and environmental science – on climate change, noise, emissions
- b. StART addresses how Port participates or not in studies

**7. CEASE FINGERPOINTING – if parties say law or jurisdiction prevents an action that otherwise has member consensus, StART will consider independent legal opinions to verify**

**ISSUE: StART is not a safe place for citizen members.**

“I am disappointed that some StART members have used the Port’s communication oversight on the SAMP Near-Term Projects as a justification to pull away from the StART process and to make broader statements about the transparency, commitment and character of the Port and its staff... trust is a two-way street. *I have seen some StART community representatives repeatedly not operate in good faith as members of the roundtable and in accordance with the agreed-upon operating procedures.*”

- Airport Director Lance Lyttle,  
August 28, 2019

**ANALYSIS: Because the Port refuses video/audio, there is no way for citizens to respond to the Port, correct the Port’s numerous public misstatements, and even clear their names. This is inexcusable. No names, no specific allegations, no facts. Only unsupported innuendo that touches all the citizen members because it excuses none of them. This tactic is identical to Joe McCarthy’s 1950 infamous claim of “a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party.”**

**CONCLUSION/REMEDY: A safe environment for citizens is mandatory StART; a verbatim record of proceedings - audio/visual recording - is mandatory. In addition, this will enhance public transparency, accountability, and trust.**

**ISSUE: StART is not a safe place for cities – even without actual results, improper exploitation of StART for marketing and engagement purposes**

Illustrated by the Port's 9/12 release at

<https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/WASEATTLEPORT/bulletins/25e9b8c>. No mention that 3 cities suspending for many reasons, including the Port's moving forward with SAMP without waiting for environmental review. Instead, Port paints a singularly positive impression of StART successes, many of which are in disputed by other StART members.

**ANALYSIS:** The Charter does not authorize a single party to conduct media outreach, particularly when implied that messaging is on behalf of StART. The Port's relentless, uneven and inaccurate marketing of "successes" misleads public; creates a false historical record that cannot be rebutted because there is no recording; prevents meaningful self-reflection for problem solving; is inflammatory; reduces trust; creates problems for members that disagree with the accuracy of the statements; requires resources to rebut; creates an illusion of "engagement" with legal consequences.

**CONCLUSION/REMEDY:** Marketing is NOT the reason for StART. StART should not be used for any purpose other than seeking consensus among stakeholders. **Members must agree that absent consent and content approval of all members (1) that no outbound public or media relations will be conducted – e.g., no public updates or press releases, and (2) StART will never be cited as evidence of community engagement.**

**ISSUE: Negotiating against yourself is never a good tactic and this is what the Port seems to want us to do.**

The Port has been provided by cities and citizens an abundant amount of information about what is needed to reform StART, but has not responded. Further, the Port has never responded to Burien's 2019 Resolutions, Des Moines' 2019 letters, and the POSANC Accords, all seeking Port positions and actions.

**ISSUE: Port's has not responded to 2019 city requests.**

**ANALYSIS:** The Port seems continually to be asking "what we want." The Port never assesses what they've been asked and comes back with their proposals to solve problems. This is a "pick-apart" strategy in which the party that doesn't want to change anything continually asks for proposals, suggestions, and more, and "picks them apart," sending it all back without commitment or counter.

**CONCLUSION/REMEDY:** There is no reason that the simplest response to the Port is the best, substantively, procedurally, and from a negotiation standpoint: list the communications that we've already sent, recently and in past year, and insist on the courtesy of a response. If they claim they don't know what we want (which they will), send 'em back to read the communications, again. And again.



**ISSUE:** We are in no hurry. StART doesn't exist without all 6 cities. There is no value in returning until ink dry on new rules. The Port has in all public communications stated we are welcome to come back. The Port creates an impression that StART is proceeding and things will happen without us. The Port implies that those that don't come back will lose something.

**ANALYSIS:**

StART has imploded; if we don't return, StART is now an abject failure. All existing Port strategies for community engagement box-checking premised on StART also fail if we don't return. A No-Tuk-Tac roundtable meaningless, StART's charter does not provide that StART can continue with less than all 6 cities at the table. The Port's recent activism in back-door meetings with city elected's evidences panic. More importantly, any objective assessment shows that StART has made no – zero – measurable progress. No flights have been stopped, at any time. The programs are so diluted and inconsequential that crediting them as "incremental" is a very bold statement. So, the question is – what is there to lose? And what is the hurry, if nothing is at stake?

**CONCLUSION/REMEDY:** There is no reason to return to StART without first obtaining a complete, written, agreement on how StART will reconstitute. There is no hurry. There is no down side. The analogy is a union strike. Can you imagine returning to work after the strike is called, without a deal?

**ISSUE: Port's decision to proceed with SAMP expansion work without environmental review.**

The Port has now repeatedly apologized for its lack of process, but has not remedied the underlying action. Now, the suspensions are being "spun" by the Port/Airport as some type of misconduct by the cities:

"I am disappointed that some StART members have used the Port's communication oversight on the SAMP Near-Term Projects as a justification"

- Lance Lyttle

**ANALYSIS:** This is core to returning; a litmus test. StART is either intended to create action where there is consensus, or it is a façade, and the Port and airport will do what it wants, when it wants, anyway.

**CONCLUSION/REMEDY:** Roll back of the Port's action and expenditure. Agree it is simply in the best interests of all stakeholders, and certainly taxpayers, to wait for environmental review and citizen comments, city comments agency comments, public health organization comments, and final review of same, before proceeding.

**STEVE EDMISTON PUBLIC COMMENT  
NORMANDY PARK 9-10-19**

Thank you. I'm Steve Edmiston. While I live far away in the City of Des Moines, I grew up in Normandy Park, dating back to the heyday of XL Sooper. My mother still lives in in Normandy Park just above Arrow Lake. I spent countless hours outside here, at the "Park" as we called it, playing slow pitch baseball and some fairly violent touch football. I went to a lot of bonfires at the Cove in high school. I love this community.

As I have watched the science on human health and the environmental impacts of overflights come in – I've been compelled to become active on behalf of our community. I serve on the Des Moines Aviation Advisory Committee. I serve on the Department of Commerce's Aviation Impact Study Technical Committee. I am a co-founder of the League of Quiet Skies Voters, which by the way is holding an important Port Commission candidate forum on September 19<sup>th</sup>. I created something called TheBriefingProject.com, which began with a 13-month series of public comments to the Port of Seattle, and is in now in development as a documentary film. Most recently, I was an appointee to the StART. And based upon all of those experiences – it was easy for to conclude that suspension of participation in StART was essential for two reasons: first, StART must be reconstituted with basic substantive and procedural guardrails to assure that its mission – which includes appropriately empowering cities and citizens to be co-equals at a transparent and accountable roundtable, in order to pursue consensus – is met, and second, the Port must reverse its significant, specific and

measurable mistake of proceeding with airport expansion work without waiting for the completion of the environmental review process.

Accordingly, I hope this Council will vote in favor of CITY OF NORMANDY PARK RESOLUTION NO. 994. I believe this Resolution is thoughtful, measured, fair, and strategic; I believe it will enhance your ability, and the ability of other airport neighbor cities, to represent and protect our citizens.

The statements, omissions, and subtext of the Port Executive Director's September 5, 2019, letters to the three cities that have already suspended, and Airport Director Lance Lyttle's August 28<sup>th</sup> comments, in your packet, support the need for the Resolution.

These documents start with an apology "for the lack of timely notification regarding the preliminary design funding." That's it. This is a phenomenal minimization by omission of what went wrong. No mention of the incredible magnitude of the spend – \$10 million. There is no mention that this action to move forward was taken while federal and state separate environmental reviews are still underway; no mention that no city, citizen, or other organization has had a chance to comment on the uncompleted environmental review; and no mention as to the justification, or cost-benefit analysis, of rushing, in light of having no environmental review.

But it gets worse, because you can scour that statements and you will not find the key element of an apology – something I learned from my



Mother growing up here in Normandy Park – the element of atonement. Of actual making it right part.

After all of this – after three cities representing what, 75% of the citizens in the six cities – have suspended, the Port still doesn't get it. It isn't going to stop moving forward with expansion and wait for environmental review. Even if all of the other stakeholders disagree. The Port is saying **we're sorry, but we're doing it anyway. We're doing it anyway.**

So, even though “consensus” is at the core of StART's mission – it's now hard to see a pathway to success. Because the evidence is, the Port will do what it wants, anyway.

I do believe StART can be successfully fixed. But simply continuing in the same problematic ecosystem is not the pathway.

Final comments.

One – the suggestion that cities do this kind of thing all the time, so it's okay for the Port. I learned long ago from my Mother here in Normandy Park that just because some kids do the wrong thing, that doesn't mean you should do it too. And in fact, the "you do it all the time" insinuation is both untrue and insulting. I sincerely doubt that any of you have proceeded with a \$5 Billion project that is highly controversial and sensitive, with critical health and environmental reviews pending. We're talking about proposed changes at Sea-Tac that will enable – reaching back to 2014 and forward with the SAMP projections – to add 180,000 new annual overflights – that's the size of Baltimore-Washington International airport. I suspect you'd wait for the environmental review.

Second – I was shocked that Mr. Lyttle actually sought to attack StART community members – insinuating in a McCarthy-esque fashion, that he knows some there are some StART community representatives that have not operated in good faith.

It would be nice to check the record on this, to clear up this attack. But we'll never know, because we can't do the one thing we need for resolution – have a video of the meetings – have a record. The Port has refused this. StART exists in the dark. And Mr. Lyttle can point his finger at citizens. Does that sound like a good faith system design going forward?

Third, the letter and statement reveal the unfortunate way that cities can be hurt simply by staying at this particular table, because of the way it is set. If you are at this table, the Port will contend – as they now contended in this very letter and in Mr. Lyttle's statement – that StART and by implication, the Port – has fully engaged communities, made meaningful progress, and taken new actions. If that is actually true, the

questions that could be answered tonight, easily, are these. What is the drop in the total number of airplanes that will no longer flying over our heads at night as a result of the voluntary Late Night Noise program? What is the actual drop in the number of planes that will no longer using the 3<sup>rd</sup> Runway during a 24 hour period? What are the specific so-called “punishments” for failing to comply with a voluntary agreement; how and where will non-compliance be published? And how about this - ask the Port to produce the record showing that your city, all the cities, reached a consensus on the details of these programs.

Remaining at this table as it is now set hurts your citizens because no matter what happens – no matter if this roundtable provably becomes the least successful roundtable in the country - the sitting at this table can, as it has in these documents, be used against your citizens as a way the Port has “engaged” your community. It has checked a box toward satisfying legal standards for community outreach. The way StART is currently constituted, the only guaranteed winner is the Port.

Finally, make no mistake – StART has by definition, by the laws of its own physics, has already imploded. StART exists as a collaboration between ALL six cities, three airlines, and two agencies. There is no alternative StART formula. Three of the cities that have suspended represent about 180,000 of 240,000 total residents in the 6 StART cities – 75%. No StART goal – entirely premised on collaboration and consensus with all 6 cities - can be achieved without all member cities. The Port’s brave face is admirable, but has does have that re-arranging-the-deck-chairs feel.

## LANCE LYTTLE StART 8/28 TALKING POINTS

- I want to thank everyone for coming this evening, especially right before a holiday weekend. Your participation is greatly appreciated.
- I would like to make a few comments before we begin tonight's formal agenda.
- My intention in forming StART, in close collaboration with your city representatives, was to provide a forum for community input and action, with stakeholders from all parties at the table working to address current operational concerns.
- Because of the cities', the air carriers', and the FAA participation, we've taken some good first steps. There is more to do, and we value the contributions made toward constructively addressing the concerns of the communities.
- Knowing that this is a sensitive topic, we again wish to apologize about the lack of timely notification regarding the Commission's recent action to approve preliminary design funding related to certain projects within the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) Near-Term Projects (NTP). The oversight was not intentional, and we remain committed to prompt communication with airport-area communities on SAMP-related and other relevant issues.
- Preliminary design funding is a practice for local jurisdictions – including your own – to do limited planning work so that a decision to proceed, or not, is more informed. We understand your concerns about the SAMP Near-Term Projects and look forward to engaging you fully in the upcoming public comment periods.
- In fact, the Port will begin a new communication to the Highline Forum members in advance of each Commission meeting, highlighting what is on the upcoming agenda and a short explanation of the item. City managers and administrators will have it in advance of the meeting and can include it in a weekly report, if that is of interest. Page 45 of

247



- Port Commission agendas are always published Thursday in advance of each meeting; that will continue. This proactive communication is to provide more assistance in flagging possible items of interest.
- I want to take this opportunity to clarify exactly which five SAMP-related projects preliminary design work was approved for:
  - o Design work for a permanent fire station on the west side of the airfield, so that we can get to west side emergencies more quickly
  - o Design work for a maintenance facility on the west side of the airfield, consolidating with services already located in that area
  - o Design work for the main terminal Ground Transportation lot, to better manage the TNCs, taxis, limos and other vehicular congestion entering the garage
  - o Design work for the southbound lanes of the North Airport Expressway, to identify congestion points related to widening the Arrivals roadway deck; and
  - o Design work for Taxiway A/B improvements, which would necessitate moving the glideslope antenna and allow for a glideslope change to 3.0 degrees or higher as recommended by StART.
- I am disappointed that some StART members have used the Port's communication oversight on the SAMP Near-Term Projects as a justification to pull away from the StART process and to make broader statements about the transparency, commitment and character of the Port and its staff.
- Trust is a two-way street, and I was glad to see it referenced in some of the communications we received from the cities voting to suspend participation. Working together, we have focused on problem-solving with conversation and creativity. I am committed to being a good partner, and I will continue to work to earn and keep your trust. However, as I stated, trust is a two-way street. I have seen some StART community representatives repeatedly not operate in good faith as members of the roundtable and in accordance with the agreed-upon operating procedures.

- My view is that we can work together to find ways to coexist in a mutually beneficial way. I welcome a conversation about how we can form true partnerships toward real outcomes, with all parties held to the same standards.
- Our commitment to productive engagement is more important than any single frustration or slight. That is why the work identified through StART needs to continue. I believe we have done good work here. • I look forward to engaging with all parties about the best way to work together. We are open to how we can move ahead, and we will be meeting with each of the cities individually.
- Burien, Des Moines, and Federal Way are all welcome to rejoin the conversation at the table, with a renewed and shared commitment to the goals of StART and the process by which we have collectively agreed to operate.
- Collaboration and partnership are what result in achievement. So again, I say thank you for your commitment and participation in helping to improve conditions for the South King County communities around the Airport.
- With that I'll turn it over to Phyllis.