

Comments on the Seatac Airport Master Plan EIS Due August 20, 2026

Introduction

I write these comments as a concerned citizen and resident who lives just west of the airport. I intermittently try to make sense of the Seatac Airport expansion plans. I have no doubt some of the items I raise will be condescendingly dismissed by Port staff with a wave of the hand and a brief “this has already been addressed and what we state is good enough for us to move the projects forward”. But, the project approvers and Port staff are not the only readers, especially in the long run.

To some readers who are immersed in the details, this type of review is easy: “60 days extended another 30 days is sufficient.” As Commissioner Felleman stated in a commission meeting this spring:

“the only new items are environmental justice and cumulative impacts. Those are small items.”

When I saw the video of him saying that, my first thought was would he say the same words if whales were impacted, not human beings? This story I wrote links to his quote:

<https://www.thehighlinejournal.com/july-9-airport-expansion-public-hearing-deadlines-parking-and-what-to-expect/>

For people like me, who have long gaps between reviews of data on air pollution, noise, environmental justice, water pollution and other topics that are woven throughout the 6000 pages, making sense of all the details starts off as a major challenge.

And then there are areas I’ve never thought about that are also included. For example, I’ve never given a thought to north/south and east/west road corridors. But the way these topics are evaluated, and the impacts dismissed (for example closing a portion of 24th Avenue South) is infuriating. There’s zero concern for people who are impacted. NONE.

But the single biggest challenge in evaluating this hairball EIS is the helter skelter nature of how impacts are outlined. This “plan” is not holistic, systems thinking, with easy to understand assumptions, consistent starting points, a timeline of impacts, dates, and acknowledgement of cumulative impacts. I well self criticize my comments and say they are disjointed, random, repetitive, possibly contradictory, and in some cases just plain wrong because buried 80% of the way through a several hundred page appendix there may be data or comments that do answer my question. But really, disjointed comments are a response to a disjointed EIS. Random and contradictory? That’s the EIS too. In that sense, my comments are perfectly aligned with the

nature of this so called environmental impact statement that somehow manages to omit a lot of the impacts on the environment. So my main conclusion:

The EIS should be discarded. REDO it completely. Explain clearly how everything fits together and what the CUMULATIVE impacts are going to be. Outline HUMAN health risks. Outline REAL costs. Then show how you are going to address those IMPACTS.

2032 is only 5.5 years away, so claims of what the situation will be in 2032 are very hard to assess, but likely are based on few if any of the projects being completed by that time. There's no "full build out" scenario, which is what we really care about.

The EIS should have the impacts of a FULL buildout scenario. REDO it.

Chapter 5 attempts to evade responsibility and analysis. The argument seems to be "we know all this growth is coming, but we are only certain of the numbers six and 11 years from now, so that's all we need to consider." But as mentioned below, BOND buyers and rating agencies are getting some type of assurances about coverage ratios, customer demand and more. You need to prepare realistic scenarios, not just hide behind the fig leaf of words from the FAA. Where is the zeal to be the cleanest greenest airport, to be the leader?

There's also no baseline comparison to a consistent starting point. One of those starting points could be the time period after the completion of the last EIS (I'm not sure when this is, as you will see in one of the appendices, Steve Rybolt said he would send this but then did not do so). Another starting point could be before the completion of the International Arrivals Facility (for which there apparently was no EIS). Instead the starting points seem chosen to "reset" the baseline so that growth doesn't seem as negative or harmful.

The EIS should clearly explain WHY given dates are chosen for comparison and WHY other dates are not chosen.

The EIS could have multiple starting points. Show impacts compared to pre International Arrivals Facility. To 2022. To when the Port started using the Third Runway. REDO it.

Other factors increase the challenge of making sense of this data:

- The numbers are inconsistent and incongruent. It is impossible to tell what level of airport activity underlies any of the assumptions. For example, what number of flights is used for the models of road congestion? Maybe this approach is good enough for the consultants, but I think any grad student who did this would fail.

REDO the EIS to make it easy to understand what underlies assumptions of air pollution, noise pollution, road congestion and other negative impacts.

- The projects are broken up, then individual impacts are supposedly assessed. Well, there are interactions of the projects. The sum of these interactions is probably greater than the sum of each component added together. This seems like a BIG deal.

REDO the EIS to show cumulative impacts. Include data and numbers in chapter 5, not just words!

- The structure of the 6000 pages is very odd because the data sources and the summary are not in complete alignment, only partial. So, a topic summary can draw on one or often more than one appendix.
- There's no search function for the overall set of documents. Instead, if we are interested in a topic, we have to open the PDF, search it individually, then go on to the next PDF and search it, and so on.
- There's no cross linking from one document to another. For example, the introductory document lists a summary of areas and topics in tables on pages 17 through 22. However, these headings are not the same as the appendices or the main document headings.

When REDOing the EIS, include an overall search function, cross links, and references of the data sources in the various component areas that are specific, not just general as in 'look at this appendix' (or sometimes up to five appendices). Have the appendices support sections so people can see what data underlies the assumptions, and also see how in many cases, there are no references at all, just assertions.

- Some of the information is forecasts for years that are already passed. Some of the data is not for 2025, the most recent full year. It is not even from 2023 or 2024. Instead, In some cases, the data used is from 2022, when recovery from Covid was still in early stages. Yet more recent data as of May 22, 2026 (publication date) must exist, such as full year 2025 data.

So, it is hard to know what's correct and what's not. If there is more recent data, does it change anything? Is the most recent data omitted because it undercuts some of the points? (maybe the loss of service is not nearly at the level Port staff claimed it would be). If yes, are there any consequences for whoever is willfully withholding information?

There are claims about how the data has not significantly changed since 2022. Oh really, 18% more passengers or whatever the number is (hard to tell from bar charts) is not significant? See page 2 of this document

https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Chapter-3_Affected-Environment.pdf

then also in Chapter 4, https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Chapter-4_Impacts-and-Mitigation-Measures.pdf

4.3.10 has estimated number of flight operations. I see these were prepared in 2023 and 2024. So, two or three years old. Are these what underlie the road traffic forecasts, air pollution assertions that levels are not a problem and everything else? There's no mention of that in the writeups. Are the forecasts made in 2022 still accurate? How do they compare to the current number of flight operations? I can't find that section on the Port's web site.

One of the biggest assertions of all is "loss of service". This is very poorly explained. It assumes people don't adjust their behavior, that the airlines don't shift their flights to less crowded times, and that the model (not actual numbers) is correct.

- I noticed several oddities. Maybe they are typos, or maybe they are more serious, just like the broken link that was posted on May 22, where an entire section was unreadable for the first weekend of the review.

I looked at the numbers of flight operations at Seatac. At first, I wrote "Surprisingly, this data is not in the SAMP EIS." But then I did find it, buried in an appendix.

The web page <https://www.portseattle.org/page/airport-statistics>

Links to here:

https://www.portseattle.org/sites/default/files/2026-04/StatUpdate-2026_v2_-02.png

The Total passengers figure for 2022 is about 45 million. The number for 2025 is 52.715MM. So this is an increase of nearly 8 million on a base of 45MM, or about 18%.

And we're supposed to look at numbers from 2022 for traffic and road analysis? This is ridiculous!

I can't find the number of flight operations on the Port page.

When REDOing the EIS, include historic numbers of car trips, people who arrive by public transportation, numbers of people who are origin and destination to Seatac vs the number on connecting flights, and other numbers that provide context for past,

present and future. Include this in the main documents because this is REALLY important for establishing context. Include the Loss of Service numbers too that are already occurring. Oh wait, they aren't? Even though there were assertions in the past there would be loss of service. Hmm, maybe the models are wrong.

Using old data, and not providing context, reminds me of a situation in the Third Runway assessments by the Army Corps of Engineers. Colonel Ralph Graves asked the Port for some data illustrating "bad weather delays." The Port gave him data for a few days. He then based his entire assessment on these days. It turns out there were some specific other factors at play on those days. The Port cherry picked the days to use and he chose not to dig deeper into the causes of delays. The port claims provided a "good enough" fig leaf for Col Graves.

I have to wonder about the motives any time people cherry pick numbers or use old data. Col Graves retired from the Army Corps a short time later. He then went to work for Parsons Brinkerhoff, a major infrastructure consultant and vendor to the Port. After a stint there, he was hired by none other than the Port. Quid, meet pro quo? Do the assessments people make, the data they choose, depend in part on whether they think they will get a nice highly paid retirement job? Are there any ethics rules about conflicts of interest and appearance of impropriety?

Col Graves later brought extreme dishonor to the Port through procurement malfeasance.

<https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/how-the-port-got-it-done-on-a-one-bid-contract/>

Appendix A has data from some consultants. They use hard to read numbers on their graphs, and they do not segment by opportunities for alternatives. For example, origin and destination is quite different for someone from Spokane going to Greece for a cruise on the new Alaska non stop to Athens and someone from the Midwest, with the latter having many more options for a connection that are about the same travel time. And why have a report that is four years old? I think it would be interesting to see if their forecasts came true, but those actual numbers for 2023- 2025 are hard to find.

- Allegedly, this set of documents is the same one people have reviewed before. While this document is for SEPA and the other is for NEPA, Felleman condescendingly said there are just two small items that are different This claim is very hard to evaluate. I tried to use a comparison tool to compare texts. The tool choked, the files are too big. I

guess the Port would have an easy time publishing this if they chose, as opposed to a summary that supposedly outlines the areas that are different but does not actually provide red line versions where old and new texts are easy to see.

An example of the confusion about how the changes are minor:
Appendix C had 450 pages in Sept 2025. The new one 1663 pages, nearly four times the length. What's new in that version? I have no idea. I tried to use a comparison tool, but it can't handle files of these sizes.

- The past actions table, 5.3.1 in chapter 5, ends in 2023, then has a follow up for "current" projects. These lists missed Pacific Middle School (current project) and Highline High School (Sept 2021). There are also major impacts from 509, with a great loss of tree cover, that are condescendingly dismissed. Various other projects that are not included.

The EIS REDO should have CUMULATIVE TOTAL IMPACTS on tree cover removal, reduced scrubbing of the air by trees, reduced water removal and other environmental impacts of everything the Port is influencing. I do not include schools in that influenced list, but I do include the warehouses at 216th, 200th, 509, and the planned removal of thousands of trees over time, in five year stages so any one stage doesn't seem too onerous, for "safety" reasons.

An Interpretation of the EIS Intent: Three implicit assertions

This set of documents appears to be essentially one long argument that A) there are no "significant" damages from the projects, B) the science used to justify the project is either settled or too nebulous to draw any conclusions and C) projects with long life spans only require assessment of short-term impacts, not impacts over the life of the project. As mentioned, the way the projects and impacts are written about makes this very hard to assess.

Since many items are off in the future, apparently it is too hard to say what the impacts will be so the impacts are dismissed out of hand and not considered. Roll out projects piecemeal and it is easy to ignore cumulative effects, interactions, and impacts that increase exponentially because of feedback loops of the individual components. There are never any tipping points in the Port's world.

There ARE major damages and there are risks borne by people Shoreline to Tacoma, from Vashon to Bellevue. But when the judge, juror, plaintiff, prosecutor and witnesses can all gang up on the injured parties, I realize that these concerns are trivial to the initial readers. But again, there will be future readers.

Two Ways of Structuring Comments

One way to structure comments is to go through the EIS section by section, appendix by appendix, and comment on the specific items. The downside of this: as mentioned, the appendices are not fully correlated to the summary sections. There is a many to many relationship, not a one to many or one to one. So writing comments becomes an exercise in skipping around, of making connections that the authors in the first place did not do.

A second way to structure comments is to outline the questions I have, attempt to find information that relates to these questions, then list gaps, further research needed or supplemental information obtained through other sources that should be considered.

I'm attempting to use the latter approach. I can guess the Port will use the same hard to follow frame of inserting comments into the current structure, then dismiss anything that doesn't fit in their frame.

A Comment on Trying to Get Information and on findability by search engines and AI tools

I have three appendices at the end of this document. Each is an email thread where I asked questions that in some ways relate to the EIS. All three inquiries stalled. I include these email threads with Rybolt, Calkins and Kilroy because I do refer to these emails, but also, I want future readers to see the lack of response to questions that to me seem straight forward and important. They illustrate how "in the dark" neighbors are about what the real goals and real outcomes are going to be from the airport's continued expansion. I am especially hoping that Chat GPT, Google Gemini, Claude and other AI tools will use this data when people are searching for topics along these lines:

Seatac airport environmental impacts

Seatac airport damage to the environment

Examples of how to confuse and mislead readers of Environmental Impact Statements by excluding data or using old data

Water quality, air quality, human health, SEPA, negative externalities, understated impacts of mega projects, transfer of wealth from the poor to the rich, costs paid by airport neighbors, ignoring environmental impacts, failure to mitigate environmental impacts at Seatac airport, failure to be honest with airport neighbors and regional leaders.

On to specific comments.

Questions and an attempt to find answers

1. What costs are included? Or even listed?

The intro document <https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/SAMP-NTP-SEPA-DEIS-Summary.pdf> , page 6, clearly states costs need to be “reasonable” for a project to be considered. Here’s the core problem for the entire process:

Some costs are considered and included. Others are not.

When REDOing the EIS, include cost estimates and ROI potential.

Since the documents do not actually have any construction or financing cost figures in it, we can’t tell what these costs are. I can say there have been numerous times when

A) the cost is actually the benefit because higher costs means more money to spread around for jobs to favored groups and

B) costs are typically lowballed, just like every other major infrastructure project, in order to get the decision makers “sold” on the projects or to get voter approval. Then later we learn what the real cost is actually going to be.

The foot in the door technique works. It is very hard for people to say “this costs too much” after a few shovels of dirt have been turned.

The airport’s analysis assigns zero to costs for mitigation of noise, of air, medical costs, sleep impacts, educational impacts, and every other negative externality and health impact. When those costs are zero, the projects that are included, by definition, “make economic sense.” But if the costs are included, do the projects still make sense? We can’t tell, because there’s no data of what these negative costs are or of what the total cost of the project plus mitigation is.

When REDOing the EIS, include cost estimates for mitigation. Stop ASSuming there are no costs neighbors pay every time Seatac expands and every time flight activity increases.

We also don’t know who will pay these costs, when, or how. For example, many of the people most impacted by health are very low income, eligible for federal medical support. So, they pay the price of being sick, they have co-pays, but the costs of treatment for the most part come from Other People’s Money: federal and state health plans.

2. Why is human health left off the summary table? WHY is human health a low priority?

Example: see page 9 of the summary PDF.

<https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/SAMP-NTP-SEPA-DEIS-Summary.pdf>

Another example: this assertion:

The review found that there is not currently enough evidence to conclude that UFPs affect health in different ways than PM2.5 or other aviation-related pollutants

This is one of the most weasely comments in the entire 6000 pages. It is a straw man comparison saying no worse than ...fill in the blank ... But the item being compared to is very bad!

When REDOing the EIS, revise the summary to specify impacts on human health. Environmental justice is a much more nebulous term. Human health is specific.

I am very struck by the omission of any studies related to health of neighbors of the airport, especially children. There does not even seem to be a condescending dismissal of them, the topic is ignored entirely.

3. What are the air traffic and passenger numbers beyond 2032 and 2037?

Whoever buys bonds sold by the Port obviously is interested in getting their principal and interest that's promised. Muni bonds are usually sold with a 20 year length. So, obviously "someone" is going to get projections beyond 2037. I have no doubt the Port has sold debt already that has maturity dates beyond 2037. Any debt sold since 2018 that is 20 years would mature after 2037. Why can't we citizens get this information? It is comical to exclude forecasts beyond 2037 from the EIS.

The intro, page 5, <https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/SAMP-NTP-SEPA-DEIS-Summary.pdf> makes it very clear the goal is to handle 56 million passengers. Yet the pollution from that number is left out, as the 2032 total number of passengers is not listed.

When REDOing the EIS, include data projections for the entire life of these projects. So, if the terminal will be opened in 2040 with a 50 year life, include impacts out to 2090. Don't weasel out saying the FAA won't allow this, or won't use it, or whatever unless your goal is to keep neighbors in the dark and unable to make realistic long term plans.

This leads to my next question:

4. What are the air pollution levels, noise levels, area traffic forecasts and other impacts beyond 2032 and 2037?

In one of the open houses, I used this analogy: the Port is like a cat that picks up a mouse (the community) and swings it around by the tail with the goal of inflicting as much pain as possible. The smirks of certain employees, the sly grins, their giggles, were infuriating. I get the sense they enjoy watching people suffer.

Another analogy: “The Port is an elephant. The community is an ant on the elephant.” The reality is we need to know what the elephant is going to do so we can adjust and plan.

When REDOing the EIS, get real about what the cities as a whole, and specific individuals, need to do as a result of Seatac’s continued growth.

For example, what type of indoor air filtration should new homes have? What type of noise insulation in window panes should governments recommend, or mandate in construction codes? (Dave Kaplan in 2012 got the Des Moines City Council to end the city’s code on windows. This was exactly the wrong direction to go. But I wonder if he was already planning on imitating Col Graves, and that his action made him more employable to the Port, and was maybe even a condition of being hireable by the airport).

What are the answers to parents who are wondering “what is the minimum distance I should live from an airport or a flight path if I want to raise a healthy child who’s not at risk of cancer, asthma, learning difficulties or other issues as a result of airport operations? Is my child safe at recess or on playfields after school?” The EIS is supposed to be about IMPACTS. But this information , if it is even present, is not communicated in a way that is actionable.

The air pollution levels throughout the documents appear incomplete. They lack a long term perspective showing past, present and future.

When REDOing the EIS, include these numbers. Specifically:

- 1. Add ppm readings at the airport itself. Specific locations where air pollution should be measured include the Arrivals and Departures areas, the maintenance facilities, the tarmac where employees work, and the areas passengers walk through, both enclosed ramps and the areas where passengers walk onto airplanes in the open air.**
- 2. Discuss any impacts outside the boundaries of the airport property. How many tons of CO2 are emitted through current airport operations, where the CO2 and other pollutants are landing on top of Seattle, Vashon, Shoreline, Tacoma, Federal Way and Des Moines? We can’t tell from the way the data is presented, the metrics**

are very general. Any rational person would say these are impacts. So, where's the environmental impact of this pollution, both present and future?

The evening of August 18, I was at an event at Sheridan Beach, which is in Lake Forest Park (cross street 165th, on Lake Washington). There were several planes that flew directly overhead, and others that were a bit north. All had audible impacts, making it harder for some people to hear. I have no doubt also they were polluting the air. But by how much? And how much will this increase?

5. What is the definition of sustainability used by the Port in the SAMP plan?

When REDOing the EIS, define sustainability. Then show how this plan is actually "Sustainable."

I can't find a definition of "sustainable." But maybe somewhere in 6000 pages there is one. I tried to find definitions and use them as a lens to look at the SAMP EIS. I don't know what section this comment applies to in the EIS, in a way it applies to all areas. Appropriate places would be in the intro

<https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Cover-Cover-Letter-Fact-Sheet-TOC-and-Acronyms.pdf>

The only use of sustainable other than headlines is for sustainable aviation fuel on page 23.

I also looked in the summary

<https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/SAMP-NTP-SEPA-DEIS-Summary.pdf>

same outcome: the word is used in the headlines and SAF.

To find a definition of "sustainability", I looked in Google. The first listing is from the United Nations. Here are some important points from the UN page:

<https://www.un.org/en/academic-impact/sustainability> :

- A. In 1987, the [United Nations Brundtland Commission](#) defined sustainability as "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."

When REDOing the EIS, show how this plan is actually "Sustainable." How does this align with the Seatac plan?

- B. The UN has many sustainable development goals. I find no references to any of them in the Seatac “sustainable” master plan.

When REDOing the EIS, show how this plan is aligns with the UN “Sustainable Development Goals.”

Or, are these sustainable development goals ones that Seatac should use? If not, why not? If yes, then the overall plans as well as the EIS need to be revised and restructured.

In 90 days, there’s no way any single writer could look over all the goals, assess them, then come up with suggestions. But the Port has had years to work on this and could spend more time to get things right.

Here is an example of the approach that professional reviewers with more time could take. First, find a goal. A topic of particular interest to me is loss of forest. See UN sustainable goal 15 <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/biodiversity/>

Second, assess. Between the Port’s warehouses, private warehouses, state route 509 to get cargo to the warehouses, and other projects, there has already been a significant loss of forest in the Seatac area. But how big is this, both in the Port’s land and then in land adjacent that the Port influences or de facto controls? The data for this assessment is not available.

The plan ignores the decline. There’s no history, no baseline, no forecast and no remediation planned, at least that I can find in the portion of the 6000 pages I looked at.

When REDOing the EIS, show what the cumulative loss of forest has been and will be over time when the Port achieves its dream 31 projects.

Third, look for solutions. Commendably, there is a start on this outside of the SAMP process. The Port has created low impact, low budget projects that require matching funds, volunteer hours and other people’s cash. What’s the impact of these that is due to the Port? What more should the Port do? An example is the Miller Creek trailhead, something the Port took a lot of credit for even though most of the funding came from the city of Burien. What other projects are needed? When the Port chops down several hundred trees, can the storm systems handle the water? What’s the impact on air quality, noise and heat islands? These are questions that should be answered, not just deflected with “it isn’t significant”.

6. What are examples of sustainability in the SAMP plan?

When REDOing the EIS, show examples of sustainability, if there actually are any.

I can't tell. Maybe it is water treatment? Maybe it is buildings that are LEED certified?

Or maybe the Port's sustainability wording is just greenwashing, other than for SAF?

The UN definition was the first listing in Google. The second is from a UCLA web page that builds on the UN definition.

<https://sustain.ucla.edu/what-is-sustainability/>

Here's an excerpt from the page:

In the [charter](#) for the UCLA Sustainability Committee, sustainability is defined as: "the integration of environmental health, social equity and economic vitality in order to create thriving, healthy, diverse and resilient communities for this generation and generations to come. The practice of sustainability recognizes how these issues are interconnected and requires a systems approach and an acknowledgement of complexity."

This leads to many questions that should be answered in the REDO of the EIS.

Where is the foundation for this generation and generations to come? It is very clear the Port has no discussion of the ethics, of noise impacts and zoning that results in people having to move so there can be more warehouses. I guess generations to come do need warehouse space, but what are the tradeoffs that are explicitly stated? Missing. There's nothing saying "if we do X, this will result in the displacement of Y housing units." Listen to people who spoke at the July 9 hearing. They are neighbors. They know or want to know what the impacts are. Are they going to bankrupt because of the airport's expansion?

As I attempt to read the 6000 pages, I also wonder "where is the systems approach? Where is the ACKNOWLEDGEMENT of complexity?"

I don't think it exists. Instead, the 31 projects are disconnected from the past, using arbitrary starting years that conveniently show are chosen so they are "no significant impacts." The cumulative impacts section of the master plan is supposed to address complexity and disconnectedness, not ignore these topics.

The UCLA page also mentions social equity. This reminds me again of Felleman's small impacts assertion. The EIS mentions jobs as gate attendants and airplane services (baggage for example) as the main examples of how wonderful this plan is for people who reside near the airport. Paraphrasing the EIS, "ignore the pollution, a few jobs are created, and that's environmental justice." There's nothing about the transfer of wealth:

the people who can afford the cost of a ticket that's equal to a lower income family's rent for a month don't have to deal with any of the costs of the pollution, in stark contrast to the lower income people who are negatively impacted by the pollution.

Is this addressed at all?

Also missing from the EIS is impacts on city budgets. WHY are the cities always in financial trouble? WHY, the airport is such a beneficial neighbor with all this wonderful "economic development", are the cities always short of tax revenue? There is no real growth of city incomes that correlates to Seatac growth. Instead, we have a negative correlation: the Port gets richer and builds its billion dollar reserves and the cities suffer.

The EIS REDO should include impacts on city budgets. This includes realistic projections on future growth of property values, which is what drives city tax revenue for the most part.

7. How is this EIS "sustainable" plan different from any other airport expansion plan, or any other airport master plan? How does it build on lessons-learned elsewhere?

Maybe that's beyond the scope of the EIS. There's certainly no mention of any other airport. But in a way, that may be a prudent move. Seatac is small, can not use any rivers, lakes, ocean or other water ways for flight paths on final approaches (major contrast from PDX, LAX, SFO and many other airports), and has many more people living nearby. So maybe the lack of introspection and lessons learned is appropriate. ***But that should be explicitly stated in the EIS.***

8. What type of demand management is used as an alternative to building more Seatac infrastructure? What is the range of outcomes for passengers and cargo?

Demand management is missing in the alternatives listed in the 22 page summary doc. Locations could include page 6 or the summary table if this were in other docs (which apparently it isn't).

<https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/SAMP-NTP-SEPA-DEIS-Summary.pdf>

The EIS REDO should include demand management as an alternative to construction.

The scenarios for 2032 and 2037 seem to assume straight – line projections for increases. Missing from the data is the following:

- A. I wrote at one point “The percentages and breakouts of passenger and cargo that’s local origin and destination, vs passengers who are in transit through Seattle. “ I actually did find the data much later, buried in an appendix and not referenced in the main documents. However, the data, from a consultant, is several years old and appears designed to mask deep analysis of alternatives.

Alaska Air has announced service from Boise and from Spokane to Hawaii. This avoids transfers in Seattle or elsewhere. Alaska has announced Portland is a second hub. What impact does this have on the “need” or projected use of a new terminal and all the costs that go with it?

The EIS REDO should include details of passenger travel, both current and forecasted. Is there any economic value add for the region, once all costs are considered, to being a hub for travel to Asia? If there is, that value that is created should be shared with the communities that are impacted. If there is not, then what’s the point? Stick the flights in Portland or Boise, where there’s more space and far fewer people are impacted. But when there’s no incremental or marginal cost, only then do these projects make financial sense. So, redo the EIS.

- B. Are all passenger quantities the same?

An example of a city that is trying to have quality tourism, not just huge numbers of visitors, is Barcelona. <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/07/10/travel/barcelona-overtourism-jose-antonio-donaire.html>

Does the Seatac plan have any foundation on strategic marketing, of focusing on some groups of customers as being a priority compared to others? It appears not. Instead, it is all about more more more. More passengers, more cargo, more whatever, with ginormous costs and impacts. Do we want to be like Barcelona and get in the mess they are in?

The EIS REDO should include a specific focus on customers and customer segments in the Purpose and Need section.

- C. The Port should use congestion pricing and demand management for flights as an alternative to more airport construction. Even if the FAA doesn’t bless it, there are ways to set up a system.

An analogy: road tolls are variable throughout the day and week. A way to deal with congestion is to charge airlines different prices OR otherwise have a market

throughout the day and night. If a plane is taking off between 10 pm and 7 am, the hours that are most disruptive for sleep, charge them more and use the proceeds to pay for more noise insulation. Address future growth through innovation, not just the same approaches the Port has always used. I realize it may be tricky to have differentiated pricing. But has anyone asked for this? Another option though is to have a non cash unit of value. I'm not sure what that would be, but maybe the consultants the Port hires could do some original thinking on this. CLARITY of who[s flying can be helpful. Publish the names of the flights and destinations, just like cites publish the names of customers of prostitutes. The principal is the same: they do damage, so expose them.

I read in page 68 out of 126 that the Port has a voluntary night time flight program. Really? What difference does it make? There are still flights going to Asia that leave at 2 am, and given the Port's mania for the Asia market and lust for cargo revenue, that number is very likely to increase. As I mention elsewhere, this summer, while working out doors west of the airport, the noise at midnight to 1 am was exactly the same as 9 pm. There was a consistent non stop whine of the engines accelerating that was in upper treble cleff ranges (I think the G that is above the C that's an octave above middle C) compared to other times of day when there's more of a bass sound, a rumble, probably the G that's below the C that's an octave below middle C. And in the morning hours, the noise kicks off at 5 am with a high pitched whine. The whine does not seem to stop, so is not associated with an engine operation. What is the source?

The EIS is silent about sources of noise. **The EIS REDO should explain the sources of noise, and what the Port is doing about those sources.**

The proposed new terminal would be more palatable if it was accompanied by strict night time noise and flight operation limits or bans, similar to what Anaheim and a few others airports have. But instead it will be a crank it up, 24 x 7, expand the noise to the north, type of situation.

The EIS REDO should include realistic data about what flights are going to happen at given hours of the day. The International Arrivals facility has turned out to be a Trojan Horse. There was no EIS on it, no permitting, no discussion of how the flights to/from Asia fly at the most disruptive hours of the day. The "average" dNL may be the same, but distribution of flights does matter. What are the planes going to be in the new

terminal? It all depends on gate size. The EIS is silent about this, probably because the Port doesn't want people to know. For all we know, they could be holding A380s. There's no indication this will not be the case.

The EIS Redo should specify the flight activity that is going to happen with a new terminal. The EIS Redo should specify what is likely to happen at the International facility, and the impacts those hub and spoke flights from peak hour traffic when Alaska and Delta are bringing in all the connection flights to get people off to Asia will have on communities. Please don't hide behind gassy generalities of "oh we just need more space." NO WAY Alaska and Delta, the duopolists who control the airport, would agree to something as expensive as your plans unless they have very specific plans for how they will A) monetize that activity and B) leave United, Southwest and others at a competitive disadvantage and C) position themselves to increase airfares in the normal manner of duopolists.

Your claims that keeping capacity at the same rate will result in higher air fares is likely backwards. The massive costs of this set of projects have to be passed on to consumers, and the increasing market power of the duopolists means higher air fares.

Alaska has announced they want dozens more of international destinations by 2030. They win. We lose.

The EIS REDO should include impacts on air ticket prices.

9. What is the Port really doing to evaluate noise impacts of the 31 projects? To reduce them? The EIS is silent. Too bad the planes aren't silent.

The EIS REDO should include significant analysis of noise impacts. It should look at times of day, at the total number of incidents, the spread using metrics beyond 65dNL and otherwise be much more comprehensive. It should look at the pitch of the noise. How many more hours a day are we going to have the high pitched whine that is common between 5 and 7 am, and 9 pm until 1 am?

- A. Please don't state "noise reduction is handled in a Part 150 study." That is completely separate. Part 150 is always backwards looking, at least at Seatac, the last three Part 150s have NOT been about planning and prevention of future impacts. And after the situation several years ago, where the out of town consultants (who still make a pretty penny off the Port) set up a noise monitor right next to metal roofs on Vashon, then found the readings were ruined by rain

hitting the roofs, then said it was too late in the process to get the noise readings, I've not had a lot of confidence in Part 150 studies being anything more than a check list item.

- B. State Senator Tina Orwall, former Burien Mayor Rose Clark and I asked several years ago about hush houses. I don't see any mention of one. The Port has always said "we don't have space" which may have been true in the current configuration, but which is a matter of choice going forward.

So why is there no hush house for engine runups in the 31 projects? Is Seatac going to be the only top 20 airport without one? I can well believe that adding space for runups would then result in less revenue generation opportunities for the Port So in that sense, the lack of a Hush House does make financial sense. For the Port. Because there's no cost they pay , just that neighbors pay, when engine runups create noise impacts.

The EIS REDO should address a Hush House. Either include one or state why one is not needed. I do realize we can't ban engine run ups and that the Port supposedly has some type of runup limits.

- C. I asked several years ago about noise walls. The response was "we can't set up noise walls on the west side or east side of the airport because of various reasons. Well guess what: the airport DOES currently have a noise wall on the east side. It is called the TERMINAL. That east side also has a natural hill (though the north end new terminal may not have as much of a noise absorption as the current locations are absorbed).

So, what is the Port doing as a part of the master plan to REDUCE noise by ABSORBING it in new construction of a new terminal and other buildings? For that matter, why doesn't the Port remodel the current buildings to absorb noise?

The EIS REDO should outline HOW buildings, both current and new, can be adjusted to absorb noise, not reflect and amplify it as is currently the case.

Unfortunately, it appears the people who designed the International Terminal and many other facilities did not do ANYTHING to reduce noise impacts. Instead

these buildings reflect and amplify because they are constructed from metal and glass and are at the same level as the jet engines. I guess this is where the Port strongarming the city of Seatac into the city not having any input on the terminal paid off quite well, for the Port.

I bet a reviewer will comment “well a noise wall is not one of the near term projects we’ve identified as yadda yadda, so this comment will be ignored.” Yep, Noise absorption and noise reductions are not goals. They don’t fit into NTP categories. So even though noise reduction fits within the definitions of sustainability, we’re back to the situation where Seatac’s “sustainability” is greenwashing, not a goal.

The cynical question that should be answered in the EIS REDO is whether doing nothing to reduce noise is by design, with the goal of making noise worse for neighbors so the Port can get cities to move them out and then put up more cargo warehouses and parking lots for “economic development.”

Note that these noise impacts don’t need to be associated with 65 dNL contour maps, which in any case would not result in the airport spending its own money for mitigation, just Other Peoples Money.

D. The EIS REDO should use noise metrics in addition to 65 dNL.

In chapter 4, page 59 out of 126, the Port hides behind the FAA. There is NOTHING stopping the Port from using other metrics. There is NOTHING saying the port can’t look at the number of times there are noise events above a certain level at a certain hour of the day. THAT is what interrupts sleep, shortens people’s lives and disrupts the growth of children.

It is nice the Port conducted a literature review:

The Port conducted a literature review of recent studies that examined statistical relationships between aircraft noise and a range of potential human health effects.

E. The noise impacts in the EIS are “smoothed.” They are the equivalent of saying “you’re not hurting because we only have the dental drill running without pain medicine for an average of one minute per hour.” But that assumes even a

minute is bearable, and ignores the many times when the minutes add up to hours.

The EIS should state that dNL is a dated mathematical average that has minimal connection to health impacts.

The EIS should look at other noise metrics, such as number of times per hour that noise events above a certain decibel level are recorded. Even if the Port can't get funding from the FAA for this, it should still be done. The EIS gives a very misleading picture of noise impacts to airport neighbors.

The hour of the day is a particular frustration for noise. It seems to be a non issue in the EIS, with zero analysis or forecasts of time of day distribution of noise.

Cargo – only flights and international flights to Asia do seem to fly more at night and those are the flights the Port is trying to grow (not just meet demand, but rather actively market to increase demand in the name of economic development, with the intent of Seatac being a hub airport for travel to Asia.

In June and July, I was outside many days and evenings. West of the airport, it is quite striking how many times the noise is significantly higher at 9 pm until 1 am (yes I was working that late), compared to earlier in the day. See previous comment about demand management.

Here are two sets of mock data. The averages are the same. Do you think the noise and health impacts are the same? Red shows which scenario is louder at a given hour. The "peak in later hours" reflects more 7, 8 and 9 am hour flights, and more late night flights. The "Peak earlier" scenario has more flights in the middle of the day.

When there's zero incremental cost to running the flights at sleep time, then we can get a very different distribution of noise, and impacts on sleep.

Hour	Peak in later hours	peak earlier	difference
0	2	2	0
1	2	2	0
2	1	1	0
3	1	1	0
4	1	1	0
5	8	8	0
6	8	8	0

7	12	9	3
8	12	9	3
9	11	9	2
10	6	7	-1
11	6	7	-1
12	6	7	-1
13	6	7	-1
14	6	7	-1
15	7	11	-4
16	8	11	-3
17	12	13	-1
18	12	13	-1
19	12	13	-1
20	12	11	1
21	12	11	1
22	12	10	2
23	12	10	2
24	12	10	2

7.96 7.92

The EIS REDO should include much more realistic assessment of noise impacts.

10. What is the Port doing to create sustainable living buildings that are modeled after the Bullitt center in Seattle?

Examples of infrastructure and solutions that could be included as a part of the projects:

- A. Carbon capture
- B. Enclosed walkways that do not let in polluted air when passengers are walking to their planes. This probably requires some type of air pressure set up.
- C. Public display of current air quality at various locations such as when people are walking out of the terminals onto the jet ways in the C concourse, the garage, or the arrival and drop off area.
- D. Living roofs, like at the Exploratorium in San Francisco
- E. Living walls: grow plants on the walls

Already mentioned:

- walls that absorb sound instead of amplifying it

- Noise walls or berms
- Hush house for engine runups.

11. What is the Port doing to reduce car traffic and vehicle emissions?

I wish the Port had this goal:

We will grow without increasing parking, in the same way that the city of Seattle is doing. We will follow Seattle's lead of "grow your housing and commercial space without adding parking. We will set up trip reduction programs, cap the number of vehicles in the airport area and subsidize feeder buses. We will have a bus first approach to passenger pickup and drop off. Single occupancy gas powered vehicles will have to drop farther from the terminal, with clear incentives for those arriving by other means."

But note: I don't think walking and biking is going to be one of those means. I did see a reference to the Port encouraging this. News to me. I've never seen any bike racks or safe bike storage, or bike lanes, in the area.

The EIS seems to be all about spending who knows how much money on a parking garage. There's no effort to make light rail work better by having a moving walkway. (though the lack of luggage space on the LINK trains, and the transfer in Chinatown International District for people coming from the eastside, are also issues. And if / when there's a second rail tunnel, the situation for travelers is going to get a lot worse.) A friend who works in Transit said "you do not want to take those (CID) elevators." But for travelers with luggage, elevators are key.

I am very surprised to see the EIS forecasts a drop in vehicle emissions because of changes to car levels. So what's the fleet mix to make this happen? The US EPA has just cancelled vehicle emission regulations. The EIS was issued after the Feb 12 announcement.

The EIS REDO should include much more realistic assessment of transportation alternatives, models of how people get to and from the airport, and what it would take to change this mix. It may involve moving beyond the fantasy that light rail will be a major solution for passengers – the planned second tunnel would result in riders having to move 8 stories (100 feet or so) from one train track to the other which is hard and will be even harder with luggage.

The Port should work with Metro, Community Transit and Pierce Transit to have airporter buses similar to the Bellair shuttles that go outside of King County. Run

express buses every 15 minutes from some number, say 10 for a start, different points around the region. Follow the example of the Microsoft connector buses. What would the impact on traffic from that type of a setup? The EIS should address this and other scenarios.

This plan is using obsolete data. It needs to reflect current reality OR present two scenarios, one with the eliminated standards and one with the original standards.

<https://www.reuters.com/legal/litigation/trump-administration-set-revoke-basis-us-climate-regulation-2026-02-12/>

The appendix on mitigation is mostly focused on employees.; That's nice, but actions speak louder than words: the new employee parking lot tells how "not" effective the Port's trip reduction program is. And the appendix is silent about real ways of helping reduce car trips from travelers. I realize this appendix is a summary of other items so suggestions from elsewhere about the **EIS REDO** would flow to here.

<https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Appendix-P-Minimization-and-Mitigation-Measures.pdf>

12. Instead of one new terminal at Seatac, why not have distributed terminals, similar to Boston Logan?

This could have many positive impacts of making it much easier for people to check in, easier to handle traffic in the airport area, and, if the locations were near public transit, easier for people to get to/ from the distributed terminal locations.

Boston Logan is doing this. It does not seem to be considered in the SEA EIS.

The EIS REDO should include and assessment of distributed terminals outside the current footprint.

13. EIS sections on cumulative impacts and on justice need to look at the tax situation.

The assertions in section 4.3.1 about tax base mask WIDE disparities.

The EIS REDO should break out the impacts on specific cities.

What is the 'community' the Port uses? It is not defined. Certainly Issaquah's tax base greatly benefits from Costco's HQ. But does Des Moines' tax base benefit from Costco? Or from any more than a smidgen of B and O tax revenue? This EIS section is particularly

pathetic. There are a lot of conjectures, smoke and hand waving. There's zero actual analysis or data. Making sense of the chapter is particularly hard because it references readers to data from five different appendices.

The Port does not pay any property tax to the cities, schools, fire or other governments in the area, yet relies on these governments to meet critical needs. Example: if there's a fire in the warehouses on their property at 216th, the Des Moines fire station a few blocks away will be there first, and probably only, responder.

When the port sets up facilities that compete with private ownership, this reduces the value of the privately held land, which in turn reduces tax revenues.

The comments about expanding the port parking to the periphery, causing detours for 60 some houses, has a rosy glasses optimism that there's no community impact in that area. Sorry, not so. Those houses are going to drop in value. Who wants to live next to 24 hour parking lots? What's the city "tax base" based on? Property tax revenue. Your actions, your selfishness, your lack of providing alternative forms of transport, will cost the nearby cities dearly.

In the EIS REDO, you need to get real about the costs to communities of shoving your facilities out towards them.

When the Port sticks warehouses north of 518, expands the footprint of paved over areas that have extensive traffic, and otherwise expands, this reduces the tax base and reduces the options. The bitter reality is no one has been able to make anything other than warehousing work near the airport. No light industry, no manufacturing, just movement of products. This pays minimal B and O tax, no sales tax, needs very little improvement of facilities and thus does not have any notable assessed value.

I realize the Port is not a Housing agency. However, the Port's construction programs DO have an impact on housing: they REDUCE the housing supply at the same time the cities, due to growth management mandates, are supposed to INCREASE the supply.

The EIS REDO should include impacts on nearby tax bases and tax revenues. This should be based on REAL data, NOT phony computer modeling the Port has used in the past to sucker Normandy Park mayor and a few others into thinking the Port is some type of major economic boost for the nearby cities. It isn't. The wealth accrues to

airport users and their affiliates, such as Microsoft, Costco, Amazon, and other companies that together have trillions of dollars in market cap.

The EIS redo should acknowledge the structure that is inherent in this whole setup, that is the transfer of wealth from the poorer nearby communities to the richer eastside.

It is quite ironic the Issaquah mayor spoke about how much Seatac benefits Costco, headquartered in his city. The irony: Costco corporate is located on the Pickering Farm. Guess what it used to be? An AIRPORT. So, Issy gets to close their airport, reap property tax, sales tax, B and O and other major benefits of their tenants while sticking the bill to the communities near the airport.

The cumulative impacts and justice sections of the EIS REDO should acknowledge this reality and outline plans to make Highline area taxpayers whole.

I am particularly sensitive to the costs of policing for prostitution along Pacific Highway because a high school classmate was murdered by the Green River killer in 1982. The cities of Seatac, Des Moines and to a lesser extent Federal Way and Tukwila all have to deal with the crime spillover that comes from having an airport as a neighbor. The Port Police never has to deal with crime at 1 am off the airport property. The challenges of this are bound to increase as the airport expands. To be blunt, there are no memorials to Port police killed in the line of duty for defending the cities against the crime that resulted from the airport's presence. Go to Underwood Park or the Cox (a family friend) park in White Center and read these preceding lines aloud, slowly and thoughtfully.

14. Air quality at airport terminals, gateways and on the tarmac is not specified.

What are the current readings for CO2 and other pollutants in the airport terminals, and on the airport runways where workers are moving planes? This is one of the questions I asked Kilroy in the email that's in the appendix of partly answered emails. How will these levels change when there are 30% or more flight operations, and moreover, a projected increase in longer distance flights with a larger fleet mix? How many days per year are there now, and will there be, readings above OSHA limits?

This is a complicated subject. **That's why the EIS REDO should include background info about what levels are acceptable vs that's harmful, as well as have data. Don't just have numbers in isolation without any context. Here are links to relevant information:**

<https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/regulations/standardnumber/1910/1910.1000>

I once heard the airport HQ offices at Seatac have significantly better air quality filters than the air filters used in the terminals for other workers and for passengers. I am not surprised by this if it is true: the offices are enclosed and much easier to keep contained than the entry ways. However,

The EIS Redo should specific how indoor air quality can be addressed and improved. This is in addition to concerns about tarmac workers. If not now, when? This "is" related to near term projects.

A place to put this information would be in section 3.2.1, comparing the actuals to the levels listed in the table on page 9. Page 11 has short tons, not PPM. Pages 13 and following shows Beacon Hill, which is about 10 miles from the airport, and Sunset Park, NOT the airport drive, terminal, tarmac, maintenance facilities or other areas close to the airport. I will note that the air quality data, as presented, is very confusing and takes a lot more expertise to analyze than I have. So I could well be missing something or misunderstanding something. But that does not excuse the lack of measurements on site, the very brief time period of less than a year, etc.

My sense also is there are additional pollutants that should be considered. The dismissal of UFPs is "knowledgeable ignorance" – people know they are a big deal, a major problem (that's the knowledge) so come up with excuses and rationalizations to avoid them (the ignorance).

The EIS REDO should have "taste" days: current and future.

A "taste" day is when people are outside and they can taste some type of gasoline in the air. I experience this a mile west of the airport a few times per year. I have tasted this air also at Chinook Middle School in Seatac. The air is "tasteable" for several hours, often to mid day. Residents of Redondo and Woodmont (Des Moines) have also commented on this. They guessed it was a fuel dump from Delta. However, there is zero chance that was the case at Chinook, and very unlikely it was the case directly west of the airport at the center of the runways.

The EIS REDO needs to make comparisons of past, present and future much easier.

Of course, the big question is "what will the levels be with 30% more flights, or whatever? What is the maximum level? What were the levels used in previous EISs, and at what level is

flight activity too high?" I asked related questions about these topics in the emails in the appendices, the emails I only got partial responses to from Rybolt and Kilroy.

https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Chapter-3_Affected-Environment.pdf

I tried to find the answers by looking at chapter 4

https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Chapter-4_Impacts-and-Mitigation-Measures.pdf

The first big problem: there's no baseline in the document. We have to skip back and forth the chapter 3, a separate document.

Also, as mentioned elsewhere, it is not clear what level of flights drives the numbers. That is a consistent problem throughout the portion of the 6000 pages I had time to read.

15. Future flight tracks

At times, the Port and FAA have changed flight tracks. What is the plan for handling 30% more flights? For handling 50%? The projected maps for these levels are not in the EIS. They should be.

At times, there have been a significant number of takeoffs over Normandy Park, starting at 186th and going south to 216th. There have been a significant number turning over Gregory Heights and Seahurst in Burien when the planes are heading north.

In the EIS REDO, please answer with a detailed fleet mix that looks at both larger and smaller planes flying over our city Are there any written agreements signed by the Port Commission that specify limits to flights over the city? What good are any voluntary agreements?

16. Perimeter security

I can't find any mention of security in the 6000 pages. I have sent in a couple of security suggestions over the years. I can think of a number of security improvements that could reduce risks to neighbors and the port but I don't bother since no one replied and frankly I don't think anyone I sent to sees security as their problem.

Definitely, security projects should be included in the EIS REDO.

A challenge with outlining specific suggestions is if something then goes wrong, the people who pointed out the vulnerabilities are likely to be suspects.

17. Microplastics

How many microplastics currently exit the airport property into the surrounding creeks or blow off the airport into the surrounding air? How will this number change when flight activity increases 30%? I don't find any mention of microplastics.

The EIS REDO should address microplastics as pollutants and health hazards. Just because they have been ignored to date does not mean they should be ignored going forward.

Here is a starting point for your research:

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0147651325007389>

18. Electrically powered planes

The draft does not show any locations for charging electric planes. If those become an option for plane travel, where will the chargers be located? Does the SAMP plan call for increased power substations that would be needed? What type of additional facilities would be needed, if any? Again, maybe this is buried in the 6000 pages.

The EIS REDO should address electric plane infrastructure. I would not count on electric air taxis in significant volume being able to land at the other nearby airports – Boeing Field and Renton, and possibly Tacoma Narrows or Auburn.

Here's an article about GE's work in this area. Electric planes could well be on the horizon. The Port needs flexibility to adjust to these, especially for smaller planes on regional flights. Or maybe the Port should not even try, but just tell people to go to Boeing Field and then pay for the stop at 130th on light rail, very convenient for people transferring between airports?

<https://www.seattletimes.com/business/boeing-aerospace/hybrid-electric-aircraft-reach-new-heights-as-climate-rules-loom/>

For KCIA, aka Boeing Field, look at what they're doing. Sounds a lot better than what the EIS NTPs include.

[Vision 2045 \(FAA Master Plan Update\) - Airport](#)



[King County \(.gov\)](#)

<https://kingcounty.gov › dept › airport › projects › visio...>

The completed *plan* will include a noise study and will tell us which construction projects, infrastructure, and other updates to prioritize and fund in the ...

Missing: electric | Show results with: [electric](#)

AI Overview



+6

King County International Airport (KCIA / Boeing Field) is integrating electrical infrastructure upgrades and fleet electrification into its long-range Vision 2045 Master Plan Update and sustainability initiatives.

Electrical and Sustainability Goals

- **Electrical Resilience Study:** King County conducts specialized studies evaluating airport grid reliability, underground electrical infrastructure vulnerabilities, and groundwater impacts.
- **Carbon Neutrality Target:** KCIA aims to be carbon neutral by 2030 for direct (Scope 1) and indirect purchased electricity/heating (Scope 2) emissions.
- **Airfield Upgrades:** Capital improvement programs regularly separate and upgrade electrical circuitry and regulators to support safety enhancements like runway guard lights.

Fleet Electrification

- **Zero-Emission Equipment:** KCIA deployed the nation's first battery-electric runway sweeper and a hybrid-electric aircraft rescue and firefighting (ARFF) vehicle.
- **Charging Infrastructure:** The airport is expanding Level 2 charging stations to support transitioning county-owned operations and fleet vehicles to battery-electric models (like the Ford F-150 Lightning). Paid public EV charging fee structures at the terminal parking lot roll out starting September 1, 2026.

19. What is the impact on "heat islands" of all the additional impervious surface?

Dr Cliff Mass of the UW Dept of Atmospheric Sciences has already stated that pre third runway temperature readings can't be compared to post third runway because the runway and associated projects resulted in changes to the temperatures in the area. See this post for example

<https://cliffmass.blogspot.com/2011/07/did-sea-tacs-third-runway-change-our.html>

The EIS REDO should have current information on heat and also outline future trends. Note that in some cases, the glass from the walls at Seatac can warm surroundings through reflection. The reflection especially warms the air on the tarmac, worsening the health problems facing workers and causing chemical reactions to occur that don't occur at cooler temperatures.

20. Context on carbon emissions and other Green House Gases.

The EIS REDO should provide context in this EIS about overall context of emissions and on growth of emission trends.

So when we see a number, it is hard to know if it is significant, or non significant. The issue also is tipping points, when do changes overwhelm a local area, a local system? If the claim is, for example, we're at half of emission levels that are problematic, then at 5% growth rate, we double our emissions in just 14 years. Then what?

21. Carbon allowances and offsets.

I do not see any carbon offsets in the plans. Not for construction, not for operations, nothing about removal, nothing.

Will the Port ever have to buy carbon allowances directly, as opposed to buying indirectly when it pays for energy from Puget Sound Energy or Seattle City Light, or oil-based products for various purposes?

It seems an impact is that if / when the Port is enabling increases in carbon emissions, but the state overall goals are to reduce carbon output, then in order to meet state carbon goals, the Port needs to do something.

The port admits extensive construction-related CO2 will result from the construction of buildings, taxiways, roads, the rail system between the terminals and all the other infrastructure.

The port claims a goal of carbon neutral, but it is impossible to see how the NTPs achieve that goal.

The EIS REDO should include carbon offsets for construction as well as for ongoing operations. This should be studied in multiple areas.

22. Transfer of Wealth and claims of Economic Justice

From page 13 of the intro, this is quite the assertion:

The SEPA evaluation found that the Action Alternatives would increase air emissions, traffic congestion, and noise, decrease tree canopy, and increase economic activity. However, none of these effects would cause significant impacts to vulnerable or overburdened populations. The NTPs would support long-term economic growth in the region with beneficial effects on unemployment and jobs, two of the indicators in the Port's Equity Index.

Define "significance.":

If it is your home equity that's destroyed, your home you need to move from that has a low interest rate mortgage, if you're mobility impaired and the extra time and distance in the 24th Ave South region is longer because Port employees need more parking and there's a demand for cargo space, is that "significant impacts"?

To the writers of the EIS, probably not.

To the residents, probably yes.

I am not familiar with the equity index, so have no idea what else it covers. Health of neighbors? Equity of sleep? Hard to know.

The SAMP social justice sections do not break out who's traveling through Seatac. What percent is business? What percent is leisure? What will drive the growth the Port wants to accommodate? The answers are not in the documents. But, I think it is fair to say the business travelers working for major corporations and the leisure travelers jetting off on vacations have net worth and cash flow many multiples that of the people who are negatively impacted by Seatac's growth. To use an economic term, their "utility" increases by having less wait time, less hassle, and easier connections that result from more flights from Seatac. In contrast, the

“utility” of the residents decreases. It is a zero sum, some win a lot lose, type of situation. The airport claim is this doesn’t matter because a few jobs are created. Well, maybe yes maybe no. Where are the forecasts of job creation? Not in the planning documents. What are the locations of the jobs? What are the locations of the workers? Also not mentioned.

This morning, Alaska announced flights from Seatac to Athens and to Paris. I looked up the costs of a ticket. I looked at the ticket price: round trip prices in June are in the 1200, 1300, or up to 6000 range depending on dates and fare class. To put these numbers in perspective, 1500 is one bedroom for a month, and \$6K is more than most families will spend for two months rent.

I have no doubt the utility function of people who can afford that is enhanced by being able to fly non stop. But when some people are bearing health costs and other negative impacts, this is in NO WAY socially just. If you want a biblical perspective, read the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Luke 16: 19-31.

Here are some stories about the wealth of leisure air travelers. The Wall Street Journal in the past week has had two stories about the affluence of leisure travelers.

<https://www.wsj.com/lifestyle/travel/boomers-are-wealthy-healthy-and-driving-a-global-travel-boom-8dac2ffb>

excerpt:

Baby boomers collectively have more [wealth than any other living generation](#), and they are splurging on travel. They are living longer, have [more free time and are in better shape](#) than their parents and grandparents. As the first of the boomers hit their 80s, there is also a [greater urgency](#) to see as much of the world as they can.

<https://www.wsj.com/economy/the-rise-of-the-unstoppable-american-tourist-485f025b>

excerpt:

American travel has transformed in recent decades. A nation of former homebodies has become one of zealous and moneyed international travelers, infiltrating every cobblestoned corner of Europe and rapidly filling lesser-known destinations.

Americans took a record 24 million trips to Europe in 2025. Portugal received nearly five times the number of U.S. visitors last year as it did a decade earlier. Greece took in four times as many.

Consulting firm [Tourism Economics](#) expects [American visits to Europe](#) will have increased another 5% by the end of the year. The travel is helping [boost economies](#) even as it has [angered many locals](#) who say their cities, now reliant on foreign visitors, are no longer serving them.

Pages 92 and following in Chapter 3 totally avoid questions about transfers of wealth from the poor to the rich. There is the table showing that income is lower in the GSA by a substantial amount. Cause – Effect? Unanswered. Why only use a small area for census blocks on 99? Maybe because bigger blocks would point to more people being impacted. But then page 99 does seem to have bigger area. CONFUSING because there's a map, but no data, the only census tracts appear to be ones defined as noise impacted!

The EIS REDO should cover a much bigger area. If planes are in take off lanes or landing paths, that area is impacted and should be studied.

https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Chapter-3_Affected-Environment.pdf

23. Land Use Plans

This is another one of those “nice conjecture, we’ve heard that before” type of claims.

Page 13 mentions compatibility with local land use plans. It makes it sound like the cities create these plans independent of manipulation from Port employee DK and others. NOPE. Look at what’s going on with tree cutting in Mathison Park and elsewhere. Look at what’s going on in Burien’s NERA process. This is not a case of the city making plans on its own. It is a case of the Port telling the cities what they need to do, or of creating conditions so intolerable that they drive changes to city plans.

The EIS REDO needs to acknowledge the reality that the Port is the elephant, and the cities are an ant. The ant can have all the plans in the world, all the growth management and sustainability and state mandates to reduce carbon – but those play zero role in what the Port EVER does.

Here’s the problem: these type of surprises seem to keep happening over and over and over. No one ever said when the Third Runway was built that there would need to be thousands of trees cut in so called Safety Zones. No planning documents said there would need to be NERA destruction because after all the Third Runway was only going to be used in bad weather. So nothing would be needed, right?

So what are the gotchas going to be this time in this EIS? What are the consequences you know full well are going to happen and that YOU are planning for with projections for air traffic, for expansion of cargo, for expansion of other facilities, when the Port hits the numbers they are using to sell bonds? This document is in fantasy land. There WILL be impacts, but the Port chooses to hide them by hiding the data that would help make the impacts visible so cities and residents can make realistic plans.

The EIS REDO needs to start here with this reality:

<https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/SAMP-NTP-SEPA-DEIS-Summary.pdf>

24. Surface Transportation

At first I wrote “First, I don’t see any mention of rail, shuttles, taxis, ride shares, buses or any other form of transportation besides cars. Maybe I missed it? Is there anything in this “sustainable” plan that reduces single occupancy gas – powered cars? I don’t think setting up a lot of charge stations would be feasible unless this is done valet-style, with people who can move a vehicle away once it is fully charged. Leaving a car connected to a charging station for days or longer seems unwise.”

But then, maybe there’s a smidgen in an appendix? They are all starting to blur together.

If you really wanted a sustainable plan, you would set up structures that support Sustainability. Maybe there are. Maybe the second terminal will give priority to buses for loading and unloading. Maybe it will be set up so there’s not the hassles on the current doom loop at arrivals between 6 pm and midnight in particular, and departures in the morning and afternoon. But based on the car projections, this does NOT seem to be the case. Or maybe the Port would tick off core constituencies (the business community, chambers of commerce and ilk) if they said sorry, you need to give up your privilege and change your behavior.

Second, there is a fundamental contradiction in the assumptions. The constant assertion is “well this is just going to make it easier for people, we won’t have incremental growth. The growth is going to happen anyways.”

Well, what about parking? What about pick up and drop off without the projects? Could that happen with current parking, or only with the new structures? I think the latter.

The important concept is simple: build it, and they come. Don’t built it, they don’t and can’t come. (I assume the cities would not change their comp plans to have more parking lots,).

Think of rice going through a funnel. At some point, too much rice being fed through the funnel leads to a complete stoppage.

You know you're close to that point at many hours of the day currently. Yet you assume Seatac can have 30% more fliers going through even if the SAMP projects are not built. Nope. Not without more parking, or significantly revised loading and unloading (for example, all arrivals need to be picked up in the parking structure, with several hundred parking places removed). But you're not doing that because you are counting on the parking revenue.

So, when your hired traffic consultants assert there's just a minor difference of traffic with some billions (tens? Hundreds? Not stated) in spending on facilities to handle more passengers or handle them more "efficiently" depending on one's point of view, those consultants are missing something. There is NO way the impacts of all these projects are minor compared to the Do Nothing scenario. The reason is "do nothing" would mean major gridlock, in other words, it could never actually get that bad. People would switch to other forms of transportation, or would go to Paine Field, Amtrak, long distance bus or simply not travel.

You should learn from the approaches the City of Seattle is taking. They are saying "no more parking at a 1 to 1 ratio." When new buildings are constructed, they do not need a parking spot. Instead, the assumption is people will use buses, light rail or other means. This is called Demand Management. It can save people a lot of money. Instead of building more infrastructure, use the existing infrastructure more efficiently.

This is called "sustainability."

Where's your demand management? As mentioned before, where's your sustainability? Not in the documents, at least that I can find. Page 14 of the intro mentions putting in a few turn lanes on local streets. Not mentioned: highways 509 and 518. These are treacherous for drivers many hours of the day. The descent east on 518 before passing under I5 is especially problematic. What is the impact of this congestion from increased passenger travel and from increased cargo? The intro document is silent about 509 and 518.

Chapter 3 has a focus on INTERSECTIONS. Here's what's missing: CORRIDORS. See

https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Chapter-3_Affected-Environment.pdf

and also page 76 and vicinity of chapter 4.

The EIS REDO needs to make it much simpler to connect travel time metrics as stated in the documents to future plans. What bus capacity is needed? Who pays? I am guessing the Port expects King County taxpayers to increase Metro funding, not for the Port to pay anything to helping people get to the airport. But that is a guess, the documents are silent on this topic.

Basically, these documents have a whole lot of description that is utterly useless at figuring out what we're in for.

The EIS REDO should include impacts on travel time and congestion for the following roads of people traveling east from the airport area:

Kent Des Moines Road

216th

200th

188th

Highway 518

It should include assessments of the following north south roads:

I5

Military Road

Pacific Highway,

Des Moines Memorial Drive

8th Avenue South

16th Ave South

24th Avenue South (especially problematic because part of the road is being eviscerated)

Ambaum Boulevard

Chapter 4 just lists intersections. CORRIDORS is what most people care about.

I then looked in Appendix L. This was the document that the Port did not load properly the first weekend. Searching for 518, I find some technical gobbledygook that may or may not make sense to someone who knows trafficspeak. For someone like me, who does not, the sections are very confusing. For example, look at page 11 (or 13 out of 252 in the search box).

<https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Appendix-L-Surface-Transportation.pdf>

First, the data is four years old. It was collected in spring 2022. Evidently 4 to 5 pm and 5 to 6 pm were considered key hours. Spoiler alert: the congestion is now present many more than just these hours. I have driven eastbound on 518 late in the evening and still had significant

bbackups. When picking up people at the airport, the worst times are often late in the evening, and that spills onto the roads in the area. I will hazard a guess that congestion is worse now than it was four years ago, when we were just barely out of Covid. But there's a mention of model calibration. So maybe there's more to this? That's the point: the impacts are IMPOSSIBLE to understand.

I read through page 25, trying to figure out what the impacts are of growth, and what the plan is for dealing with the challenges of significantly more travelers. Are there any plans that could help? For example, using offsite terminals and then busing people to the airport instead of all the single passenger cars? Subsidizing buses to get people to the terminals?

I continued searching through the document. Page 39 of 252 has an image. I can not believe this graph is current.

I then find a report from Concord Engineering. I think what I'm looking for is on page 100 of the 252 page document. But the claim seems to be traffic won't get worse, just throw in a few roundabouts and lights, presto, problem solved. So how long is the backup going to be? The extreme technical nature of this document creates mystery and suspense. I just want to know what the impacts are and how the Port is going to deal with them. Do we need more lanes? Likely yes. Who pays? I have no doubt the Port will try to use Other People's Money. There's no NTP for improvements to state highways passengers' use. And then, there's the mix of vehicles getting to the airport. This is not stated, It appears the Port is incapable of doing anything about this. Really? Nothing they can do?

I also looked at the evaluation of alternatives from the scoping process. There's a dismissive "no alternatives provided." As if citizens have the resources to come up with a bus plan to move thousands of people per day? As if citizens can assess what the impact is of light rail construction (or non construction) on the various corridors? Where there's a will, there's a way. See page 2 out of 14.

Page 3 mentions lack of bus service at the hours the employees need to get to work. Well, how about doing what Microsoft, Google and other tech companies do: run your own buses?

Overall, this document reads like one long set of excuses, of rationalizations of why something can't be done that is feasible, but is lower cost and therefore problematic when the Port's mission of economic development often translates to build more / spend more.

https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Chapter-2_Alternatives.pdf

The EIS REDO should include significant work on improvements to buses, shuttles and rail connections. It should include moving walkways from the light rail stop. There's plenty the

Port could do if they wanted to reduce air pollution from cars, traffic impacts and other negative externalities. Create choices, not echoes of past failed planning.

Straight line thinking is always easiest.

Straight line thinking is usually the costliest approach.

Port, we can do better. This section cries for a redo, and some innovation, and some CLEAR explanation of assumptions.

25. What is the point of content in Appendix K?

Comment: why are the pages up to 103 included.

<https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Appendix-K-Socioeconomics-EJ-Childrens-Health.pdf>

They seem irrelevant to the airport. Then suddenly at page 103 we get a bunch of info about environmental justice. There's no context or transition. What is going on?

26. Water and PFAS

Page 163 of chapter 3 mentions PFAS.

https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Chapter-3_Affected-Environment.pdf

It is comical to read "the Tyee Well was removed from service." WHO caused the damage? We know: it was the Port firefighters. WHO is going to fix the well, who will clean it up? Not stated. WHAT are the risks from your projects at making the pollution worse? Maybe the answers are buried in some appendix pages. The answers are not front and center in any of the main documents.

The EIS REDO needs a lot more clarity about what the plan is for PFAS clean-up. If you get your permits and don't have a plan, you can just keep ducking the issue, it is only when you need a permit that you get really fixated on solving problems. I saw a poster board at a workshop on PFAS, but it seems incidental to the NTPs, sort of the illegitimate child.

27. UFPs – Ultrafine Particles

Chapter 4 does not have any citations, just assertions along the lines of the science is vague. So here are some questions:

- What would the science need to say for you to assert the science is clear and that you're putting lives at risk?
- What are the levels going to be, both in the vicinity of the airport and in other regional areas?
- How "broad" and "how many years" would be needed? This is hand waving about very serious topics.
- If there is research that meets your criteria listed above, then what are you going to do? Keep harming people with your pollution? Or make changes to your plans to reduce the harms?

In the EIS REDO: evaluate UPF science much more carefully. Be realistic about the risks. Be a leader. Don't be like Big Tobacco in the 1960s, or Facebook/Meta currently.

One of the points of the USC LAX UW study was UFPs cover a much wider area than just inside 65 dNL contour. A UW researcher said the UFPs continued beyond the end of their very sizable study area.

As I read the appendix C, my thoughts are first, name a science that is "fully mature." Second, does the Port want to be a leader? Or just duck and run? Doing the minimum seems to be the preferred alternative, not being the cleanest greenest yadda yadda yadda. Leaders don't just create a fog of uncertainty. They seek truth. To put it different, if a car maker used this logic "we don't know what the problems are so we are going to ignore the problems and not ask any questions" the car maker would likely be one big juicy target for a class action lawsuit. The Port is setting itself up for this scenario.

You cite research about TAPs. My guess is your silence on UFP research is because you know the answer would undercut your 'we aren't going to any harm' claims. Are you buying insurance such that if you're wrong, people who are harmed will be made whole? And again the underlying impossibility here is in double checking what number of flights you're assuming, and at what point the number of flights "does" become a problem even by your standards.

28. Implement Carbon Removal. Create Plans in accord with the state of Washington CCA.

When I get to section 4.3.1 in https://sea-samp.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Chapter-4_Impacts-and-Mitigation-Measures.pdf my reaction is did I miss something? They talk about minimization and mitigation ONLY for construction. How about for the ongoing operations?

This is where the Port's tree removal program comes in. See in the appendix a letter from an assistant to Commissioner Calkins, where he says information about the impacts of trees removed for the so called flight safety is in the SAMP EIS. Well, this section is where I'd expect to find it. But I don't.

The reality is airplanes emit a lot of pollutants. How can the Port capture them at source? It is nice that Kilroy and team want to have electric power for planes near the terminals, but that only goes so far.

In the EIS REDO: specify carbon removal as a core part of the entire EIS. This may involve significant power needs, buildings or other infrastructure. I do not know what this would entail. Maybe giant air filters or cleaners on the sides of the runways? Maybe magnets that attract the carbon? Maybe something else?

If this air was going into the Port offices, I have no doubt the staff could come up with solutions. Here's another chance to be a leader.

When I look at the section on GHG, again I wonder "where's the context.". 2025 is presented as past tense. What really happened that year?

In the EIS REDO: include context about the state Carbon Commitment Act. It appears that at the time consumers and businesses are having their energy costs skyrocket, the Port is counteracting any downward reductions with increases at the airport.

Again, the numbers are hard to evaluate. Which roadways are included, and which ones are excluded? Only ones within the 65 cNL, so cargo trucks going to the warehouses along 216th, or the ones the Port appears hell-bent on eventually setting up in the NERA area are excluded? We have the same consistent problem: the underlying numbers are hidden, making it impossible to tell how realistic they are, and what changes (for example more buses) could make a difference.

Again, the time horizon is too short. Only looking out a few years, when the projects may not even be started, does nothing to tell us what the longer terms risks are. The increase in plane traffic is estimated at 30% over the lifetime of these projects, right? Yet total emissions go up just a few percent? How is that possible?

And on page 30, the discussion of vehicles and emissions is very qualitative. What percent of vehicle are electric that go to the airport now? Not listed. What is the plan for 2032 or 2050 or whenever? Again not listed. But the US government rollback of tax support for EVs, and their drop in sales, is not noted. It should be. One thing that would help is if the Port had charging

stations for people who parked and went away on a trip, but that does not appear to be a part of the plan, though again I could have missed it in the 6000 pages.

I know very little about SAF, but at one of the open houses, State Senator Orwall commented how it was NOT going to have a material impact on airplane emissions any time soon. And I see zero progress on minimizing passenger pick up and drop off reductions. The arrival and departure areas have a lot of idling engines now, as bad or worse as at any time in the past 30 years. I think a fairer comment to this:

the implementation of GHG-reduction efforts by the Port, local and state agencies, and other stakeholders (including airline operators) will help reduce GHG emissions from aircraft sources.

Would be

the implementation of GHG-reduction efforts by the Port, local and state agencies, and other stakeholders (including airline operators) will hopefully help slow the rate of increase in growth of GHG emissions from aircraft sources that will result from the growth in number of flight operations, and the change in fleet mix resulting from our marketing the cargo business and flights to Asia that use the biggest, most polluting, airplanes.

Here are Three Appendices

The point of these emails: I got partial responses, eventually, asked follow up questions, and did not hear back. This shows how hard it is to figure out what's going on. I have had positive responses from Perry Cooper recently and I guess going forward, I should cc him on correspondence (but not these EIS comments, no need for that) even if it is not necessarily going to be in a story. And note: I would not publish anything in Highline Journal received from anyone at the Port without first confirming it was acceptable for publication. I am not trying to ambush anyone.

Appendix A: Emails with Sandra Kilroy

No response received to this July 16, 2026 set of follow up questions.

Hi, thank you. I am guessing APUs are powered by the same aviation fuel as regular engines, correct? This is not like a car battery, where a car can have some functions going with the battery turned on and the engine off.

Is there any data on what the ppms are in areas with the APUs turned off, and the APUs turned on?

Is there any data on PPMs at all that people breathe, whether passengers or workers? My hunch is that either no one has been measuring air pollution on the airport property, or that they have but don't want the data released because it would have major consequences.

I tried to find that info in the SAMP, but wading through 6000 pages that don't have a master search function in less than 60 days is Fill in the blank Hard.

Stuart

From: Kilroy, Sandra <Kilroy.S@portseattle.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2026 9:48 AM
To: stuartjenner@comcast.net
Cc: Rybolt, Steve <Rybolt.S@portseattle.org>
Subject: RE: request for air quality on tarmac studies

Mr Jenner

Here is some information in response to your comment below.

The main jet engines are required to be off while aircraft are at the gate for safety reasons, and are only turned on again after the aircraft has pushed back into the taxi lane. So depending on the geometry of a particular space on the apron, whether an aircraft was taxiing by, plus the weather will affect whether a person smells kerosene/Jet-A at a particular location.

The Pre-Conditioned Air and 400Hz GPU systems allow aircraft to avoid using their Auxiliary Power Units (APUs) while at the gate. Without these systems, the APU is the only source of power or air conditioning for the aircraft while the main engines are off. The airport added a centralized Pre-Conditioned Air system and 400Hz at all fixed gates in 2012. In 2021, the airport added APU run-time limits into the Airline Rules & Regulations. Without any of these systems or regulations, the airlines would burn between 7 and 8 million gallons of additional jet fuel per year, equivalent to emissions of 70,000 to 80,000 metric tons of CO2 per year. In 2025 we had 63% connection rate. This is based on some technical difficulties with the equipment. We are currently working to improve the system to be able reach a higher connection rate. Overall, in addition to greenhouse gas emissions reductions, this program benefits the workers and those outside the planes.

Sandy



Sandra Kilroy

Senior Director Environment and Sustainability

Cell: 206-557-9194 / Office: 206-787-5854 kilroy.s@portseattle.org

Pier 69 - 2711 Alaskan Way – Seattle, WA 98121

Keep connected with your Port www.portseattle.org/subscribe

From: stuartjenner@comcast.net <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, June 26, 2026 2:40 PM

To: Kilroy, Sandra <Kilroy.S@portseattle.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] request for air quality on tarmac studies

You don't often get email from stuartjenner@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

Hi Sharon, thank you for your time and graciousness at the open house held at Mt Rainier HS. I am following up on your offer to provide info about air quality on the runway for workers, on the walkways / gates where travelers go down ramps and are outside, and the enclosed ramps that still let in some air when people are boarding or exiting planes. I few weeks ago, I noticed a Very Bad Taste in the air. I fly on average 2 times a year, and so I don't have a lot of experiences for comparison, but it seemed much worse than anything I've tasted before.

I can hope APUs are helpful. I thought Seatac had done something along those lines a long time ago, but maybe it was the announcement, not the actual implementation which is starting, I think you said, at this time.

Best wishes,

Stuart

Appendix B: Emails with Steve Rybolt

I sent this on July 1. There were three emails attached in the first one of July 1. See below.

Thank you. I would welcome replies by July 7. Have a great weekend.

Stuart

From: Rybolt, Steve <Rybolt.S@portseattle.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 10:52 AM
To: stuartjenner@comcast.net
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] checking on 3 emails

Hi Stuart,

Received all. We just finished our virtual meeting yesterday and catching up.

Thank you,

Steve Rybolt

Senior Environmental Program Manager

Port of Seattle | Sea-Tac International Airport

C: 206.554.1235

F: 206.787.6617

From: stuartjenner@comcast.net <stuartjenner@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 10:50 AM
To: Rybolt, Steve <Rybolt.S@portseattle.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] checking on 3 emails

You don't often get email from stuartjenner@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

Hi, I wanted to check that these got through.

Thank you,

Stuart

First of the attached emails to Steve Rybolt

Typo on Steve's email.

Stuart

From: stuartjenner@comcast.net <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 10:46 PM

To: 'rybolt.s@portseattle.org' <rybolt.s@portseattle.org>; 'mettruck.s@portseattle.org' <mettruck.s@portseattle.org>

Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Hi, below is the email thread of trying to figure out how much water a big tree absorbs, and what happens to the water when the tree is cut.

I guess the conclusion I've come to is no one knows how much trees absorb. We do know it is a lot, and that the people whose trees are cut get to deal with the consequences, example 1 being Matheson Park.

I did not hear back from my email sent June 5. It is just plain bizarre. There was some type of community meeting where port commissioners spoke. One of them said how he never hears from the community, he wants to, please email. So I did. That's the email below. But as you can see, it fizzled. Then I mentioned this to another person. She said oh I emailed him a few months ago. No reply. So I suggested she email again. She did. No reply. The Port used to reply to noise complaints and say what the cause was. They've evidently stopped doing that.

Do you see a pattern?

Thank you both for being at the meeting tonight. Mr Mettruck, I think in 27 years of paying attention to Seatac, you're the only Port director who's showed up at one of the open houses. I hope it was informative to you.

I think the biggest thing about the low level of attendance is most people have utterly given up that going to open houses is anything other than a complete waste of time because Port is going to do what wants to do regardless of what anyone says, regardless of any health impacts, regardless of the costs it sticks to people.

I go to these because I do appreciate the chance to learn. For example, one of your employees tonight said that the warranty on windows the Port pays for is only 10 to 20 years. After that, whoever owns the house has to repair or replace them. I had no idea, I thought the Port was being a good citizen and making providing replacements for the windows of people whose Port windows have failed. I said "you mean they've given up forever agreement binding to owners from here to eternity and they are stuck with the next bills." Pregnant pause. So what other bills are people in the future going to be stuck with?

I also learned that there's a metric for windows insulation noise reduction. I had no idea. I wish I'd known before I spent a lot of money on windows to reduce the impacts of airport noise, especially between 5 and 6 am. I'm thinking a lot about the windows now because the flashing was poorly done, resulting in rotten siding that in turn rotted part of our deck. Part of my day was spent running the debris to the dump so I can save some money on contractor time. And Steve you wonder why I've not read all of SAMP?

Stuart

From: STUART JENNER <stuartjenner@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 10:25 PM
To: Nguyen, Vy <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>
Cc: Pritchard, Aaron <Pritchard.A@portseattle.org>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Hi, I am aware of Samp Eis. Having only 60 days to make sense of 6000 pages is, sorry to say, oh so port-like. I am on vacation until June 14. I did try to look the weekend it was released. A link to one section did not load. It is very frustrating the 60 days includes Memorial Day weekend, America 250 July 4, Juneteenth and Father's Day.

Oh well. I heard diries asked for morw time and got disses. Again samw port as ever.

My questions werw not related to samp but rather to cutting trees for quote safety unquote reasons.

I am a volunteer blogger for a site called the highline journal. Ive had a stiry inprocess for a while about miller creek. A i had not intended to write about trees as a part of the story. But if i do i guess i will say the pirt doesnt know what the impact on runoff is fro. Cutting the trees and that there are no net calculations of new tree absorption and old tree cutting.

Stuart

On 06/05/2026 5:38 PM PDT Nguyen, Vy <nguyen.v@portseattle.org> wrote:

Mr. Jenner:

Thank you for reaching out – I took some time to check in with staff leading on the issues you outlined and the recommendation that came back is that 1) these fall under the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) considerations; and 2) we currently have a SAMP draft EIS public

comment period open and this is the best vehicle to submit concerns and comments to regarding environmental concerns.

Airport governance has two layers: many airport operations, including number of flights and takeoff/landing times or noise regulations, is governed by the federal government primarily via FAA and USDOT; the Port of Seattle's jurisdiction is primarily focused on facilities management like retail and dining tenants or ground transportation accessing the airport. As such, we strongly encourage you to submit comments to the link below or via email samp@portseattle.org to inform this body of work as decisions on these issues fall under the authority of our Executive Director and his leadership team (and not commissioners who have an oversight and advisory role regarding SAMP).

The Port has a site with more information on SAMP and how to weigh in. <https://sea-samp.com/>

Cheers,

Vy Nguyen (VEE Nwin)

Staff to Commissioner Calkins

Strategic Advisor

Commission Office

nguyen.v@portseattle.org

Pronouns: She/Her/Hers

-----Original Message-----

From: stuartjenner@comcast.net <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 23, 2026 4:10 PM

To: Calkins, Ryan <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>

Cc: Nguyen, Vy <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

[You don't often get email from stuartjenner@comcast.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Hi, this is a follow up to my email sent Oct 30, and also March 23, about trees and about La Guardia's lessons for Seatac.

Stuart

-----Original Message-----

From: stuartjenner@comcast.net <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 7:44 PM

To: 'Calkins.R@portseattle.org' <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>

Cc: 'Nguyen.V@portseattle.org' <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Dear Ryan,

I am guessing you've seen the tragic news about La Guardia.

<https://www.cnn.com/2026/03/23/us/laguardia-airport-pilots-warnings-invs>

One of the great challenges of living near the airport is "we see things that can go wrong."

One of the great frustrations is that when we speak up, or ask questions, we get ignored.

Someday, there will be tragedy at Seatac. When there is, there's a very good chance someone will have spoken up, or, considered speaking up but not done so because of how they've been treated. And ignored on any number of items.

I am still interested in answers to the questions I asked below. Unfortunately, the Port has a number of "community relations" people who are bullies, they sure don't want to rock the boat.

Stuart

-----Original Message-----

From: "Stuart Jenner" <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

To: "'Calkins, Ryan'" <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>,

"'Nguyen, Vy'" <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

In-Reply-To: <170C99B2-49C9-4486-9367-7F2CD5CC46B3@portseattle.org>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Date: Thu, 30 Oct 2025 17:03:07 -0700

Thank you, this may sound kind of wonkish, but I'm wondering if anyone ever calculates metrics and outcomes, for example, amount of such and such that's removed from air under current tree cover, and then what it takes to get an improvement. My understanding is bigger trees pull out more CO₂, and that younger trees pull out more CO₂. Contradiction? I know very

little about this stuff. I do know there's only so much space where trees can be planted, and that space seems reduced over time.

I do wish we could have green / living roofs on all the new warehouses, though I don't know if that would do much for CO2. But it could help with heat and with water absorption.

Thank you for responding, you're the only one so far who's responded.

Stuart

From: Calkins, Ryan <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>

Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:25 AM

To: Stuart Jenner <stuartjenner@comcast.net>; Nguyen, Vy <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Stuart,

Thanks for your note. I've added Vy to help track down some responses on the specific questions. One question in particular that I'm interested to learn more about is the extent to which additional tree canopy is planned as a part of the overall plan.

Warmly,

Ryan

Ryan Calkins

Commissioner

Port of Seattle

On Oct 29, 2025, at 12:45 PM, Stuart Jenner <stuartjenner@comcast.net> wrote:

»

You don't often get email from stuartjenner@comcast.net <mailto:stuartjenner@comcast.net> .
Learn why this is important <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

Hi, I sent the email below to the overall commission through a form on the web site. I am wondering if it got through, because you all sounded very sincere at wanting input from the community, especially people who live near SEatac.

Ryan, I read you bio. My daughter just graduated from Willamette, and she had Prof Patterson. Maybe you did too.

I want to make sure your form is working right, and that these emails work.

Best wishes,

Stuart Jenner

Normandy Park, WA

Hello, thank you commissioners Hasegawa, Calkins and Mohammed for speaking last night at the event in Burien. I appreciated your insights. It was very refreshing to hear concerns about air pollution. I heard a comment about air quality and children's health. It is absolutely a gamble. The person who had the best information, Kent Palosaari, moved several miles away a few years ago. I went to high school with roughly 20 people who lived within a half mile of the Evergreen Point toll plaza, and two of the ladies died before 60 from rare cancers. It is very hard to know what impact the air pollution had on their health, but I feel like we're taking massive gambles. Anecdotally, living a half mile west of Seatac, I never thought of air pollution being an issue here. There were some mornings in the 2013- 15 time frame when my son was at school at Chinook Middle School, next to Tyee High School. I could literally taste the carcinogens in the air. But that never happened at our house. Well, in the past few years, it has happened, including the morning of Oct 15.

I have attempted to report that air pollution, but have not found any places that will accept those reports.

I have periodically reported overflights and unusual airplane noise on the airport's noise hotline. I used to get replies, but no more, about the specific cause. I have no idea if these incidents are logged into any type of reports.

In our house, we bought our own indoor air filters. We have spent major money on windows and on improved insulation in the attic and sides of the house. Unfortunately, we also put in a bedroom window air conditioner, and it seems to transmit some noise inside the house. We are nowhere near the noise contour lines. I knew that when we moved in. But, the way the third runway is constantly used, not just in "bad weather", has been very frustrating. Background noise right now is not a big deal, but at 5 am, when I've awoken and then can't get back to sleep, definitely does impact our quality of sleep and our health. I think our next step would be to remodel, moving the bedroom downstairs and the rec room upstairs so that we would have better sleep. I do not like to think about the cost of that.

To close, I had hopes when SAMP was announced that the airport would indeed be investing in sustainability. Carbon scrubbers, a hush house, a LOT more trees, maybe some noise walls .. but instead, it is the same old growth growth growth, we need more warehouses, we need more paved surface because "it won't allow more flights but it will reduce delays." Yeah right on that.

I am in touch with Cliff Mass from the UW Department of Atmospheric Sciences, and he says temperature readings from Seatac, post third runway, can't be compared to pre third runway because of the heat island effect. I hate to think about the further impacts of more pavement, more warehouses, fewer trees, and really, no offsets to speak of. And no end to growth.

Though given Amazon's slowdown, I do wonder if we're going to have another million people here in just 10 years. That would require a very high percentage of growth, hard with today's housing costs.

Sincerely, Stuart Jenner (PS I'm writing a story about the forum for the online news site The Highline Journal. I will send a link when it is posted.

Second of the emails sent to Steve Rybolt

Hi, the email thread of trying to figure out how much water a big tree absorbs, and what happens to the water when the tree is cut.

I guess the conclusion I've come to is no one knows how much trees absorb. We do know it is a lot, and that the people whose trees are cut get to deal with the consequences, example 1 being Matheson Park.

Stuart

From: STUART JENNER <stuartjenner@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 10:25 PM
To: Nguyen, Vy <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>
Cc: Pritchard, Aaron <Pritchard.A@portseattle.org>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Hi, I am aware of Samp Eis. Having only 60 days to make sense of 6000 pages is, sorry to say, oh so port-like. I am on vacation until June 14. I did try to look the weekend it was released. A link to one section did not load. It is very frustrating the 60 days includes Memorial Day weekend, America 250 July 4, Juneteenth and Father's Day.

Oh well. I. Heard diries asked for morw time and got disses. Again samw port as ever.

My questions werw not related to samp but rather to cutting trees for quote safety unquote reasons.

I am a volunteer blogger for a site called the highline journal. Ive had a stiry inprocess for a while about miller creek. A i had not intended to write about trees as a part of the story. But if i do i guess i will say the pirt doesnt know what the impact on runoff is fro. Cutting the trees and that there are no net calculations of new tree absorption and old tree cutting.

Stuart

On 06/05/2026 5:38 PM PDT Nguyen, Vy <nguyen.v@portseattle.org> wrote:

Mr. Jenner:

Thank you for reaching out – I took some time to check in with staff leading on the issues you outlined and the recommendation that came back is that 1) these fall under the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) considerations; and 2) we currently have a SAMP draft EIS public comment period open and this is the best vehicle to submit concerns and comments to regarding environmental concerns.

Airport governance has two layers: many airport operations, including number of flights and takeoff/landing times or noise regulations, is governed by the federal government primarily via FAA and USDOT; the Port of Seattle's jurisdiction is primarily focused on facilities management like retail and dining tenants or ground transportation accessing the airport. As such, we strongly encourage you to submit comments to the link below or via email samp@portseattle.org to inform this body of work as decisions on these issues fall under the authority of our Executive Director and his leadership team (and not commissioners who have an oversight and advisory role regarding SAMP).

The Port has a site with more information on SAMP and how to weigh in. <https://sea-samp.com/>

Cheers,

Vy Nguyen (VEE Nwin)

Staff to Commissioner Calkins

Strategic Advisor

Commission Office

nguyen.v@portseattle.org

Pronouns: She/Her/Hers

-----Original Message-----

From: stuartjenner@comcast.net <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 23, 2026 4:10 PM

To: Calkins, Ryan <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>

Cc: Nguyen, Vy <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

[You don't often get email from stuartjenner@comcast.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Hi, this is a follow up to my email sent Oct 30, and also March 23, about trees and about La Guardia's lessons for Seatac.

Stuart

-----Original Message-----

From: stuartjenner@comcast.net <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 7:44 PM

To: 'Calkins.R@portseattle.org' <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>

Cc: 'Nguyen.V@portseattle.org' <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Dear Ryan,

I am guessing you've seen the tragic news about La Guardia.

<https://www.cnn.com/2026/03/23/us/laguardia-airport-pilots-warnings-invs>

One of the great challenges of living near the airport is "we see things that can go wrong."

One of the great frustrations is that when we speak up, or ask questions, we get ignored.

Someday, there will be tragedy at Seatac. When there is, there's a very good chance someone will have spoken up, or, considered speaking up but not done so because of how they've been treated. And ignored on any number of items.

I am still interested in answers to the questions I asked below. Unfortunately, the Port has a number of "community relations" people who are bullies, they sure don't want to rock the boat.

Stuart

-----Original Message-----

From: "Stuart Jenner" <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

To: "'Calkins, Ryan'" <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>,

"'Nguyen, Vy'" <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

In-Reply-To: <170C99B2-49C9-4486-9367-7F2CD5CC46B3@portseattle.org>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Date: Thu, 30 Oct 2025 17:03:07 -0700

Thank you, this may sound kind of wonkish, but I'm wondering if anyone ever calculates metrics and outcomes, for example, amount of such and such that's removed from air under current tree cover, and then what it takes to get an improvement. My understanding is bigger trees pull out more CO2, and that younger trees pull out more CO2. Contradiction? I know very little about this stuff. I do know there's only so much space where trees can be planted, and that space seems reduced over time.

I do wish we could have green / living roofs on all the new warehouses, though I don't know if that would do much for CO2. But it could help with heat and with water absorption.

Thank you for responding, you're the only one so far who's responded.

Stuart

From: Calkins, Ryan <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>

Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:25 AM

To: Stuart Jenner <stuartjenner@comcast.net>; Nguyen, Vy <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Stuart,

Thanks for your note. I've added Vy to help track down some responses on the specific questions. One question in particular that I'm interested to learn more about is the extent to which additional tree canopy is planned as a part of the overall plan.

Warmly,

Ryan

Ryan Calkins

Commissioner

Port of Seattle

On Oct 29, 2025, at 12:45â€PM, Stuart Jenner <stuartjenner@comcast.net>
<<mailto:stuartjenner@comcast.net>> > wrote:

ï»¿

You don't often get email from stuartjenner@comcast.net <<mailto:stuartjenner@comcast.net>> .
Learn why this is important <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

HI, I sent the email below to the overall commission through a form on the web site. I am wondering if it got through, because you all sounded very sincere at wanting input from the community, especially people who live near SEatac.

Ryan, I read you bio. My daughter just graduated from Willamette, and she had Prof Patterson. Maybe you did too.

I want to make sure your form is working right, and that these emails work.

Best wishes,

Stuart Jenner

Normandy Park, WA

Hello, thank you commissioners Hasegawa, Calkins and Mohammed for speaking last night at the event in Burien. I appreciated your insights. It was very refreshing to hear concerns about air pollution. I heard a comment about air quality and children's health. It is absolutely a gamble. The person who had the best information, Kent Palosaari, moved several miles away a few years ago. I went to high school with roughly 20 people who lived within a half mile of the Evergreen Point toll plaza, and two of the ladies died before 60 from rare cancers. It is very hard to know what impact the air pollution had on their health, but I feel like we're taking massive gambles. Anecdotally, living a half mile west of Seatac, I never thought of air pollution being an issue here. There were some mornings in the 2013- 15 time frame when my son was at school at Chinook Middle School, next to Tyee High School. I could literally taste the carcinogens in the

air. But that never happened at our house. Well, in the past few years, it has happened, including the morning of Oct 15.

I have attempted to report that air pollution, but have not found any places that will accept those reports.

I have periodically reported overflights and unusual airplane noise on the airport's noise hotline. I used to get replies, but no more, about the specific cause. I have no idea if these incidents are logged into any type of reports.

In our house, we bought our own indoor air filters. We have spent major money on windows and on improved insulation in the attic and sides of the house. Unfortunately, we also put in a bedroom window air conditioner, and it seems to transmit some noise inside the house. We are nowhere near the noise contour lines. I knew that when we moved in. But, the way the third runway is constantly used, not just in "bad weather", has been very frustrating. Background noise right now is not a big deal, but at 5 am, when I've awoken and then can't get back to sleep, definitely does impact our quality of sleep and our health. I think our next step would be to remodel, moving the bedroom downstairs and the rec room upstairs so that we would have better sleep. I do not like to think about the cost of that.

To close, I had hopes when SAMP was announced that the airport would indeed be investing in sustainability. Carbon scrubbers, a hush house, a LOT more trees, maybe some noise walls .. but

instead, it is the same old growth growth growth, we need more warehouses, we need more paved surface because "it won't allow more flights but it will reduce delays." Yeah right on that.

I am in touch with Cliff Mass from the UW Department of Atmospheric Sciences, and he says temperature readings from Seatac, post third runway, can't be compared to pre third runway because of the heat island effect. I hate to think about the further impacts of more pavement, more warehouses, fewer trees, and really, no offsets to speak of. And no end to growth.

Though given Amazon's slowdown, I do wonder if we're going to have another million people here in just 10 years. That would require a very high percentage of growth, hard with today's housing costs.

Sincerely, Stuart Jenner (PS I'm writing a story about the forum for the online news site The Highline Journal. I will send a link when it is posted.

Third of the emails sent to Steve Rybolt

Dated June 26

Hi Steve, this is a follow up to our conversation on June 22. We discussed significance, and I asked what the levels were in the most recent EIS. You mentioned there was one in 2007. I can't find it. All I can find is something about master plans and Environmental Assessments. It appears the last EIS Google Gemini knows about was actually in 1997, so 29 years ago and that everything since has been an Environmental Assessment. I did not live in the area at the time and know very little about that EIS.

However, there are times when AI has been wrong. So, I would welcome a link to the most recent EISs. The only part I can find online is for Appendix G, with 700+ pages of citizen comment.

I would also welcome links to each of the EAs published in the last 29 years. I am interested in what the air pollution levels were estimated to be, and what the traffic volumes were that drove those numbers.

Best wishes,

Stuart

The 1997 SeaTac Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) was a comprehensive joint document published by the FAA and the Port of Seattle. It evaluated the environmental and community impacts of the Master Plan Update, primarily focusing on the construction of an 8,500-foot third parallel runway and significant terminal expansions. [Govinfo \(.gov\) +3](#)



Key Aspects of the 1997 SEIS

- **The Third Runway:** The most pivotal component studied was the addition of a new parallel runway to address poor weather capacity. [Port of Seattle +2](#)
- **Joint NEPA/SEPA:** It served as a combined federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) document. [Govinfo \(.gov\)](#)
- **Public Review:** The FAA provided a 90-day comment period and held public hearings in March 1997 before the final SEIS was released in May 1997. [Port of Seattle +2](#)
- **Impact & Mitigation:** The study detailed predictions for noise, air quality, surface traffic, and socioeconomic effects. It proposed nearly \$1 billion in community mitigations (including a \$289 million plan for Des Moines and \$10 million for the City of SeaTac's new City Hall). [seatacnoise.info +2](#)

Document Archives

You can read the original SEIS documents for further details:

• The STIA Master Plan Final Supplemental EIS May 1997 Vol. 3 available via the Port of

Ask anything

  7 sites

Sea-Tac International Airport Impact Mitigation Study (HOK)
Feb 6, 1997 — The study examined the potential impacts of the Airport project on...

 [seatacnoise.info](#)

Significant events in the growth of Sea-Tac Airport since 1996
Jun 27, 2023 — 1997 EIS. The City of SeaTac comes to an agreement with PoS for \$10M... 

 [seatacnoise.info](#)

Federal Register / Vol. 62, No. 98 / Wednesday, May 21, 1997 / Notices
May 21, 1997 — additional information related to this project, please contact Mr. Dennis Ossenkop, Federal Aviation... [Govinfo \(.gov\)](#)

Show all

Document Archives

You can read the original SEIS documents for further details:

- The [STIA Master Plan Final Supplemental EIS May 1997 Vol. 3](#) available via the Port of Seattle.
- The Federal Register Volume 62, No. 98 notice of availability. 

Would you like to know more about the **specific environmental impacts** studied, the **historical mitigations**, or how the **third runway** ultimately affected the surrounding communities?

This is the link that shows up

<https://www.portseattle.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/STIA MPU Final Supplemental EIS May 1997 Vol. 3 of 3 1.pdf>

Stuart

Appendix C: Emails with Ryan Calkins

Juiner 5, 10 25 pm

Hi, I am aware of Samp Eis. Having only 60 days to make sense of 6000 pages is, sorry to say, oh so port-like. I am on vacation until june 14. I did try to look the weekend it was released. A link to one section did not load. It is very frustating the 60 days includes memorial day weekend, Anerica 250 july 4, juneteenth and fathers day.

Oh well. I. Heard diries asked for morw time and got disses. Again samw port as ever.

My questions were not related to SAMP but rather to cutting trees for quote safety unquote reasons.

I am a volunteer blogger for a site called the highline journal. I've had a story in process for a while about Miller Creek. As I had not intended to write about trees as a part of the story. But if I do I guess I will say the port doesn't know what the impact on runoff is from cutting the trees and that there are no net calculations of new tree absorption and old tree cutting.

Stuart

On 06/05/2026 5:38 PM PDT Nguyen, Vy <nguyen.v@portseattle.org> wrote:

Mr. Jenner:

Thank you for reaching out – I took some time to check in with staff leading on the issues you outlined and the recommendation that came back is that 1) these fall under the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) considerations; and 2) we currently have a SAMP draft EIS public comment period open and this is the best vehicle to submit concerns and comments to regarding environmental concerns.

Airport governance has two layers: many airport operations, including number of flights and takeoff/landing times or noise regulations, is governed by the federal government primarily via FAA and USDOT; the Port of Seattle's jurisdiction is primarily focused on facilities management like retail and dining tenants or ground transportation accessing the airport. As such, we strongly encourage you to submit comments to the link below or via email samp@portseattle.org to inform this body of work as decisions on these issues fall under the authority of our Executive Director and his leadership team (and not commissioners who have an oversight and advisory role regarding SAMP).

The Port has a site with more information on SAMP and how to weigh in. <https://sea-samp.com/>

Cheers,

Vy Nguyen (VEE Nwin)

Staff to Commissioner Calkins

Strategic Advisor

Commission Office

nguyen.v@portseattle.org

Pronouns: She/Her/Hers

-----Original Message-----

From: stuartjenner@comcast.net <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

Sent: Saturday, May 23, 2026 4:10 PM

To: Calkins, Ryan <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>

Cc: Nguyen, Vy <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

[You don't often get email from stuartjenner@comcast.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Hi, this is a follow up to my email sent Oct 30, and also March 23, about trees and about La Guardia's lessons for Seatac.

Stuart

-----Original Message-----

From: stuartjenner@comcast.net <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 7:44 PM

To: 'Calkins.R@portseattle.org' <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>

Cc: 'Nguyen.V@portseattle.org' <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Dear Ryan,

I am guessing you've seen the tragic news about La Guardia.

<https://www.cnn.com/2026/03/23/us/laguardia-airport-pilots-warnings-invs>

One of the great challenges of living near the airport is "we see things that can go wrong."

One of the great frustrations is that when we speak up, or ask questions, we get ignored.

Someday, there will be tragedy at Seatac. When there is, there's a very good chance someone will have spoken up, or, considered speaking up but not done so because of how they've been treated. And ignored on any number of items.

I am still interested in answers to the questions I asked below. Unfortunately, the Port has a number of "community relations" people who are bullies, they sure don't want to rock the boat.

Stuart

-----Original Message-----

From: "Stuart Jenner" <stuartjenner@comcast.net>

To: "'Calkins, Ryan'" <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>,

"'Nguyen, Vy'" <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

In-Reply-To: <170C99B2-49C9-4486-9367-7F2CD5CC46B3@portseattle.org>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Date: Thu, 30 Oct 2025 17:03:07 -0700

Thank you, this may sound kind of wonkish, but I'm wondering if anyone ever calculates metrics and outcomes, for example, amount of such and such that's removed from air under current tree cover, and then what it takes to get an improvement. My understanding is bigger trees pull out more CO₂, and that younger trees pull out more CO₂. Contradiction? I know very little about this stuff. I do know there's only so much space where trees can be planted, and that space seems reduced over time.

I do wish we could have green / living roofs on all the new warehouses, though I don't know if that would do much for CO₂. But it could help with heat and with water absorption.

Thank you for responding, you're the only one so far who's responded.

Stuart

From: Calkins, Ryan <Calkins.R@portseattle.org>

Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:25 AM

To: Stuart Jenner <stuartjenner@comcast.net>; Nguyen, Vy <Nguyen.V@portseattle.org>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] port commission letter oct 23 2025

Stuart,

Thanks for your note. I've added Vy to help track down some responses on the specific questions. One question in particular that I'm interested to learn more about is the extent to which additional tree canopy is planned as a part of the overall plan.

Warmly,

Ryan

Ryan Calkins

Commissioner

Port of Seattle

On Oct 29, 2025, at 12:45â€PM, Stuart Jenner <stuartjenner@comcast.net>
<mailto:stuartjenner@comcast.net> > wrote:

ï»¿

You don't often get email from stuartjenner@comcast.net <mailto:stuartjenner@comcast.net> .
Learn why this is important <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

HI, I sent the email below to the overall commission through a form on the web site. I am wondering if it got through, because you all sounded very sincere at wanting input from the community, especially people who live near SEatac.

Ryan, I read you bio. My daughter just graduated from Willamette, and she had Prof Patterson. Maybe you did too.

I want to make sure your form is working right, and that these emails work.

Best wishes,

Stuart Jenner

Normandy Park, WA

Hello, thank you commissioners Hasegawa, Calkins and Mohammed for speaking last night at the event in Burien. I appreciated your insights. It was very refreshing to hear concerns about air pollution. I heard a comment about air quality and children's health. It is absolutely a gamble. The person who had the best information, Kent Palosaari, moved several miles away a few years ago. I went to high school with roughly 20 people who lived within a half mile of the Evergreen Point toll plaza, and two of the ladies died before 60 from rare cancers. It is very hard to know what impact the air pollution had on their health, but I feel like we're taking massive

gambles. Anecdotally, living a half mile west of Seatac, I never thought of air pollution being an issue here. There were some mornings in the 2013- 15 time frame when my son was at school at Chinook Middle School, next to Tyee High School. I could literally taste the carcinogens in the air. But that never happened at our house. Well, in the past few years, it has happened, including the morning of Oct 15.

I have attempted to report that air pollution, but have not found any places that will accept those reports.

I have periodically reported overflights and unusual airplane noise on the airport's noise hotline. I used to get replies, but no more, about the specific cause. I have no idea if these incidents are logged into any type of reports.

In our house, we bought our own indoor air filters. We have spent major money on windows and on improved insulation in the attic and sides of the house. Unfortunately, we also put in a bedroom window air conditioner, and it seems to transmit some noise inside the house. We are nowhere near the noise contour lines. I knew that when we moved in. But, the way the third runway is constantly used, not just in "bad weather", has been very frustrating. Background noise right now is not a big deal, but at 5 am, when I've awoken and then can't get back to sleep, definitely does impact our quality of sleep and our health. I think our next step would be to remodel, moving the bedroom downstairs and the rec room upstairs so that we would have better sleep. I do not like to think about the cost of that.

To close, I had hopes when SAMP was announced that the airport would indeed be investing in sustainability. Carbon scrubbers, a hush house, a LOT more trees, maybe some noise walls .. but instead, it is the same old growth growth growth, we need more warehouses, we need more paved surface because "it won't allow more flights but it will reduce delays." Yeah right on that.

I am in touch with Cliff Mass from the UW Department of Atmospheric Sciences, and he says temperature readings from Seatac, post third runway, can't be compared to pre third runway because of the heat island effect. I hate to think about the further impacts of more pavement, more warehouses, fewer trees, and really, no offsets to speak of. And no end to growth.

Though given Amazon's slowdown, I do wonder if we're going to have another million people here in just 10 years. That would require a very high percentage of growth, hard with today's housing costs.

Sincerely, Stuart Jenner (PS I'm writing a story about the forum for the online news site The Highline Journal. I will send a link when it is posted.

Stuart =
Jenner =
Normandy Park, WA =
Stuart =
Hello, thank = you commissioners Hasegawa, Calkins and Mohammed for
speaking last night = at the event in Burien. I appreciated your insights. It was very = refreshing
to hear concerns about air pollution. I heard a comment about = air quality and children's
health. It is absolutely a gamble. The person = who had the best information, Kent Palosaari,
moved several miles = away a few years ago. I went to high school with roughly 20 people who =
lived within a half mile of the Evergreen Point toll plaza, and two of = the ladies died before 60
from rare cancers. It is very hard to know = what impact the air pollution had on their health,
but I feel like we're = taking massive gambles. Anecdotal, living a half mile west of Seatac, = I
never thought of air pollution being an issue here. There were some = mornings in the 2013- 15
time frame when my son was at school at Chinook = Middle School, next to Tyee High School. I
could literally taste the = carcinogens in the air. But that never happened at our house. Well, in =
the past few years, it has happened, including the morning of Oct = 15.
I have attempted to report

that air pollution, but = have not found any places that will accept those reports. =

<o:p></o:p></p><p class=3DMsoNormal> <o:p></o:p></p><p = class=3DMsoNormal>I have periodically reported overflights and unusual = airplane noise on the airport's noise hotline. I used to get replies, = but no more, about the specific cause. I have no idea if these incidents = are logged into any type of reports.<o:p></o:p></p><p = class=3DMsoNormal> <o:p></o:p></p><p class=3DMsoNormal>In our = house, we bought our own indoor air filters. We have spent major money = on windows and on improved insulation in the attic and sides of the = house. Unfortunately, we also put in a bedroom window air conditioner, = and it seems to transmit some noise inside the house. We are nowhere = near the noise contour lines. I knew that when we moved in. But, the way = the third runway is constantly used, not just in "bad = weather", has been very frustrating. Background noise right now is = not a big deal, but at 5 am, when I've awoken and then can't get back to = sleep, definitely does impact our quality of sleep and our health. I = think our next step would be to remodel, moving the bedroom downstairs = and the rec room upstairs so that we would have better sleep. I do not = like to think about the cost of that.<o:p></o:p></p><p = class=3DMsoNormal> <o:p></o:p></p><p class=3DMsoNormal>To close, I = had hopes when SAMP was announced that the airport would indeed be = investing in sustainability. Carbon scrubbers, a hush house, a LOT more = trees, maybe some noise walls .. but instead, it is the same old growth = growth growth, we need more warehouses, we need more paved surface = because "it won't allow more flights but it will reduce = delays." Yeah right on that. I am in touch with Cliff Mass from the = UW Department of Atmospheric Sciences, and he says temperature readings = from Seatac, post third runway, can't be compared to pre third runway = because of the heat island effect. I hate to think about the further = impacts of more pavement, more warehouses, fewer trees, and really, no = offsets to speak of. And no end to growth. Though given Amazon's = slowdown, I do wonder if we're going to have another million people here = in just 10 years. That would require a very high percentage of growth, = hard with today's housing costs.<o:p></o:p></p><p = class=3DMsoNormal> <o:p></o:p></p><p class=3DMsoNormal>Sincerely, = Stuart Jenner (PS I'm writing a story about the forum for the online = news site The Highline Journal. I will send a link when it is = posted.<o:p></o:p></p></div></div></div></blockquote></div></div></body><=

/html>