

December 17, 1981

Ms. Jody Yamanaka
Department of Planning and Research
Port of Seattle
P. O. Box 1209
Seattle, WA 98111

Dear Ms. Yamanaka:

This is to summarize FAA's major review comments on the draft Sea-Tac Noise Exposure Update Report (dated November 1981) which were discussed during the December 11, 1981, meeting attended by you and Bob Wells from the Port and Dennis Ossenkop and George Saito of our office. These comments are presented below.

- a. Phase II, Task B, of the project work program shows as an output an estimation of the variance range for the flight tracks. The draft report does not reflect this variance range. We feel it is important to address this subject in the final report, especially based on citizen comments we have received. We assume the final report will include maps which show the flight tracks with reference to ground features (e.g., streets) which are discernible.
- b. Phase II, Tasks D and E, of the project work program deals with the INM verification. We feel the draft report does not adequately cover this matter. The main purpose of these tasks is to establish accuracy comparison between INM and NMS. Some of the pertinent questions not answered in the draft report include: Which flow direction(s) was used in the model verification? What were the acceptable variations and basis for acceptance? How did the INM contours and NMS values compare (before and after adjustments were made and for both north and south flows)? In Task E, how were the aircraft types and altitude variations accounted for in making adjustments to the INM NEL? Were the altitudes and aircraft types obtained from each of the air carriers?
- c. Phase III, Task B, of the project work program involves the portable noise meter. The draft report does not adequately address the verification of the portable noise meter with the NMS by simultaneous measurements, or how the data acquired using the portable meter was used to verify the accuracy of the INM contours (before and after INM calibration procedure). This task also includes identification of low frequency noise and vibration. We believe this matter should be discussed in more detail in the final report. We understand that the consultant has prepared a working paper on the subject.

- d. Phase III, Task C, of the project work program shows as an output a working paper on noise abatement application at Sea-Tac compared with other applied systems. The draft report has a summary table of noise monitoring systems at other airports, but it does not include how this information was applied to Sea-Tac in this study (Appendix A of the draft report).
- e. Phase IV, Task A, of the project work program calls for an output which provides a range of estimates of operations growth and fleet mix for INM input and noise impact projection. The draft report does not provide such a range of estimates. We believe this should be included in the final report (high and low as well as the specific forecasts used in the noise impact projection). This range of estimates relates to the various "scenarios" covered in Phase V, Task A, and the "best guess" hypothesis as well as pessimistic and optimistic alternatives mentioned in Phase V, Task C, of the project work program. This task indicates that the range of noise impacts will also be examined and presented. The final report should address this range of noise impacts (contours for pessimistic, nominal and optimistic operation projections).
- f. Phase IV, Task C, of the project work program involves collection of miscellaneous data. In this regard, we feel there are several questions related to this task which are not answered in the draft report. These include: How was the Ldn calculated for the airport taxiing noise and what were the results? How were the results then used to adjust the INM contours? We would like to see the noise contours before and after the adjustments shown in the final report. Other elements covered in this task but not reflected in the draft report include actual ambient noise levels, meteorological data and sensitivity analysis (i.e., noise in relation to meteorological conditions).
- g. Phase IV, Task D, of the project work program on survey on population patterns and land use (170 hours of staff time) is not covered in the draft report. If the Port wishes to drop this task from the project, we would like to have a letter from you stating the reasons for this decision. We will then make appropriate adjustments in the total federal payment on this project.
- h. Phase VI, Task B, of the project work program includes a "series" of PAC briefings and discussions as well as "public meetings." We assume these actions will be taken prior to finalization of the report.

It appears to us from reviewing the draft report that the consultants (30 hours for Phase V, Task C) were not involved in the preparation of this document. In short, did the consultants "oversee" the entire study and do they support the draft report findings?

Our editorial and other more detailed comments have been made in a marked-up copy of the draft report. It will be furnished to you under separate

cover. Please call us if you have any further questions or comments regarding our views summarized above on the draft report.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Mark A. Beisse
Mark A. Beisse
Acting Chief, Planning and
Programming Branch, ANW-610

cc:
Joe Sims
Hugh Parry

December 21, 1981

Ms. Jody Yamanaka
Department of Planning and Research
Port of Seattle
P. O. Box 1209
Seattle, WA 98111

Dear Ms. Yamanaka:

Our major review comments on the draft Sea-Tac Noise Exposure Update Report were furnished to you in our letter of December 17, 1981. Enclosed is a marked-up copy of the draft report which contains our editorial and other more detailed comments.

Please call us if you have any questions on any of our comments.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Mark A. Beisse

Mark A. Beisse
Acting Chief, Planning and
Programming Branch, ANW-610

Enclosure

cc:
Joe Sims
Hugh Parry