Sea-Tac / june 27, 1992

OUTLINE OF OVERALL POSITION STATEMENT

I. POSITION STATEMENT.

Sea-Tac has reached its operational, economic and environmental capacity. Because of this, the facility should be capped at a maximum of 380,000 operations per year and no third runway should be authorized. (The cap is important because otherwise we leave the POS to continue to do what they want.) In particular,

a) the environmental impacts from noise and other forms of pollution are well in excess of what should be allowed in the residential and commercial areas around the airport.

b) the economic benefits of the airport have been exaggerated and the economic costs have been underestimated

c) there are alternatives to provide additional capacity for passenger traffic at Sea-Tac and the third runway does not make operational sense.

II. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM SEA-TAC ARE SEVERE AND UNACCEPTABLE.

A. NOISE IMPACTS.

1. Noise Metric. Noise impacts are not properly measured. The use of the LN metric (esp. 65 $L_{Dn}$) does not adequately describe noise impacts (yearly noise averages are meaningless). Use of alternate metrics is appropriate, including SEL and lower Ln contours.

2. Actual v. computer generated noise measurements. Simulated noise measurements are inaccurate. Actual measurements of noise reveal greater impacts than are predicted. As such, actual noise impacts are severely under estimated and the number of people effected is underreported.

3. Adverse Effects of Noise. Health effects of noise pollution are severe and not just a nuisance. Long term health of many thousands of people is at stake.

4. 4-Post Plan. The 4-post plan and the abandonment of the Elliott Bay approach have greatly compounded the noise impacts. The 4-post plan should be abandoned.

5. School impacts. Noise has serious impacts on education. Schools cannot properly function if they are continuously affected by noise pollution.

6. Stage III. The replacement of Stage II by Stage III aircraft provides little relief. Stage III aircraft are only marginally better than Stage II, (esp. if reengined). Stage III may be postponed because of financial problems of airlines. Use of larger aircraft is predicted which will result in more noise.

7. Noise mitigation. Few ways to mitigate noise impacts exist. Insulation does not work well and is ineffective when windows are open. And Cost

B. LAND USE IMPACTS.

1. Sea-Tac operations have resulted in the deterioration of neighborhoods around the airport. Increases in operations will cause further adverse impacts.

2. Proposal is contrary to Growth Management Act because it prevent effective infill of highly desirable residential areas with existing infrastructure. Continued adverse noise impacts will prevent the "infill" required by GMA.

C. LANDFILL.

1. Movement and placement of dirt for runway is massive.

2. Fill activity will impact not only area where fill is placed, but also areas where material is mined. Traffic and secondary impacts from fill operations are substantial.

3. Huge fill requirements make cost prohibitive.

D. TRAFFIC.

1. Current traffic problems at airport are serious.

2. Plan will greatly increase the actual number of vehicles through the airport.

3. POS has failed to develop alternate ground transportation facilities to serve the airport.

4 GMA Landuse vs Traffic

E. AIR POLLUTION.

1. Sea-Tac is a significant generator of air pollution. Air pollution occurs both because of the air craft, but also because of ground transportation congestion.

2. Sea-Tac has failed to provide alternative transportation systems to reduce air pollution.

III. A THIRD RUNWAY DOES NOT MAKE OPERATIONAL OR ECONOMIC SENSE; OTHER METHODS EXIST TO HANDLE TRAVEL DEMAND.

A. Flight Delays. Flight delays are not correctly calculated and are due to causes other than limits on runway capacity. Real loss to the public from flight delays are overstated.

B. Growth projections for airline passenger travel. Projections for increases in passenger travel are exaggerated. Analysis of relevant factors indicates that a much lower level of growth is to be expected indicating that increases in airport capacity are not required.

C. Benefits of third runway (airport/airspace capacity). The third runway provides little increase in airport capacity because of operational limitations, including traffic crossing two active runways. Use of runway during VFR-2 conditions is illusory; weather data does not support usefulness of runway at times of peak congestion and poor flying conditions.

D. Demand Management. Various methods are available to control demand, especially by reducing peak flows at critical travel times. Assignment of landing slots can reduce peak hour congestion. Use of larger planes can reduce commuter operations.

E. Enhanced Landing capability. A variety of methods exist

to increase landing capacity at the airport. These include navigational aids and reduction of in-trial spacing.

F. Size of Sea-Tac. Sea-Tac land area is too small to handle, on the "landside", the traffic proposed by the runway expansion. To fully utilize the runways major expansion in land area for the facility is required; such expansion causes inappropriate impacts on surrounding areas.

IV. ECONOMIC ISSUES.

A. Airport Overall Economic Benefits. The economic value of the airport is substantially overstated. Landing delays will not have an adverse impact on travel or tourism. The purported economic benefits from the airport actually result from family, business, and pleasure travel not directly related to the airport.

B. True economic Cost of Airport Operation. The airport has severe, adverse economic consequences for surrounding properties. The comprehensive cost of airport operations needs to be considered.

C. Cost of Third Runway Expansion. Third runway is too expensive at $700 Million. Possible WPPSS burden on taxpayers if the runway falls through; potential white elephant.

D. 3rd Runway Financing. Financing of third runway by PFCs may result in huge "white elephant" for taxpayers if the demand does not materialize. Airport has other needs requiring financing, including the insulation and buyout of homes.

V. ALTERNATIVES TO THIRD RUNWAY/CONTINUED SEA-TAC EXPANSION.

A. No additional capacity is required because of growth projections, demand management and improvements in capacity with existing runways. Use other methods to handle commuters, including transfer at Spokane, rail and other transportation modes.

B. Portland/Vancouver B.C.. Make use of existing regional airports with unused capacity.

C. Tenino Airport. Can be terminus for international and other flights; is midway between Seattle and Portland.

D. Wayport. Possibly in Moses Lake or other location.