

StART

MEETING SUMMARY

AUGUST 26, 2026; 5:00 PM – 7:00 PM

HYBRID MEETING (ONLINE & IN-PERSON)

Meeting Objectives:

- Introduce the primary feedback themes identified by StART members regarding StART's Operating Procedures and determine areas that may warrant future discussion.

I. Facilitator Welcome, Meeting Management

Andrés Mantilla, Facilitator, Uncommon Bridges;

Wendy Reiter, Airport Managing Director, Port of Seattle (POS)

- The last time StART reviewed its operating procedures, it led to changes that made the agenda setting process more inclusive, strengthened the connections to the Highline Forum, and set behavior expectations for members
- StART is a voluntary non-governing roundtable where concerns and feedback specific to the airport are shared: it is not a formal decision-making body making or an official interlocal agency
- Updates
 - Tom Fagerstrom and Jon Flanagan: Will provide Aviation Noise and Policy Working Group reports
 - Moira Bradshaw: Normandy Park Community Representative nominated to serve on FAA's Aircraft Noise Advisory Committee
 - Eric Schinfeld has left the Port of Seattle
- Dinner Break until 5:30 PM

II. StART Operating Procedures Discussion

Andrés Mantilla, Uncommon Bridges

- Not a meeting tonight to decide or adopt changes, recommendations will go through the Steering Committee
- The purpose is to identify preliminary opportunities to strengthen StART's structure, participation practices and accountability processes and determine areas that may warrant future discussions.
- The intention tonight is to:
 - Identify topics that may warrant more discussion

- Build shared understanding
- Q: How was the memo and feedback themes produced?
 - Procedures were reviewed, Feedback was collected, observations made, synthesized into themes for discussion (in memo shared with StART members)

III. StART Operating Procedures: Initial Input Review
All Participants + Andrés Mantilla, Uncommon Bridges

Wall Graphic

- Leadership + Governance
 - Intersection with Highline Forum
 - Agenda setting
 - Representation on Steering Committee
 - Port staff carries load
 - Co-Chair model
 - Better definitions of roles
 - Not all cities have same interests
- Public Participation + Access
 - Conversation with members and city managers
 - Yearly prioritization of topics
 - Pre-meetings with city members
 - Public comment in the beginning
 - Hybrid meeting consideration
 - Quarterly meeting consideration
- Accountability + Follow-Through
 - Direct contact with Port Commissioners
 - Immediate recordings of the meetings
 - Solutions
- Process Clarity & Consistency
 - Clarity of Decision-Making Authority
 - Solutions
- Decision-making + Consensus
 - Clarify what decisions StART members can make
- Other
 - Future impact & future solutions
 - Community Impact Funding

Primary Feedback Themes

- Based upon feedback received from the Steering Committee and StART membership, these are the five primary themes captured about StART's operating procedures as articulated by Andres Mantilla. They've been grouped together to facilitate a more organized discussion. Details on each of the categories were provided in the memo provided to the StART membership on Friday

Additional Context Regarding Primary Feedback Themes

- Leadership & Governance – Roles, shared leadership, and the Port's role as convener
 - Who is the chair?
 - Who is on the steering committee?
 - Roles and responsibilities, should things change?
- Public Participation & Access – Public comment, meeting access, and participation support
 - Timing of Public Comment
 - Zoom virtual format
 - Transparency
- Accountability & Follow-Through – How StART input is communicated, considered, and tracked.
 - Change of how recommendations or opinions are addressed, how is it tracked and communicated?
- Process Clarity & Consistency – Member transitions, points of view, procedural concerns, and periodic review
 - When is next review of the operating procedures?
- Decision-Making & Consensus – Shared understanding of consensus and how StART guidance is developed
 - How consensus is defined in Operating Procedures
 - If there is not consensus, how are differences of opinion handled?

Discussion

- Q: What is the path for requesting Port Commission approval?
- Q: Who is setting the agenda? What comes forward?
- Q: Where do we talk about making sure the content of meetings is representative of StART's goals? "We spend a lot of time on stuff that does not really help"
 - Shared amongst steering committee members
 - Maybe it is not working how it needs to but that can warrant further discussion
- Leadership & Governance Discussion
 - Q: Why are cities not able to decide who is represented on the Steering Committee? Could there be more of a community voice/perspective by having different representation on the Steering Committee?
 - Q: If the sole role of the Steering Committee is to set the agenda, why is there a separate committee for that? Could there just be an agenda committee that develops the agenda?

- A: The Steering Committee does other things besides agenda setting. That can be discussed more.\
- Q: How do you work with your community reps to advocate for them to suggest items for the agenda?
- C: Every city does not have a city manager. Hard for StART to try to manage the internal dysfunction within cities
- Q: How do we get to solutions? Instead of StART just focusing on hearing about and raising issues related to the airport
- Q: Are there other organizations and advisory groups in King County? Why is there a separate committee serving as a Steering Committee?
- C: Right now the Port Staff do 100% of the work to make StART happen & organize meetings. If we want to change structure and governance, are the cities equipped to take on that labor to create presentations and collect data to make meetings possible?
- Accountability & Follow Through Discussion
- C: There are no elected officials on StART, what members are saying - does it get back to Port Commission? Does it impact their decisions? There is not a feedback loop with StART
 - C: StART is parallel to the Highline Forum which does include elected officials
- C: I report to Commissioners but as leader of the airport I make decisions for the airport
- C: Personally not interested in having elected officials in the group. Do not personally think changing things makes sense
- C: Use elected officials strategically, for example, come up with something that presents them with a political win. Elected officials do not want to just hear the same complaints StART is more solution oriented and if people just want elected officials to hear them directly then the group should just merge with the Highline Forum
- C: I am on StART and on two different Dept of Commerce advisory committees. Could there be an additional chair or co-chair or different representation
- C: Build on using elected officials
- Decision Making & Consensus Discussion
 - C; Currently some things can be decided by the Airport Director, some things may need to go back to the cities
 - C: Concern about role of airlines and how they are included in decision making
 - Q: What decisions can be made in the room? What can StART actually decide?
 - Cannot change Noise or Operations
 - Cannot change Flight Patterns
 - Can support advocacy efforts, but the relationship and presence of elected officials is what makes that happen
 - Q: Burien and Des Moines have concluded air pollution and noise are going to increase. Should we be identifying neighborhoods and houses that will be impacted? What if we looked at zoning or thought about future impacts?
 - Q: Can you give an example of something that requires a group decision?
 - Community Impact Funding

- Advocating for lower assessed values for impacted homes
- C: Although there are things to work on, I do not think we need to change StART to fix those issues. As opposed to changing the core of StART, better define the role of representatives
- Q: Not all cities have the same interest; how do we move forward with discussions on things that may not matter to all cities but potentially only one or two cities?
- C: Concerns are different, fenceline cities have had a lot of issues on agenda but often not the same issues for non-fenceline like Tukwila
- Accountability & Follow-Through
 - C: The Operating Procedures purposely did not dictate how each city interacts with its community reps
 - C: Accountability flows both ways, from community to group and from group to community
- Public Participation & Access
 - C: Currently one hybrid meeting per year and the rest of meetings are on Zoom
 - Q: What structural things can be looked at? Could it be that people speak at the start and end of a meeting?
 - C: This is a bad idea
 - Discussions need to be structured well so that the meetings do not get out of hand
 - In previous StART structure, comment was at beginning and people said they needed something to react to
 - Beginning public comments would be good because it does allow the meeting presenters to be impacted by those comments
 - Q: Any feedback about in person, hybrid, only online?
 - C: Zoom is helpful for accessibility and engagement but hybrid feels like a better option and we have technology to allow for successful hybrid meetings
 - C: Currently, StART meets every two months, would be better to have the full group meet quarterly with room for working groups, and committees to meet in between, and would give more time for them to work on action items. Move from six to four meetings per year
 - Currently, there is no formal process to respond to public comments. Is there a way for StART to respond to those comments?
 - Q: How does this group function as a focus point as SAMP goes forward?
 - How can StART support the work of feedback for things like SAMP? Currently comments directed to start are not seen as official responses because of regulatory requirements
 - How will the community direct topics to StART? What does StART do with that as representatives of the community?
 - Q: Can we get a set of minutes at the end of this? Current summary is not sufficient, would like to see improvement on report back that includes transcript of meeting

Summary of Discussion

- More conversation to be had about membership and Steering Committee
- Chair/Co-chair, agenda setting, different opportunities for representation
- Not all cities have same interests and priorities
- Conversations between city managers and representatives is how information is shared with the Steering Committee.
- Yearly prioritization of topics can continue
- Consider beginning with public comment at meetings
- Hybrid meetings
- Quarterly meetings
- Accountability/Contact with Airport Director, consideration of how to involve Port Commissioners and elected officials
- Immediate meeting recordings
- Clarify decision making authority
- The group is good at raising concerns but there is a challenge with moving things forward and focusing on future impact vs just discussing current impact.

IV. Part 150 Noise Study TRC/Aviation Noise Working Group Update

Tom Fagerstrom, Noise Programs Manager, POS

- Report from August 10th meeting
- Technical Review Committee (TRC) discussion was led by consultant who is helping lead the Part 150 Study
- Focus on potential noise compatibility program measures
 - Noise abatement measures that could possibly reduce noise
 - Examples: Increased glide slope as a potential solution, offset approaches, preferential runway usage at night
- Land Use Measures: possible expanded sound insulation eligibility for parcels, improved noise nuisance data from King County, and encouraging cities to utilize noise zoning
- Programmatic Measures, upgrade noise monitoring, adjusting current monitor locations, changes to Flight Quiet program
- Robust discussion with lots of questions
- October 17th, 19th and 20th- public workshops will take place in local airport communities
- Aviation Noise Working Group
 - Late Night Noise Limitation Program: 8% of operations in late night hours exceeded noise thresholds
 - Average of 5.5 landings per night on the 3rd runway.
 - 8,445 noise comments or complaints in June, significantly lower compared to last year
- Q: Is this the first meeting since the noise exposure maps have been published?
 - This is second meeting since report was published online

Commented [MM1]: Eligibility for what?

- Q: After Part 150, What is the process for implementation?
 - All noise abatement and most land use measures need to be approved by FAA, programmatic measures do not need FAA approval
- Zoning amendments would require city approval.
- C: Do not want cities to change zoning to reflect aviation noise, affordability is so critical in our communities. Overall worry that zoning changes would impact affordability
- C: It would be nice to have a working group or side conversation, because detrimental impacts are disproportionately impacting low-income people

V. Policy Working Group Update

John Flanagan, State Government Relations Manager, POS

- Fed priorities: reviewed last version, most are part of FAA reauthorization bill, big success due to work of this group
- Next meeting on 10/5: Fed lobbying team and POS's Nate Caminos will be present to answer questions about policy agenda
- DC Fly in and State Visit: considerations in 2027
- Simplified state policy agenda draft: environmental mitigation one category, second category regional airport capacity
- Draft state policy agenda to be sent out for comment shortly
- Legislative session update: State revenues are challenging. This group's priorities require significant spending from state resources. Therefore, we need to ensure that we have identified revenues sources to cover the spending we want to see. On environmental mitigation and noise reduction spending; we think that improperly diverted aviation fuel tax could be a solution, but currently that money is being utilized by Ecology for operations and staffing. That means that our main ask involves job loss and program restrictions at Ecology. Highlighted this because the conversations in Olympia this year will be tough and we need to understand what kinds of trade-offs legislators are being asked to make
- Aiming for first or second week in Feb for State Lobby Day
- SAMP Update from Sarah Cox, Director of Aviation Environment and Sustainability
 - Comment period closed last Thursday
 - Approximately 480 comments received

VI. Public Comment

- No Public Comment

VII. Wrap Up/Next Steps

Andrés Mantilla, Facilitator, Uncommon Bridges

- Tentative Next Meeting: October 28th – 5:00 - 7:00 pm via Zoom

Members	Interest represented	Present
Alethia Miller	Alaska Airlines	X
Amy Arrington	Normandy Park – City	X
Barton Delacy	Des Moines – Community Representative	X
Bill Vadino	Federal Way – City	X
Bob Larson	Burien – City	X
Brandon Miles	Tukwila – City	X
Jack Dovey	Federal Way – Community Representative	X
Jeff Harbaugh	Burien – Community Representative	X
Jennifer Redding	FAA	X
Joe Dusenbury	Des Moines – Community Representative	X
Karen Veloria	Burien – Community Representative	X
Katherine Caffrey	Des Moines – City	X
Maira Bradshaw	Normandy Park – Community Representative	X
Roger Kadeg	SeaTac – Community Representative	X
Sarah Cox	Port of Seattle – Chair (Alt)	X
Scott Ingham	Delta Air Lines	X
Wendy Reiter	Port of Seattle – Chair	X
Will Booth	SeaTac – Community Representative	X
Resources		
Clare Gallagher	Port of Seattle	X
Marco Milanese	Port of Seattle	X
Ryan McMullan	Port of Seattle	X
Presenters		
John Flanagan	Port of Seattle	X
Tom Fagerstrom	Port of Seattle	X
Consultants		
Andrés Mantilla	Uncommon Bridges	X
Julia Martinez	Uncommon Bridges	X
Audience		
Aleksandar Krstic		X
Dave Kaplan		X
Dawson Frank		X
Paris Edwards		X
Sky Laron		X