

WORKING DRAFT

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Chapter 5

FINAL EVALUATION OF NOISE ABATEMENT AND NOISE REMEDY MEASURES

INTRODUCTION

As a result of the initial evaluation described in Chapter 4 certain measures were eliminated from further consideration (see Tables 4.1 and 4.2). In this chapter, the various noise abatement and noise remedy measures that were considered for further evaluation in Chapter 4 are analyzed with respect to their specific applicability at Sea-Tac (now Jackson) International Airport. Those measures recommended for implementation are also identified.

As previously noted, airport-oriented noise improvements may be divided into two categories:

- On-airport noise abatement measures
- Off-airport noise mitigation or noise remedy measures

Some ten criteria were used in developing the final evaluation of noise measures described in this chapter. They are:

1. Compatibility with the operation of Sea-Tac and its associated airspace. This criterion relates primarily to the on-airport noise abatement measures. The measures to be included in the program should, at a minimum, not negatively affect the operation of Jackson International and its associated airspace; whenever possible the operation should be improved.
2. Aircraft operational safety considerations. This criterion also relates primarily to the on-airport noise abatement measures. The measures to be included in the program should not impair the safe operation of aircraft.

3. Aircraft noise reduction. This criterion relates directly to the on-airport noise abatement measures. The measures to be included in the program should provide for some noise reduction in the airport environs.
4. Reduction of incompatible land uses and the related number of people exposed to adverse aircraft noise levels. This criterion is related to remedy measures that can convert an existing incompatible use into a compatible use or can be applied to ensure that future noise-sensitive uses are not developed in areas exposed to high levels of aircraft noise. Therefore, the measures to be included in the program should mitigate noise effects or reduce future incompatible land uses in the airport environs.
5. Community attitudes and opinions. This criterion relates to both on-airport and off-airport measures. Measures to be included in the program should be consistent with community attitudes and opinion.
6. Social and induced socioeconomic impacts. This criterion relates primarily to off-airport noise remedy measures. Measures to be included in the program should not have social or induced socioeconomic impacts on the airport environs.
7. Relationship to existing plans. This criterion relates to both on-airport and off-airport measures. To the extent possible measures to be included in the program should be compatible with the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan and other planning documents and guidelines pertinent to the Airport environs.
8. Program and/or unit costs. This criterion relates to both on-airport and off-airport measures. The measures to be included in the program should not impose an undue cost burden on either the aviation community or the public in the Airport environs.

9. Economic and financial feasibility of implementation. This criterion relates to both on-airport and off-airport measures. To include a measure in the program, implementation of the measure should be both economically and financially feasible.

10. Timing of implementation action(s). This criterion relates to both on-airport and off-airport measures. While time is of the essence, the implementation of measures included in the program should recognize and be compatible with other plans and programs affecting the Airport and its environs.

EVALUATION OF ON-AIRPORT NOISE ABATEMENT MEASURES

[Text to come]

EVALUATION OF OFF-AIRPORT NOISE REMEDY MEASURES

Some 17 noise mitigation measures for potential application in off-airport areas have been identified and considered on a preliminary basis. In the pages that follow, a final evaluation of these 17 measures is presented that incorporates the many opinions and suggestions expressed by technical, agency, and citizen participants in the Noise Remedy Update Study.

Table 5-2 summarizes the findings of this final evaluation.

1. Comprehensive planning and urban growth management. As noted in Chapter 2, comprehensive planning in the environs of Sea-Tac International Airport has been ongoing for many years, and plans have been formally adopted by King County for both the Highline and Federal Way communities. The current Highline Communities Plan, as adopted by the County Council in December 1977 and amended in May 1981, covers virtually all of the Airport Environs area. This Plan, together with the related Area Zoning for Highline, reflects the various land use policies embodied in the 1976 Sea-Tac/Communities Plan.

For instance, the 1976 Plan included a policy that "Airport acquisition areas should be primarily open space, put to community multiple use." The North Sea-Tac Park now in existence and the Airport Open Use (AOU) zone incorporated in the Highline Area Zoning Ordinance are representative examples of how the comprehensive planning process can and should be used to accomplish compatibility between a busy commercial airport and its neighbors. This is not to say, however, that comprehensive planning is the "perfect" or only off-airport mitigation measure that needs to be utilized. Since the process is carried out in a political environment, some compatible land use recommendations may not be adopted by the governing body, while others that are on the books may be rescinded or so changed in the future as to be ineffective.

Table 5-2

FINAL EVALUATION OF OFF-AIRPORT NOISE REMEDY MEASURES
Sea-Tac Noise Remedy Program Update

Noise Remedy Measure	Recommendation
1. Comprehensive planning and urban growth management	Continue with comprehensive planning process.
2. Zoning	Possible zoning changes to deal with Port-acquired property.
3. Height/noise/safety zoning overlay	Overlay not considered necessary.
4. Acoustical treatment of new structures	Develop specific building code provisions.
5. Acoustical treatment of existing structures	Implement sound insulation program.
6. Avigation easements	Outright purchase of easements recommended.
7. Purchase assurance	Implement purchase assurance program.
8. Acquisition programs	Continue with acquisition program as necessary.
9. Redevelopment programs	Continue with land use conversion programs.
10. Land banking	Explore revenue-generating uses for public properties.
11. Modification of building codes	Develop specific building code provisions.
12. Subdivision regulations	Revise subdivision regulations as necessary.
13. Fair disclosure ordinances	Develop fair disclosure ordinances.
14. Timing of capital improvements	Review CIP programs and modify as necessary.
15. Tax incentives	Explore legal and political ramifications of tax incentives.

5-5

Despite such imperfections, comprehensive planning is an off-airport mitigation measure that can and should be utilized to the maximum extent possible. On the other hand, sophisticated urban growth management techniques that have been developed by the planning profession in recent years do not need to be considered relative to the Jackson Airport Environs, since most of the area is already urbanized.

2. Zoning. As noted above, the zoning provisions that currently govern the use of property in the surrounding area do reflect the fact that King County has used the zoning process to help achieve compatibility with the Airport. These zoning provisions will need to be reviewed and changed (if necessary) in response to the recommendations stemming from this Study.

In particular, adjustments in the territory covered by King County's present AOU zone may need to be made in light of the additional land acquisition suggestions discussed under #9 on page 5-16. Also, the various height limitations for structures (typically 30-45 feet) that are set forth in both the County and Des Moines Zoning Ordinances should be tested for conformance with the FAA's obstruction clearance guidelines (FAR Part 77). This is of particular relevance where areas of single-family residential use are to be acquired by the Port with subsequent conversion to a noise-compatible industrial/commercial use pattern.

3. Height/noise/safety zoning overlay. A special zoning overlay that prescribes additional height, noise, or safety provisions in relation to aircraft operations at Jackson International Airport is not considered to be necessary. This is due to such factors as:
 - Most of the area affected by the Airport falls under the zoning jurisdiction of King County. In keeping with policies of the 1976 Sea-Tac/Communities Plan, the County has established ways

and means to handle height and safety considerations associated with aircraft operations. For example, the Highline Area Zoning Ordinance as amended in May 1981 calls for property located just north of S. 200th Street (see page 133 of the Ordinance) to be converted from an AOU zone to the category of ML-P (planned light manufacturing). Any development here would require site plan approval based upon a recognition that such development may require special conditions to protect the public interest such as ". . . height regulations, permitted uses, performance standards, or other requirements or limitations to assure its compatibility with adjacent land uses (e.g., the Airport) as well as the community." Of course, the AOU Airport Open Use Zoning classification has been expressly developed by the County to provide for "economic uses and development of areas affected by major airports which are compatible with neighboring residential areas, designated open space areas, and airport clear zone requirements" (refer to p. 176 of the Highline Ordinance).

- The 1976 Sea-Tac/Communities Plan (and this update) is largely predicated on the mitigation of excessive aircraft noise by means of programs such as land acquisition, purchase assurance, and sound insulation. As a consequence, compatibility is to be essentially achieved via specific Plan implementation rather than long-term land use controls. This is due to the urbanized (rather than undeveloped) nature of the Airport Environs. If the surrounding area was basically in agricultural or other non-urban use at present, then a preventive noise overlay might be more appropriate.
- As noted in Chapter 4, a special noise overlay if enacted by the Port would be difficult--if not legally impossible--to enforce. Fortunately, the present zoning approach by King County to this matter appears to be more than adequate with regard to airport-oriented noise, height, or safety considerations.

4. Acoustical treatment of new structures. As noted in Chapter 4, any new structure (residential, commercial, institutional) to be built in future years within a prescribed aircraft noise exposure area should be acoustically treated so that interior noise levels do not exceed Ldn 45. With reference to the Sea-Tac Environs, such a criterion should be applied via the King County Building Code to applicable new structures located within any noise exposure area of Ldn 65 or greater, as depicted by the 1980 and 2000 Noise Contour maps contained in the Noise Exposure Update report released by the Port of Seattle in June 1982.

The specific building code provisions required to accomplish the foregoing recommendation should be developed by the King County Building and Land Division. This agency has applied to the FAA for a grant to study the nature and feasibility of incorporating airport-related noise insulation criteria into the County Building Code.

It should be noted that this recommendation is in keeping with the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan which also called for building code requirements "in connection with the renovation of existing structures as well as new construction after the date of adoption" (of the Plan). The discussion on page 11, Section 6.2.3 of the 1976 Plan document pertaining to the growing use of code requirements to achieve quieter interior environments is still applicable. Indeed, sound insulation is rapidly becoming a favored technique for dealing with airport/aircraft noise problems in all parts of the United States and elsewhere.

5. Acoustical treatment of existing structures. This measure was an integral part of the 1976 Sea-Tac/Communities Plan and should be retained. As mentioned in Chapter 2 of this report (p. 2-16), noise grid cells were used in place of noise contours to determine where and to what extent acoustical treatment and other remedy programs might be applied within the Airport Environs. The use of such cells, each of

which constitutes a ground area of approximately 40 acres, is preferable because (a) the curving contour line is difficult to interpret relative to specific parcels of property, and (b) the local land subdivision and street system is essentially laid out in a N-S/E-W "gridiron" pattern.

Detailed evaluation of acoustical treatment as a noise remedy measure and its application within the Airport Environs has resulted in development of the following suggested eligibility criteria for sound insulation:

- (a) Existing single-family structures located in areas with a noise exposure of Ldn 70 and above in 1980 (present condition-base year) or Ldn 65 and above in the year 2000.
- (b) Structures/uses identified under the sound insulation noise remedy program included as part of the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan.

[Note: Criteria used in the original Sea-Tac/Communities Plan for acoustical treatment involved the ANE (adjusted noise exposure) noise metric. The day-night level or LDN metric is being used for this Noise Remedy Update Study, in accordance with national trends. A given ANE value such as ANE 40 can be converted to an equivalent (\pm) LDN value by adding 35; thus, LDN 75 approximates ANE 40.]

The Communities Plan delineated two (2) acoustical treatment program areas. For those locations with a "permanent" (e.g., over the entire 20-year planning period) exposure of ANE 35 (LDN 70) and above, a cost-sharing (75% POS; 25% property owner) insulation program was recommended. The second area also involved a cost-sharing insulation program based on the premise that noise exposure would drop below the ANE 35 (LDN 70) level in the future. Both the Port and owner would share equally in funding this latter program, according to the adopted Plan.]

- (c) To the extent feasible, single-family structures in designated Purchase Assurance areas (see #8 below) should be appropriately sound insulated by the Port at no dollar cost to an eligible property owner who chooses this noise remedy option in exchange for an aviation easement.
- (d) Special cases of non-single family use nature.

Exhibit 5-1 provides an indication of the locations within the Airport Environs that represent full application of these criteria. Exhibits 5-2 and 5-3 show the same program boundaries at a larger scale. As shown by the Exhibits, Criteria (a), above, would include some 6,397 eligible structures, including mobile homes, in neighborhoods situated to the north, east, south, and west of the Airport. This contrasts to a total of 5,017 units covered by the 1976 Plan in both of the aforementioned acoustical treatment program areas. It also reflects that the overall noise exposure area has changed somewhat from its 1976 counterpart. As noted in the Port's Noise Exposure Update report of June 1982, noise exposure levels have decreased north and south of the Airport (since the 1976 Plan was adopted), and increased to the east and west. Also, substantial infill of vacant lots with new residential units has taken place in recent years.

Application of Criteria (c) involves some 1831 single-family residences (390 of which are mobile homes). This is an increase over the number of homes covered by the Communities Plan. Some of the reasons for such a dramatic difference include changed aircraft operations (current and forecast) stemming from deregulation of domestic airlines in the U.S.; improved noise exposure computer modeling programs; and continued growth in the Highline area of King County.

Since the cost of sound insulation can vary widely from structure to structure--depending upon such factors as age, condition, present provisions, etc.--a demonstration project appears to be in order and is so recommended. The details of such a project for the Sea-Tac area are described in Chapter 6 of this report.

A "ballpark" estimate of what it might cost to acoustically treat all 6,397 eligible structures within the Sound Insulation Program areas depicted on Exhibits 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3 can be made, however. A 1981 study by Wyle Research for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provides a basis for making such an estimate. According to this "Study of Soundproofing Requirements For Residences Adjacent to Commercial Airports," the average cost in 1981 dollars to soundproof (e.g., reduce the interior level to LDN 45 or below) a single-family dwelling in the Sea-Tac Airport area that is exposed to LDN 65-70 decibels was determined to be \$2,700. Application of the 7.2% overall rate of inflation that has occurred since 1981 would increase this figure to \$2,900 per dwelling, or about \$18 million for the more than 6,000 structures that might be eligible. Of course, the estimate covers insulation costs only--it does not include expenses that would be incurred by an agency (such as the Port) administering a program of such magnitude and complexity.

6. Avigation easements. Noise remedy programs that may be designated as "Purchase Assurance" or "Sound Insulation" all involve the granting of an avigation easement by a property owner to an airport sponsor in return for relief from, or mitigation of, excessive noise exposure. The possibility of an owner receiving monetary compensation only for

WORKING DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

an aviation easement must also be considered, even though no actual relief is provided in the form of a reduced noise environment.

Based on the criteria and considerations cited at the beginning of this Chapter, the exchange of an aviation easement for an agreed-upon sum of money should be a permitted option in the Purchase Assurance and Sound Insulation program areas tentatively identified on Exhibits 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3.

7 Purchase assurance. Again, as discussed in Chapter 4, a purchase guarantee (now referred to as purchase assurance) program was included in the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan and should be retained as part of the current Update effort. The following eligibility criteria have been developed for the revised Purchase Assurance Program area depicted by Exhibits 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3.

- (a) Purchase assurance should be provided by the Port in single-family housing areas only; moreover, King County must be in agreement that such areas can and should remain as residential neighborhoods in the foreseeable future.
- (b) This type of noise-remedy program should be available in exposure areas of Ldn 75 and over at present (1980) and Ldn 70 and over in the year 2000.
- (c) Properties identified for purchase guarantee in the 1976 Sea-Tac/Communities Plan should be eligible. The criteria in use at that time was as follows: "For areas defined by 'sustained' exposure

WORKING DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

levels of ANE 40 (LDN 75) or above (but below 'permanent' ANE 40 levels), purchase guarantees should be applied in conjunction with a residential soundproofing program and with permanent or long-term easements." (Refer to Plan Section 6.2.4 on page 4).

[Note: A "sustained" exposure level is one that is expected to fall below ANE 40 (LDN 75) at some point during the planning period.]

The new criteria cited in (a) provides for a greater emphasis on present noise level conditions than did the 1976 version. Such an approach is now warranted by the changed noise conditions reflected in the grid cell/contour coverage, as well as by the strong citizen preference for this type of mitigation.

Recommended Purchase Assurance Program boundaries are portrayed on Exhibits 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3. As shown, this program could involve some 1,831 single-family properties (390 mobile homes) over time.

The new boundaries represent extensions of the original Plan recommendations from S. 116th Street to S. 100th Street on the north, and from just north of S. 223rd Street to S. 240th Street on the south. Also, purchase assurance program areas are now shown both to the east and west of the Airport whereas there were none in these locations prior to this study. As discussed under #5 above, the reasons for change involve such things as a different noise exposure pattern (present and future); boundary selection criteria that favors early relief for residents in high impact, non-acquisition areas; and growth in general within the Highline area.

With regard to estimated costs, if all eligible owners were to eventually avail themselves of purchase assurance--an unlikely realization since many of the persons involved will wish to stay in their homes and not relocate due solely to noise--the total price tag might involve

some \$25 million (1983 dollars) over the 16-year period from 1984 to 2000. This estimate is based on a net cost to the Port of \$16,000 per transaction (outright acquisition followed by appropriate sound insulation and resale of the improved property with an avigation easement attached to the deed). The \$16,000 net figure represents average program administration costs of \$4,500 together with average sound insulation costs of \$11,500 per structure, as required to reduce interior levels to LDN 45 and below. It does not encompass any relocation costs (see below).

Due to uncertainties as to (1) the extent and timing of applications for this type of program assistance; (2) the actual cost of appropriate sound insulation; (3) ultimate administrative costs and procedures; and (4) the likely return in dollars to the Port upon resale of the improved properties (see page 3-23 in Chapter 3), it is hereby recommended that a demonstration project be developed and carried out as soon as possible. This project could be dovetailed with the previously recommended sound insulation program outlined earlier in this Chapter.

In support of the foregoing recommendations, it should again be emphasized that the various opinion/attitude surveys conducted by McClure Research in the communities affected by the Airport's presence and location clearly indicate widespread enthusiasm for the concept of purchase assurance. A well-founded demonstration program should therefore be accomplished so as to permit early funding and implementation of this particular noise remedy.

Two other key points should also be noted. Relocation benefits should not be provided to eligible applicants for purchase assurance, and the Port should be the "buyer of last resort" in carrying out the proposed program. Both of these conclusions stem from the overriding need to encourage the improvement and stability of the desired residential environment. While purchase assurance should be available to those

WORKING DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

who truly are bothered by excessive aircraft noise, the process must be deliberate (rather than hurried), and it should not be overly costly in order to permit maximum, timely application of available funds.

With regard to the Port functioning as a "buyer of last resort" in connection with an eligible purchase assurance applicant, an administrative process such as has been set up by the St. Louis, Missouri Airport Authority might be employed. The basic steps involved in such a process include:

- (1) An eligible owner would notify the Port of intent to apply for assistance under the purchase assurance program and also engage a licensed, reputable local realtor to handle the sale of his/her property. The realtor would be expected to aid the owner in establishing a reasonable price, to utilize the local multiple-listing service, and to bring all serious offers to the attention of both the owner and a designated representative of the Port of Seattle.
- (2) If no reasonable offers are received and accepted during a minimum 90-day marketing period, then the owner could request the Port at that time to acquire the property.
- (3) The Port and owner would next negotiate a sales agreement based on the fair market value of the property. Professional appraisers would be used by both parties, as necessary.
- (4) Following establishment of a fair price, the owner would then sell his/her fee simple interests to the Port in entirety.

- (5) After appropriate sound insulation and other necessary improvement activities (if any) have been completed, the Port would place the home back on the market and resell same for a fair price with an avigation easement attached to the deed.
8. Acquisition programs. Between 1972 and the end of 1982, the Port of Seattle acquired nearly 669 residential properties impacted by aircraft operations, at a total cost in excess of \$38,000,000. Authorization was also given by the Port Commission in January 1983 to purchase another 150 parcels (+) for an estimated cost of \$13,100,000. The need to continue this permanent but expensive form of noise remedy (as necessary) was concluded during the initial evaluation discussed in Chapter 4.

The final evaluation of outright acquisition resulted in the following criteria for use in developing revised program recommendations:

- (a) Program focus would be on the acquisition of single family residential properties located in high noise exposure areas--areas that are to be completely redeveloped for Airport-compatible uses.
- (b) The program should primarily be carried out in exposure areas of Ldn 80 and over in 1980, as well as areas of Ldn 75 and over in the year 2000.
- (c) Properties identified for acquisition by the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan should continue to be eligible.

The criteria used to determine acquisition boundaries in the 1976 Plan were very straightforward: all residential and other noise-sensitive uses located in any area permanently exposed to ANE 40 (LDN 75) and above levels was earmarked for outright acquisition by the Port. As suggested above, the new criteria

take into account the need to provide near-term (e.g., as soon as possible) relief for the owners of property now impacted by very high levels of noise due to changes in aircraft operations (number, type, time of day) that have occurred since 1975-1976. Properties subject to LDN 80 and above levels in 1980 are covered by the new criteria, as well as locations that still will be in excess of LDN 75 in the year 2000, according to the most recent forecasts for the Sea-Tac (Jackson) Airport.

- (d) Houses that are not suitable for insulation in purchase assurance program areas would also be acquired by the Port when and as necessary. Following acquisition, the Port would remove the structure and resell the then-vacant lot with an aviation easement.
- (e) Special cases of a non-single family use nature would be incorporated in the program as determined by a detailed review of each noise exposure "cell" produced as part of the aforementioned Noise Exposure Update report.

Inasmuch as federal funds will be utilized to the maximum extent available, relocation benefits will be provided to all property owners who are bought out by the Port. These benefits, as prescribed by the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-64684 Statute 1894), include such activities or costs as (a) assistance in finding suitable housing within the Seattle metropolitan area that is equivalent in type, size, and cost to the dwelling being acquired; (b) the difference in value if the replacement housing is more costly; (c) an interest differential subsidy if the mortgage interest rate on the replacement housing is greater than on the original dwelling; and (d) loading and unloading goods on a moving van for transport up to a 50-mile distance. It should be noted, however, that existing federal law limits the federal share of the housing and interest cost differentials, plus the cost of

moving, to no more than \$15,000 above the fair market value of the property in question.

Based upon recent cost estimates developed for the latest acquisition program authorized in January 1983, it is anticipated that the further acquisition of single-family residential properties will average some \$90,000 per parcel.

The equivalent cost for a mobile home and lot ownership package is \$65,000, while a mobile home on a rented lot approximates \$37,500. All of these average dollar figures include property acquisition and clearance, relocation, and administrative costs typically borne by the Port of Seattle.

Based upon the foregoing estimates, some \$38,100,000 in 1983 dollars will be required to handle the 469 residential parcels slated for acquisition, as shown on Exhibits 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3.

It is of interest to note that the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan called for the fee simple purchase of 1,008 homes, 819 of which have been, or are being, acquired. The remaining 189 units are included in the 469 total recommended by this study. Thus, some 280 additional single-family properties have been designated for acquisition in accordance with the new criteria.

9. Redevelopment programs. As pointed out in Chapter 4, the land use conversion programs described in the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan should essentially be retained, particularly those that are incorporated in the Highline Communities Plan. Additional recommendations for the new acquisition areas are to be incorporated in the updated noise abatement/noise remedy program set forth in Chapter 6.

10. Land banking. The Sea-Tac/Communities Plan specified that lands acquired outright by the Port should primarily be used for open space or to provide recreational opportunities for residents of the Airport Environs. The establishment of the North Sea Tac Park is a prime example of this policy.

Since the Plan was adopted in 1976, however, local governmental bodies in all parts of the United States have become interested in how public properties might be used to generate badly needed revenues--if, as, and where appropriate. Such revenue sources are required to continue the provision of vital public services in a time of declining tax revenues and uncertain economic conditions.

Both the Port of Seattle and King County desire that some of the open space areas designated by the 1976 Plan be considered for possible use by activities that can generate additional revenue but are still compatible with the Airport. While preliminary discussions have been held with the County in relation to these desires, no definite options have yet been identified. The process will be continued, however, as part of the effort to develop a suitable updated noise remedy plan and program for inclusion as Chapter 6 of this report.

11. Modification of building codes. The King County Building and Land Division study referred to under #4 above will address ways and means to specifically modify the King County Building Code in order to ensure that new construction in connection with aircraft noise-sensitive uses will comply with minimum soundproofing standards.

Although new sound insulation requirements in the Building Code might be expected to increase the cost of new housing in the Airport Environs, long-term savings to the buyers of such housing may actually be realized. This is due to the fact that, in general, everything done to a residence to attenuate noise also works to conserve energy. Thus, the initial acoustical treatment costs could well be recovered in full over a 10- or 20-year period of time.

12. Subdivision regulations. Modification of applicable subdivision regulations to require the dedication of avigation easements should be accomplished as called for by the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan. This is of special relevance to the review and approval by the County of revised subdivision plats for both large and small land holdings in the Airport Environs. Such "replatting" may be associated with the trend toward higher residential densities in urban areas throughout the U.S.--a trend necessitated by ever-rising land and construction costs.

The concern with regard to this and similar trends (such as the "infill" of passed-over tracts of land) can be stated quite simply: neither the Port nor the County should be supportive of development that permits more people to be subjected to high noise levels than is presently the case. In addition to exercising vigilance over the type and location of new development in order to ensure at least general compliance with key policies of the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan, the County should consider some modification of current subdivision regulations.

In particular, approval of any new plat or replat of lands exposed to noise levels in excess of LDN 65 (now or in the future) for occupancy by noise-sensitive uses such as residences, institutions (hospitals, nursing homes), and the like should be contingent upon the dedication of avigation easements to the Port of Seattle by the developer or redeveloper. When combined with appropriate building code requirements, this action should provide adequate protection to the Port as well as future residents of such uses.

Although the Airport Environs does not have a great deal of undeveloped land whereby this type of noise remedy program could be applied, it nonetheless should be implemented. Fortunately, the King County Department of Planning and Community Development has agreed to consider the development and adoption of necessary provisions in the regulations that are currently in effect.

13. Fair disclosure ordinances. Also called for in the original Sea-Tac/Communities Plan, an effort by the Port and King County should be made to permit the enforcement of a fair disclosure ordinance throughout the Airport Environs. Most of the participants in the public workshops conducted as part of this study have indicated that such an ordinance should be developed to ensure that new residents to the area are aware of existing and projected noise exposure conditions.

A fair disclosure ordinance typically requires that any party interested in acquiring property within a prescribed aircraft noise impact area should (1) be made aware of the exposure levels involved prior to purchase (by either the seller or seller's agent), and (2) sign a form to that effect as part of the sales transaction. Supporters of this form of noise remedy often come from the ranks of those who are now or who have been adversely affected by aircraft/airport noise. While they may not be able to personally benefit from enforcement of the measure, their concern is for the well-being of future residents. This view was expressed on many occasions at the community workshops held in August 1983, as part of this update study.

Opponents of fair disclosure usually represent real estate and/or development interests. The necessity to disclose the noise information and also get another form signed to close a property sale is onerous to many of these interests. As a consequence, difficulty is usually experienced when attempts are made to pass needed legislation at either the state or local level.

Nonetheless, there are some "success" stories. In Norfolk, Virginia, for example, the local boards of realtors have voluntarily agreed to implementation of fair disclosure because the importance of Norfolk International Airport and the numerous military air installations to the local economy has been well documented by the news media, chambers of commerce, and representatives of local government. In that same state, Fairfax County has passed disclosure ordinances and also