

MEETING MINUTES
POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON UPDATING THE SEA-TAC/COMMUNITIES PLAN NOISE REMEDY PROGRAMS
Tuesday, March 23, 1982
Sea-Tac International Airport

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 by Chairman Art Yoshioka. In attendance were: Brad Broberg, The Highline Times; Marian McKenzie, Bill Holstine, Carol Berwald, Barbara Summers, Pauline Conradi, and Arun Jhaveri; and George Sutter, Jody Yamanaka, and Ed Parks, Port of Seattle.

1. The Committee discussed the recommendations at the last Committee meeting regarding the methods used to solicit input to the now-started Sea-Tac/Communities Plan Noise Remedy Program Update. Marian McKenzie suggested a direct mailing would be appropriate for those houses that were initially to be purchased under the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan Noise Remedy Program (between S. 128th and S. 136th Streets). This would allow those people to participate in the process and would encourage them that the Port of Seattle is doing something to address their conditions. George Sutter mentioned that a log of all calls was kept at the Relocation office. People who call could be mailed specific invitations to meetings. Marian also stated that the perception of the Noise Remedy Program being a closed session was possible unless we made some very overt efforts to get out into the community and pass the word around. The use of the newspapers was appropriate, especially the South End edition of The Seattle Times and The Highline Times, but that the mailing list should include other interested groups and citizens as well. Arun Jhaveri suggested that the Port use those lists of interested citizens developed in the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan and other noise update programs to begin to solicit citizens from the broader community interested in the whole Noise Remedy Program Update.
2. Art Yoshioka opened the discussion of the work scope by handing out a revised work scope. The one sent out in the mail was a very early edition and has since been massaged into a more concise document.

It was emphasized that the Port continued to have a strong commitment to the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan and while the programs that we initially thought would be implemented in a shorter time than they actually were, the intent is still to finish up the implementation of those programs we can.

Pauline Conradi stressed that any work that we do in revising the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan should address the area as a whole. That is, one overall study. Past commitments aside, we could do a better job in addressing a total impacted area by not being prejudiced by things that were done in the past.

Jody Yamanaka suggested that we could use some definitions to help pick out areas, such as long-term 75 Ldn exposure levels (as identified in the Noise Forecast Update) and assuming the prior commitments made in the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan. Art Yoshioka also said that by using a "dual-track" schedule that was flexible we could initiate short-term solutions and concurrent with the long-term general investigation of noise impact on the community.

Discussion continued about addressing the whole Noise Remedy Program at large rather than with a two stage process. It was stressed that if the whole program was to be addressed, the recommendation to the Commission could not be achieved during the first quarter of 1983. It would be advantageous for the Port to keep its excellent Relocation staff onboard but any Commission action later than the first quarter, 1983, would.

Bill Holstine said that there might be more noise in some areas identified in the Noise Remedy Forecast Update than in the old Sea-Tac/Communities Plan. He questioned how they might be treated in some sort of an interim program. It was a consensus agreement by the Committee that in cases such as that, the process would probably bend toward those areas which were identified prior to the noise update work, for they have been theoretically receiving the noise for a longer period of time. Pauline Conradi again stated that she thought the whole area would have to be addressed as a whole before any even short-term solution was possible. She was concerned that any single area being "pushed forward" even if already committed in the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan would harm the program as a whole.

Carol Berwald raised the question of construction in those areas which we are possibly considering for acquisition. She stated that King County was not doing their part in holding the line for development underneath the flight pattern and stressed that the County had to become an active partner in any implementation program.

Bill Holstine said even given his area, which he believes is getting more noise, that if he were in the area identified for acquisition in the Sea-Tac/Communities Plan, he would "put the Port's feet to the fire" to get the acquisition program already identified underway. Marian McKenzie suggested that when the new noise acquisition areas were drawn, that both sides of the street be taken so we would not have the problems we have now on the east and west sides of 24th Avenue South.

Arun Jhaveri questioned George Sutter as to how much of the acquisition was completed. George stated that almost all the houses had been appraised at this time and that by June, all of the acquisition would be done. The relocation process and acquisition of vacant property would fill out the year.

Various persons suggested that people were not going to stand for a lull between June and the first part of the year. They stated the Port was slowly losing credibility in its actions regarding the acquisition program. Even with recognizing the funding limitations, the Committee suggested that the longer you wait, the more the acquisition costs. Yawn!

Art Yoshioka stated that the Port had spent between \$28 and \$29 million already for housing acquisition and relocation. Bond issues are, of course, possible, but given the voting climate and the financial condition of the airlines, was not necessarily a sure option. Marian McKenzie suggested that economic utilization of the acquired land, so it could become an income-producing property, would help aid not only the tax base of King County but would also make the land cost less to the Port eventually. Arun Jhaveri then inquired about the industrial development bonds that the legislature approved for municipalities in the last year.

Marian McKenzie stated that the south end of the Airport that land might lend itself more to resale for commercial use than that land already acquired; it would not impact the remaining residential parcels, that the changes in land use might be one issue with which the Committee itself should be working with the County.

Bill Holstine said that while the plan development was being completed, special "hardship cases" for the elderly, people who must move or the infirmed should be instituted. Marian McKenzie stated that there were "terrible" hardships north of South 136th Street, but that the Hardship Committee which had worked during the present acquisition program handled those cases very well.

Art Yoshioka also mentioned the possibility of being able to carry out an acquisition program that did not offer relocation assistance to families. Although the number of takers he believed might not be as many as if the relocation benefits were active, the Port would also not need to use Federal money to continue the acquisition.

It was requested that along with the scope of work a rough flowchart and sequence of events be developed. It was also suggested by the Committee that the scope of work be reproduced at its standard size rather than the reduced size so people could see it a little better. Jody Yamanaka stated that she would like to have any comments from the Committee on this initial scope of work by Tuesday, April 6.

The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, April 19, 1982 to discuss the work program in more detail.