

Summary of comments - FAA.

#17 - The section on school districts needs clarification. The way the section is written, the inference can be made that the schools which are being closed are being closed solely because of reduction in attendance.

---

Response to comment - Art Yoshida, Director  
Planning & Research.

#15 -

Available data on noise impact indicates that incompatibility for residential and school uses becomes most pronounced at levels above ~~45~~<sup>NEF</sup> 35. Investigations by a noise consultant for the SeaTac Communities Plan indicate that the entire proposed acquisition area lies within an NEF range of 45 to 50. Therefore, in relation to noise impact, this land is not compatible for residential and school uses.

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a date or reference number.

Main body of handwritten text, appearing to be a letter or document with several lines of cursive script.

Handwritten text block in the middle section, possibly a signature or a specific heading.



Large block of handwritten text at the bottom of the page, likely the main content of the document.

Information was obtained from

1. Sea Tac International Airport Land Acquisition Final Environmental Impact Report
2. A letter dated Feb. 26, 1974 from J. H. Turner, Acting Director Northwest Region FAA. - defining clear zones, extended clear zones & noise impact areas.
3. Response to comments by submitted by George Bully after regarding final EIR - by Arthur Yashinski Director Planning & Research P.O.S.

Copies of ~~being~~ information sent to:

George Bully, FAA.

State Legislators

Cunningham

Herr

Lyser

Valle

Paul Barden, County Counselman

Don Shay (off PAC)

Ed Parks

Donovan Tracy, ~~Sea Tac~~ Communities Plan

Board of Directors, Highline School District

Highline Community Council

Highline Times

In order to comply with FAA land use compatibility criteria, the Port of Seattle proposes to acquire land adjacent to the north and south boundaries of SeaTac International Airport.

① Acquisition is based on FAA criteria for expanded clear zones. At airports serving turbo-jet aircraft such areas of land may extend up to 1250 ft. laterally from the runway centerline and extend 5000 ft. beyond each end of the runway.

② The purposes of clear zones and extended clear zones is to provide for safety areas.

③ The extended clear zones are to provide land necessary to restrict the use of areas adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations - as well as to meet current and anticipated development at the airport.

④ Incompatible land uses include "places of public assembly" - including schools, hospitals, churches and similar institutions.

The FAA has defined the expanded clear zone.

The Port of Seattle has applied for funding to acquire property for the expanded clear zone at SeaTac to comply with FAA criteria.

~~Is~~ Is it not NOW defined as an <sup>expanded clear zone</sup> safety area for the airport & not compatible to schools - or does that definition not take effect until after acquisition?

NOTE Sachse page  
response to comments  
by Art Yoshiohara

Sunset Jr. High is within the FAA criteria  
set for the expanded clear zone. It is the  
ONLY school within the precise boundaries.

Dr. James Jennings states in the EIR (Environ-  
mental Impact Report) that total attendance at  
Sunset is 605 - has three acquisition  
will be 100.

Why should we send 500 children  
into an area ~~so~~ defined as an expanded  
clear zone' - why not send 100 children  
out of that area daily. The majority will  
live in the vicinity of the airport after the  
proposed acquisition is accomplished.

Neighborhood school ART important.  
But why not relocate now ~~and start~~  
~~and begin~~. ~~With~~ two or three years from  
now!

~~A~~ Can the Highline School District legally  
open to classes a public school  
(~~uniparticular~~ Sunset Jr. High) when it  
has been defined as being in ~~the~~  
expanded clear zone - a safety area  
for the airport that not compatible to  
school?

★ If there should be a plane accident or an airport related accident, <sup>at airport</sup> what will the Heights School District <sup>be</sup> responsible for?

We are sending our children into a defined safety area for the airport! Would that shift the liability from the airlines ~~and the Port of Seattle~~ to the school district?

---

FAA funding is not presently available for land acquired on a basis of airport impact such as noise or air pollution.

Use only FAA criteria for the expanded clear zone?????

→ #15  
★ If partial funding of the acquisition by the FAA should not be approved - would the area still be defined as an expanded clear zone - a safety area for the airport, not compatible to schools and other similar institutions AND residential development? Thus making the Port of Seattle responsible for its acquisition?

March 18, 1974

Dear Representative Douthwaite -

With the passage of HB 1328 - the Ports noise & air quality bill - lets hope the cart is not before the horse. It can be a good bill - it gives the Port the power, "or permission" to do alot of things for an area that certainly needs help.

I feel the boundaries "east & west" are not adequate to cover the problems caused by the Ports restriction on relocating Port required homes - "for fear of future requisition or noise problems." It is not a bill for mass requisition - has no dollars or cents put on financing so it really should have been wide enough to cover PEOPLE problems. The Port had already set those boundaries first! The people outside the noise impact area - but within the Ports no-no area are looking for real estate protection, not requisition. They would like to be able to go to the Port for help in buying or selling if needed. Is that too much



to ask!

Will HB1328 automatically put a "kiss of death" to financing of real estate by lending agencies within the area? The Post did not check - did the legislature? Will the banks & other lending agencies - FHA - VA, etc. still do business within the area? Or will those people be worse off than when they were just Zone 3! Will it all be left up to the Post from now on?

Will the Post be required to pay "real estate" property taxes on the houses bought, rented - or resold? Would they pay the taxes involved in purchasing & selling property? A half cent tax, I understand goes into the general fund - ~~not special districts~~ - such as schools, fire, water, sewer & the like - We can't afford to lose much more tax base in the Highland School District.

Am I expected to vote in additional tax money so the Post can help

The man across the street who has the same noise & real estate problems I have I think! There will always be a wrong side of the street to live on - but the Port ~~Area~~ has double trouble boundaries - what happens to the people living in "no man's" land! Beyond those boundaries I don't think people are much concerned!

Should the bill have said "airport & facilities" oriented noises - not just airplane noise! - what happens if they build a "helipad" for helicopters or a monorail type container hauler from the Duwamish to the airport via 24<sup>th</sup> Ave. So. - Now there's another type of noise! - Think to the future! The Port does!!!!

If its a good bill - the lending agencies will still participate in real estate dealings in it - then it should be broad enough to cover the PROBLEM!

Thanks for listening -  
Virginia Rona  
2648 So 142  
Seattle 98168