

**MEDIATED ROLE DETERMINATION PANEL  
SNOHOMISH COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING EAST  
FIRST FLOOR MEETING ROOM #1  
MARCH 2, 2006**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**MRD PANEL ATTENDEES**

|           |                |              |                 |
|-----------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Don Doran | Ray Stephanson | Mark Wolken  | Michelle Robles |
| Tom Hoban | Lori Kaiser    | Kevin Lavery |                 |
| John Shaw | Hugh Townsend  | A J Chase    |                 |

**TECHNICAL ADVISERS ATTENDEES**

|              |               |            |
|--------------|---------------|------------|
| Roy Chandler | Stephen Kiehl | Carol Key  |
| Russ Keyes   | John Sibold   | Rich White |

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY OFFICIALS**

Aaron Reardon                  Mark Soine

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY STAFF ATTENDEES**

|                 |                  |                 |            |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|
| Tom Fitzpatrick | Mary Lynne Evans | Dave Waggoner   | Bill Dolan |
| Dave Hopkins    | Dave Stroble     | Christie Baumel |            |

**INTRODUCTION**

Co-Chair Ray Stephanson called the meeting to order and welcomed MRD Panel members, technical advisers, staff and the public to the second meeting of the MRD review panel.

**Minutes:**

Kevin Lavery moved for approval of the November 1, 2005 meeting minutes as submitted. Mark Wolken seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**Administrative:**

Bill Dolan described the contents of the meeting information packets that Panel members received. The packets included a revised agenda; minutes from the November 1 meeting; an executive summary of the 2002-2021 Airport Master Plan Update; the Forecast chapter from the Airport Master Plan, including County Council Motion 01-255 adopting the regional Low forecast scenario and reaffirming the MRD; the Noise Analysis chapter from the FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Plan, including background and definitions; flight operations and flight track data, as requested by panel members at the first meeting; copies of Steve Keihl's Puget Sound Regional Council ("PSRC") PowerPoint presentation; a summary of the PSRC's 1996 decision process regarding Sea-Tac's Third Runway; a PSRC general chronology of Airport capacity

decisions from 1973-2006; a copy of House Bill 2383; a Washington State Department of Transportation (“WSDOT”) paper on the Washington State Long-term Air Transportation Study (“LATS”); and a CD, including the 1977 Paine Field Community Plan and appendices; and the 1981 Airport Master Plan that were discussed at the Panel’s first meeting. Bill noted copies of these materials were available on the table at the entry for the public.

DIS presentation:

Dave Hopkins, systems project lead supervisor from the County Department of Information Services (“DIS”), described the opportunities for his Department to support the Panel’s efforts to communicate externally with the public and internally amongst themselves. Using the ongoing County Charter Review Commission as an example, he described how the County web page can provide a powerful vehicle for communication with opportunity to include features like search, eSubscribe notifications, media coverage links and surveys. Dave Stroble, DIS systems analyst, then described how DIS can create a Microsoft SharePoint site (or sites) to allow panel members to communicate amongst themselves as an entire group or as subcommittees. The sites require usernames and passwords but he noted the programs are wizard driven requiring no special computer skills. DIS staff will meet with Tom Fitzpatrick to determine an administrator who will be the focal point for content added to the web site.

Retaining experts:

Tom Fitzpatrick discussed with the Panel some of the staff effort that had occurred since the first meeting on the subject of expert assistance. He noted the MRD review panel is an independent body with no predetermined results and that while the Panel may wish to use existing County staff resources for some subject areas, they may wish to use outside consultants for others. Tom said there is no specific budget amount identified for the Panel’s use of outside consultants but noted also it is not an unlimited budget. Based on the conversations at the first Panel meeting, staff have been reviewing opportunities for outside consultants to provide input on the questions of what effect scheduled air service would have on economic development and what effect it would have on property values. He noted the two subjects are not totally exclusive and explained that the Paine Field situation is a bit unique in that most studies on these issues deal with commercial service in communities where no commercial service previously existed and noise impacts studies are from larger scale operations. A third potential area for outside consultant help could be with helping the Panel with public involvement.

Tom explained that a Request for Qualifications (“RFQ”) process would be required to obtain such consultant services and that with the required advertising, submittal preparation, review, interview, selection and contracting time required in the RFQ process, the consultant(s) could be on board in a little over a month after the RFQ is published. He noted that a case study approach would be one way to approach the economic and property value effects questions and thought others might be suggested by the consultants during the RFQ process.

Regarding existing data for the Panel’s use, Tom explained that the adopted 2002-2021 Airport Master Plan data was created in a standard FAA approved process and was based on reasonable population forecasts that have been recently verified. The plan projected four scenarios of regional low, regional high, national low and national high.

The County Council adopted the Regional Low forecast. Those forecasts were the basis for the FAR Part 150 Noise Exposure Maps.

Don Doran indicated he was uncomfortable with the discussions of measuring noise and other impacts of air service options and reminded the Panel of the charge given to them by the Executive. As noted in the minutes of the first meeting, the Panel's mission is to review the MRD document, work to make the document more relevant and make recommendations to improve the document.

Ray Stephenson responded that, as noted in the minutes, Executive Reardon stated to accomplish this, the Panel should assemble factual information, provide this information to the public through the Panel's discussions and work, and make recommendations on the policy positions taken in the MRD. He noted there are differences in opinion of what the MRD says. He said he did not know where the Panel's review of the document and data generated in the process was going to lead and he wants to find out what the facts tell.

Michelle Robles noted the MRD is a 28-year-old document with some sections now obsolete due to the passage of time and intervening events. She felt it was a living document in need of the panels review. Michelle expressed how the public perceptions of the Panel's independence and transparency of the review process and the opportunity for public involvement were key to a successful outcome. She felt that the web page could be a valuable tool for getting information out there in a factual, non-emotional manner. She also suggested that media links on the site should include Seattle and South County media coverage on the subject.

Mark Wolken indicated that the Panel's review of economic impacts should address economic development in a broad sense, not just counting jobs. Michelle said the review of negative impacts should include a quality of life perspective, not just monetary property value impact.

Russ Keyes noted that a lot of data pertinent to these discussions has already been developed in the Airport Master Plan Update and FAR Part 150 noise study processes conducted by the Barnard Dunkelberg firm. Russ felt they would be a valuable asset to the Panel's efforts.

Lori Kaiser noted that the negative impacts from air service would go beyond airplane noise. She rates increased vehicle traffic congestion right up there with noise. In addition, she has concerns also about potential for air and water pollution impacts.

Tom Fitzpatrick noted that there are in-house capabilities at the County to provide data on some of these issues, noting specifically the County Public Works Department could provide the road traffic information. He said any analysis of impacts will need to know the activity assumptions the Panel is working with and suggested the four levels of activity identified as scenarios in the Airport Master Plan forecasts would be a reasonable starting point.

John Shaw asked what the deliverable is here. Executive Reardon reiterated the deliverable is that the Panel should assemble factual information, provide this information to the public through the Panel's discussions and work, and make recommendations to him on the policy positions taken in the MRD.

Kevin Lavery said he felt the Panel would benefit from input from consultants who specialize in the areas of positive and negative economic effects.

Ray Stephanson said the Co-Chairs would work with Tom to review a RFQ for consultants to address the positive and negative economic effects. He noted that responses to the RFQ process may show that the kind of data wanted is not available or is not available in a form wanted.

Michelle Robles felt that the Panel would do well to get the website established and begin to get public feedback before deciding on whether to hire a public involvement consultant.

#### WSDOT LATS:

John Sibold, Director of the WSDOT Aviation Division, was then asked to brief the Panel on the status of the state's new Long-term Air Transportation Study required by the Legislature last year. John provided copies of a LATS briefing paper and the legislative bill that authorized the study. He explained that LATS addresses statewide transportation needs and includes three distinct phases with the first phase being an inventory assessment that is now underway by the consulting firm SH&E and scheduled for completion by July 1, 2006. The second phase will complete airport demand forecast and market analysis for the next 25 years and is scheduled for completion by July 1, 2007. The third phase, which he described as the "How do we get there," will include a ten member planning council to be appointed by the Governor to review the data and make recommendations on future statewide aviation needs. He noted the primary source of information on the study will be the study website:

[www.wsdot.wa.gov/aviation/news/2005/airtranspstudy/default.htm](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/aviation/news/2005/airtranspstudy/default.htm)

The FAA has contributed \$900,000 in grant funding for the first two phases of the study, matched by \$100,000 from the state and supplemented by \$50,000 from the state for a rail study component.

#### PSRC:

Steve Keihl, senior planner for the Puget Sound Regional Council, made a presentation to the Panel on the history of air transportation planning efforts in the region over the past three decades. He provided copies of his PowerPoint presentation and a written chronology. He noted that the 1992 "Flight Plan" process concluded that the Third runway should be built at Sea-Tac and the region should continue to look to develop major supplemental airport(s) (*defined as airports with two parallel 10,000' long runways capable of simultaneous independent operations*) and removed Paine Field from consideration as a major supplemental airport (*couldn't meet the criteria*). Steve stated that the Major Supplemental Airport study was unable to find any feasible sites and requested the state begin a process to address the long-range airport capacity needs, which is the purpose of the LATS study now underway. He noted that Sea-Tac is currently handling 29 million passengers annually. Current planning projects 3% annual growth, with Sea-Tac reaching its 45 million passenger capacity in 2021.

Steve proceeded with a discussion of last year's proposals by Southwest Airlines and Alaska Airlines to relocate operations from Sea-Tac to new terminals they would build at Boeing Field. King County analyzed both proposals and determined that the airport had the physical capacity to accommodate one proposal and the impacts and public investment necessary would have been manageable. The analysis determined that

there was inadequate airport capacity to accommodate both proposals and the combined impacts and investments necessary with both proposals would have been unacceptable. So rather than choose one airline over the other, King County declined both proposals.

Steve also provided some discussion on the economic nondiscrimination assurance (*assurance #22*) that Snohomish County and all airport sponsors commit to when accepting federal grants. Section a obligates the County to ...”make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the airport.”

Future meetings:

Ray Stephanson noted the meeting was nearing the 2-hour mark. Executive Reardon stated the next meeting of the Panel is scheduled for 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 16. The next meeting will include a draft timeline of subjects to be addressed at future meetings in an effort to tighten up the process and provide Panel members a clear path to the deliverables expected from them.

Tom Hoban asked if the 37 seat dash 8-200 turboprop aircraft operated by Horizon Airlines was allowed to operate at Paine Field under the current MRD. Bill Dolan noted that the Panel’s packets included County Council Motion 01-255 adopting the Master Plan forecasts, which reaffirms its commitment to the MRD and encourages commuter service. He said that packet also included the CD with the Paine Field Community Plan (“PFCP”) and appendices on which the role was based and that the PFCP projected commuter aircraft up to 50-seat capacity.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.