

**MEDIATED ROLE DETERMINATION PANEL
SNOHOMISH COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING EAST
FIRST FLOOR MEETING ROOM #1
May 4, 2006**

MEETING MINUTES

MRD PANEL ATTENDEES

Don Doran	Tom Gaffney	Michelle Robles	Mark Wolken
Ray Stephanson	Tom Hoban	John Shaw	Gary Haakenson
A.J. Chase	Lori Kaiser	Hugh Townsend	(for Deanna Dawson)

TECHNICAL ADVISERS ATTENDEES

Roy Chandler	Carol Key	Stephen Kiehl	Rich White
Ryk Dunkelberg	Russ Keyes	John Sibold	

SNOHOMISH COUNTY STAFF ATTENDEES

Peter Camp	Bill Dolan	Christie Baumel
Dave Waggoner	Mary Lynn Evans	Paula Bond

INTRODUCTION

Co-Chair Don Doran called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm welcoming members. Mr. Doran asked for self introductions around the room and then asked for review of the minutes. Lori Kaiser moved for approval of the minutes as submitted and Hugh Townsend seconded the motion. In discussion Peter Camp advised the protocol for public comment at the beginning of the MRD Panel meeting, speakers need to sign up on the sheet before the meeting begins, with limit of 3 minutes per speaker and 10 minutes total. During the course of the presentations, if an audience member has questions or comments for the folks at the table, jot them down and give them to Mr. Camp. He will then give the items to a Co-Chair to address. This procedure is similar to what the Court systems use for Juries to ask questions.

Peter Camp announced there were 2 speakers signed up to address the MRD Panel. The first speaker was Marko Liias, Mukilteo City Council. He has been following the progress of the panel thru the press. He wanted to urge the panel to focus on the MRD language that can be updated to be more relevant and let the political process address the concerns of the development of the Airport and its activities. The second speaker, Joe Marine, Mayor of Mukilteo reiterated the same as Marko, and that his understanding of the task of the MRD Panel was to clarify but not to expand the activities encouraged in the role.

Ryk Dunkelberg gave the presentation on his recent noise modeling effort. He noted that the data inputs for the Integrated Noise Model (INM) came from the forecast chapter of the 2002-2021 Airport Master Plan Update adopted by the County Council. There are 5 Scenarios in the forecast model for the year 2021. In addition to the four scenarios included in the Master Plan

Update he included one that had all the projected general aviation operations (ops) but no airline service called the “base case”. The base case is included in each of the other 4 scenarios.

- Base Case – no commercial passenger service but does include growth of large aircraft by Goodrich & Boeing, and general aviation. 347,714 ops per year. (952/day) [1 landing or 1 departure is 1 op, touch & go's would be 2 ops]
- Regional Service Low – base case plus airline service to regional destinations [500 miles or less], for passengers living within a 30 minute drive time, flying primarily on aircraft with less than 60 seats. Approximately 11,462 annual passengers on 11,462 airline ops (16 arrivals and 16 departures per day), 359,176 total ops.
- Regional Service High – base case plus airline service to regional destinations, (500 miles or less), for passengers from the airports catchment area including Snohomish, Skagit and Island counties and people in King County within a 30 minute drive time of the airport, primarily on aircraft with less than 60 seats. Approximately 239,000 annual passengers on 17,975 air carrier ops (25 arrivals and 25 departures per day), 365,689 total ops.
- National Service Low – base case plus airline service to regional and national destinations for passengers living within a 30 minute drive time, flying on smaller planes to regional destinations and larger 737 size planes to national destinations. Approximately 996,000 annual passengers on 27,858 airline ops (38 arrivals and 38 departures per day) 375,572 total ops.
- National Service High – base case plus airline service to regional and national destinations for passengers from the airports catchment area including Snohomish, Skagit and Island counties and people in King County within a 30 minute drive time of the airport, , flying on smaller planes to regional destinations and larger planes to national destinations. Approximately 1,562,219 annual passengers on 43,687 airline ops (60 arrivals and 60 departures per day) 391,401 total ops.

Mr. Stephanson inquired about the airline operating hours assumed in the computer model of the various scenarios. Mr. Dunkelberg noted that the Integrated Noise Model (INM) applies a 10dBA penalty to nighttime noise events (between 10 pm and 7am) in the DNL contours and confirmed that the model assumes nearly all airline flights are during the 15 daytime hours (7am-10pm) but that in the national low and high scenarios a few more flights are assumed at night to make east coast connections. Ms. Kaiser asked if there was capacity to accommodate these airline operations and Mr. Dunkelberg indicated that the airport generally has enough capacity and that capacity challenges translate to delays so when things are running smoothly there are no delays but when capacity is stretched hiccups can more easily cause delays. He also explained that after a question was raised at the April 6th meeting asking if DNL understated airport impacts due to the relative lack of flight activity at night, he had also run the INM model for the 15 daytime hours from 7am to 10pm.

It was agreed that the busier times for the Ops would be likely be bunched into a few concentrated periods in the morning 7-9am and early evening (5-8pm) for business travel regardless which scenario was used, and the roadway vehicle traffic would likely be proportional to the number of passengers. A question was raised about how this data compares with the 2004 market study by Mead Hunt which said there are 7,000 passengers per day in the airports catchment area. Bill Dolan stated that the data presented here is projections for the year 2021 that were developed in the 2002-2021 Airport Master Plan Update. He said the 2004 Mead Hunt study counted the # of tickets purchased in 2003 and is not reflected in this data.,

Mr. Dunkelberg described the aircraft differences in the various scenarios.

- Regional Low and High: Generally aircraft with less than 60 seats. Dash 8-200/400, CRJ 700 type aircraft.

- National Low and High: Dash 8-200/400, CRJ 700 type aircraft for short stage flight lengths (<500 miles); and CRJ-700, B737-700-900 type aircraft for longer stage flight lengths (500 miles and greater)

When asked why these aircraft were chosen for use in the INM model Mr. Dunkelberg replied that the model is a forecast thru 2021 and it uses the aircraft likely to be operated in 2021. The Alaska Air Group (Alaska Airlines and Horizon Airlines) which is the dominant carrier in the Seattle market flies these aircraft. The model was run assuming some heavier flights with longer stage lengths to provide a most reasonable worst case noise projection for the scenarios. He noted that the louder noises from large jet aircraft tend to be the primary driver in the size of the noise contours.

Mr. Dunkelberg then presented a series of graphics showing the noise contours generated from the INM for the projected numbers of operations in the year 2021 under those 5 scenarios. Included on these slides were the number of acres within the noise contours and the population within the contours projected by the County's GMA Comprehensive plan for the year 2025. These included:

- ⇒ Comparison of all 5 scenarios 65DNL noise levels remain on Airport and Boeing property. do not leave Paine Field property on any of these scenarios. He explained that the 65DNL is the threshold for planning for compatible development but noted that some communities have chosen to use 60DNL and a few have even chosen 55DNL for land use planning restrictions.
- ⇒ Base Case scenario showing 60 and 55 DNL, and 60 and 55 LEQ15 contours This slide also contained a contour showing the Airport's FAR Part 150 adopted Noise Exposure Map projection of 2008 impacts. In each scenario the LEQ15 contour area was slightly smaller than the DLN contour area.
- ⇒ Regional Low scenario showing 60 and 55 DNL, and 60 and 55 LEQ15 contours.
- ⇒ Regional High scenario showing 60 and 55 DNL, and 60 and 55 LEQ15 contours.
- ⇒ National Low scenario showing 60 and 55 DNL, and 60 and 55 LEQ15 contours.
- ⇒ National High scenario showing 60 and 55 DNL, and 60 and 55 LEQ15 contours.
- ⇒ Table summarizing the acreage and year 2025 projected population within each DNL contour for each of the 5 scenarios. He explained that he normally doesn't use projected future populations for this type analysis but because the data is available in an officially adopted land use plan he used it here to show a worst case. It should be noted that these year 2025 projections reflect substantial growth as the GMA has forced the county to push the bulk of the 50% countywide population growth into the urban areas
- ⇒ Table summarizing the acreage and year 2025 projected population within each LEQ15 contour for each of the 5 scenarios
- ⇒ A slide containing the 55DNL contours for each of the 5 scenarios.

As he showed the slides Mr. Dunkelberg noted that the east and west edges of the contours don't change perceptibly between the 5 scenarios but explained how the change was most noticeable at the south end of the 55DNL contours where the Base Case contour extended to 150th Street S.W., Regional Low contour extended to 151st Street S.W., the Regional High contours extended to 152nd Street S.W., The National Low contour extended to 163rd Street S.W., and the National High contour extended to 168th Street S.W.

The next slide was the Conceptual Development Plan map from the 2002-2021 Airport Master Plan Update. It showed the Airport in detail with, blue shading of the areas for aviation purposes; green shading for the areas used for aviation compatible type development (i.e. parts suppliers, avionics and instruments vendors).

The last slide contained two noise contours. The larger one showed the noise contour forecast for the year 2000 that was developed with the 1980 Airport Master Plan. The much smaller contour showed the noise forecast for the year 2008 that was adopted by the County Council and FAA as the Official Noise Exposure Map (NEM) for the year 2008 that was developed as part of the 2002-2021 Airport Master Plan Update. It was noted that the larger contour had been the basis for the zoning established around the airport in the early 1980's.

Peter Camp then introduced Mary Lynne Evans, the manager of GMA compliance in the County Department of Planning and Development Services, to discuss the Growth Management Act (GMA) and Comprehensive Plans around the Airport. Ms. Evans gave an overview of the presentation, the GMA requirements and the Snohomish County update for the long range plan. "The GMA established a structure for all future land use planning in Washington State. The Act required that all planning activities be based upon 20-year population and employment forecasts developed by the Office of Finance and Management (OFM) using 1990 census numbers." The GMA has 13 general goals including protection of rural areas, reduction of sprawl, provision of adequate roads and services to new development. Snohomish County's GMA Comprehensive Plan has 5 parts:

- ⇒ General Policy Plan – guidelines for future developments
- ⇒ Future Land Use – depicts land use over next 20 years
- ⇒ Capital Facilities Plan – inventory of facilities, establish service standards for public facilities, and prioritize future facilities needed, and facilities difficult to sight including new facilities or expansion of existing sites
- ⇒ Parks and recreation Element – park and recreational planning guidelines

She explained that the GMA requires jurisdictions to accommodate the location and expansion of Essential Public Facilities (EPF's). Avenues for Cities or Citizens to object to these facilities are thru the political process, but that doesn't allow the County to "say no" to necessary facilities either expanding or building new sites. Mr. Doran took issue with that comment, stating the County can choose not to expand a facility that it owns and that the process allows consideration of all the cumulative impacts of multiple EPF's in a community.

Christie Baumel, senior planner at PDS then gave the second portion of the presentation on the GMA on Future Land Use in the areas around the Airport. She described the sections of the comprehensive plans adopted by the County and the cities of Everett and Mukilteo as they relate to the GMA requirement for accommodating Essential Public Facilities and the requirement for jurisdictions adjacent to general aviation airports to plan for compatible land uses adjacent to the airport.

Snohomish County's Comprehensive Plan General Policy Plan includes a Capital Facilities Goal 8 "to develop investment strategies to support and enhance its role as a general aviation and industrial commercial facility consistent with the Airport Master Plan" The City of Mukilteo's comprehensive plan designates industrial uses, and it's opposition to commercial use or physical expansion of the Airport and to be active with the Paine Field planning to limit flight patterns and operations. The City of Everett Comprehensive Plan supports the Paine Field Master Plan Update, anticipates a reevaluation of the MRD and discourages incompatible land uses around the airport. The County Planning Department is available to discuss land uses and help others develop comprehensive land use plans Ms Baumel used a map of the area with color coding of the different land use categories. Also included was the Official FAR Part 150 Noise Exposure Map (NEM) for the year 2008. Bill Dolan noted that due to poor economy the operations in 2004 were down to approximately ½ of those forecast for 2008 and that only about 3,500 of those were big jets from Boeing and Goodrich where the year 2008 ops include 6,000 Boeing/Goodrich

operations. Requests were made from the panel to have PDS enhance the map by adding a higher resolution of residential densities, manufacturing industrial centers, the 2021 projected noise contours and proposed annexation areas.

Mr. Camp briefed the panel on a consultant selection. He has reviewed the statement of qualifications (SOQ) from Economic Research Associates (ERA), the only firm that responded to the County's request for qualifications (RFQ). He had also reviewed their report on a similar project they did for the Contra Coast County in California dated 6/15/2000 reviewing the impacts their airport has on the community. He said it didn't appear to be as balanced a report as we are likely looking for here as it did not reflect some impacts like vehicle traffic. This was the only company that applied, however there have been a couple of other consultants inquiries since the application time expired. We are at a "Fork in the Road", do we open another RFQ to get a larger consultant pool? Do we go with ERA? Do we have a good outline of expectations for the consultant – or are we premature and need to better define the questions for the study?

Discussion ensued:

Michelle Robles asked why are we going to a consultant? Aren't we supposed to be looking at the MRD document? Maybe we should wait until we can ask the right questions.

Russ Keyes stated that the panel's objective is to make the MRD document relevant to current times. To interpret the contents and determine if it needs to be amended.

Gary Haakenson, Mayor of Edmonds, asked when are we going to review the MRD?

Lori Kaiser commented she is respectful of the business community travel needs, but feels it is premature in engaging a consultant at this time. We need to decide what information should be studied to defend any decision the panel makes. Also, it is worrisome only having one consultant to pick from.

Peter Camp – it sounds like we should leave the RFQ for now, not move on a consultant until the 6/1 meeting. Come prepared to that meeting to review the MRD and suggest whether it should be "tweaked" or rewritten.

Mr. Camp advised that there will be 2 presentations at the next meeting 5/18/2006. There are 2 45 minute presentations by the Save Our Communities (SOC) group. The next two meetings only have the use of the Public Meeting Room 1, which severely limits the # of participants, and would not be audio taped (audio equipment is in the 2nd room). It was suggested that perhaps we could use one of the PUD rooms, he will check on other locations and advise the panel. It will also be posted on the website on the 5/18 agenda.

Mr. Camp gave an update on the MRD website - It is operational, the goal is the week after the MRD Panel meeting to have the minutes and agenda for the next meeting on the website.
http://www1.co.snohomish.wa.us/County_Services/MRD/Information/



Snohomish County Washington

Mediated Role Determination: Paine Field

[Home](#) [About The County](#) [Services A-Z](#) [County A-Z](#) [Links](#) [Popular Services](#) [Print Version](#)

MRD Menu

County Links

MRD

- Information
- Meeting Agendas
- Meeting Minutes
- Presentations

Shortcuts

- Related Links
- Related Services
- Related Maps
- Related Media

Information

- [Meeting Presentation Materials](#)
- [Meeting Agendas](#)
- [Meeting Minutes](#)

[Home](#) > [County Services](#) > [MRD](#) > [Information](#)

 Snohomish County, Online Government Information & Services

[County Home](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Statement](#) | [Site Information](#) | [Feedback](#)

Main: 425-388-3411 or 1-800-562-4367, TTY 425-388-3700
Snohomish County, 3000 Rockefeller Ave, Everett, WA 98201, [Get Directions](#)

The meeting adjourned at 4:35pm.