

---

## Meeting attendees

### Airport Working Group (AWG) Members

- Art Scheunemann, PSRC Freight Mobility Roundtable
- Ed Parks, Community Representative, Beacon Hill/Rainier Valley
- Holly Krejci, Georgetown Community Council
- Joel Funfar, SPEEA
- Kristi Ivey, National Business Aviation Association
- Larry Reid, Georgetown Merchants Association
- Tim Cosgrove, UPS
- Tom Ysasi, Community Representative, Magnolia
- Wendy Langen, Mente LLC

### Others in attendance

- Beth Mountsier, King County Council Staff
- Clare Gallagher, Port of Seattle
- Don Stark, Smith & Stark
- Julianna Ross, Seattle City Light
- Keith Searles, Boeing
- Kenny Pittman, City of Seattle
- Nora Gierloff, City of Tukwila
- Peter Anderson, Galvin Flight Training, LLC
- Steve Ohlenkamp, TCG, LLC and Clay Lacy
- Wayne Werner, PNBA

### Airport staff and consultant team

- Randy Berg, KCIA/BFI
- Gary Molyneaux, KCIA/BFI
- Alexander Lew, KCIA/BFI
- Mark McFarland, Mead & Hunt
- Michele Mwangemi, KCIA/BFI
- Susan West, King County
- Cody Fussell, Mead & Hunt
- Ryan Orth, EnviroIssues
- Lauren Dennis, EnviroIssues

The following document provides a summary of the King County International Airport/Boeing Field (KCIA/BFI) Master Plan Update Airport Working Group Meeting #2 on September 27, 2016. The summary is organized into the following sections:

- I. Introductions and housekeeping items
- II. Capacity Analysis
- III. Facility Requirements
- IV. Next steps and action items

See the meeting presentation and technical working paper #2 for additional details.

## **I. Introductions and housekeeping items**

Airport Planning Manager Gary Molyneaux and Airport Director Randall Berg welcomed members of the Airport Working Group (AWG), thanked them for their continued commitment the master plan update process. Ryan Orth, meeting facilitator, invited AWG members, airport partners and other interested members of the public in attendance to introduce themselves.

### *Summary of Working Group Meeting #1*

AWG members were invited to provide comments to the Meeting #1 summary document. Hearing none, Ryan noted that the summary will be finalized and published to the airport website.

### *Comment summary for Working Paper #1*

Cody Fussell (Mead & Hunt) noted that all comments received from the working group regarding Working Paper #1 on inventory and forecasts are being tracked for incorporation in the final master Plan document. Several comments were received on the first working paper that will be tracked for subsequent discussion during appropriate points in the Master Plan Update process. The comment tracker will be updated following Meeting #2, and AWG members asked to share comments or observations about the comment summary.

### *AWG meeting schedule*

Ryan reminded AWG members that calendar invitations were distributed with the group's future meeting dates. The future meeting dates (also listed on the airport website) are as follows:

- Tuesday, Jan 31, 2017 (also date of second open house)
- Tuesday, May 23, 2017
- Tuesday, Sept 26, 2017
- Tuesday, Dec 12, 2017

All meetings will be held 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. unless otherwise noted. Ryan also invited members to stay for the open house directly after the September AWG meeting.

### *Airport planning staff*

Gary introduced Alexander Lew, the airport's new planner, to the to the working group.

## **II. Capacity Analysis**

Cody Fussell (Mead & Hunt) presented key findings from the second technical working paper on the airport's capacity analysis. These findings are categorized by airside and landside considerations.

### *Airside capacity*

- The unit of measure is the annual service volume, or the volume of operations that can be accommodated at the airport on an annual basis. It is influenced by factors such as meteorological conditions, instrument approach capability and airspace considerations.
- No anticipated airside capacity constraints are anticipated through 2035; annual operations in 2035 are forecasted to be approximately 171,000 (the current annual operations total is approximately 166,000), while the annual service volume is forecasted at over 250,000 operations in that year.

#### *Landside capacity*

- This measure evaluates to vehicular access to the airport. The airport's roadway system was found to be adequate for existing and future levels of service, however the local highway system is severely congested and presents a challenge to mobility of goods and services affiliated with the airport.

### **III. Facility Requirements**

Cody presented key findings on the second topic of Working Paper #2 – the airport's facility requirements. These findings are also categorized by whether they are related to airside or landside requirements.

#### *Airside Facility Requirements*

- Airfield dimensional criteria
  - Runway length for the airport's two runways (13R and 31L) is adequate
  - Existing modifications of standard (MOS) and an FAA waiver exist for several features many of which were grandfathered in, including:
    - Non-standard distance between the two runways
    - Hot spot areas (i.e., areas of confusion for pilots), including on the smaller runway
    - Taxiway dimensions and non-standard angles
      - This is of particular interest to the FAA and a focus area of the Master Plan Update. It may be recommended as a project that comes out of the plan update.
    - Existing structures such as the steam plant in the Runway 13R approach runway protection zone (RPZ – or enhanced area of safety at the ends of a runway)
  - The FAA is about to release new guidance about RPZs. If there is a change in the size or positioning of the RPZ as a result of development recommendations at either the north or south end of the runways, the airport may be subject to the latest set of RPZ criteria.
    - For example, the Sabey property to the south – a parcel identified for potential acquisition – is located in the southern RPZ and any changes in that area of the airport could invoke the new guidance.
- In summary, hot spots will be mitigated as much as possible, instrument approach procedures for both approaches and departures will be reevaluated, NextGen airspace improvements will be considered and pavement repair will be included in maintenance planning. These findings are drivers for the airside components of the Alternatives Analysis.

#### *Airside Facility Requirements – comments and questions*

- What would cause the airport to change the size of the RPZ and invoke the FAA reevaluation?

- It would likely have to do with changes to instrument approaches (e.g., lower minimums could result in larger RPZ sizes), and could be related to the potential removal of obstructions.
- What would be the impact of FAA reevaluating the modifications and waiver?
  - This is part of the analysis. The Master Plan Update needs to re-confirm that those modifications are still safe as built.
- When you consider annual airside capacity, do you look at peak hour capacity as well? For example, UPS has flights that land almost simultaneously.
  - Yes, we look at hourly capacity as well. The peak hourly capacity is driven by the busiest hour of the average day/peak month.
- Are you looking at infrastructure or equipment modifications?
  - We are looking at an option to install new lighting system to enhance visibility for pilots on the approach
- Can this group make a recommendation to discourage development of a sports arena in the south end of the airport?
  - The Sabey property on the south end can be used in many different scenarios. It is fairly important to the future alternatives for the airport.
- Can this group make a recommendation to add light rail and bus service to serve the airport and its users?
  - As for public transportation, the ST3 proposal currently has a link light rail station at the South Boeing Access Road, near the junction of I-5 and SR 900, with a commuter rail below it. A connector bus could also link the airport and Georgetown to the rail station.
- The Sabey property is not sufficiently addressed in writing in Working Paper #2.
  - There is still a lot unknown about this property, and many options for how it could be used. This is in part what the alternatives analysis and Working Paper #3 will consider.
- Can you remind us what “NextGen” refers to?
  - NextGen will reduce airspace congestion by making operations independent of each other. It could help improve capacity and/or reduce delays.

### *Landside Facility Requirements*

In addition to airside facilities, landside facility requirements were also evaluated. These include features such as passenger terminal area, air cargo facilities, aviation industrial facilities, airport vehicular access, support facilities and future development areas. Mapping these facilities provides an understanding of the footprint for each user group. Findings highlighted that the following:

- Passenger terminal area
  - The passenger terminal area is adequate to meet current and future demands
- Cargo
  - There is less acreage for cargo, with a portion of the previous DHL facilities being reconfigured for corporate general aviation. There is currently no area to expand cargo operations given parking and space constraints. Finding another future cargo area could be part of the alternatives analysis.

- Aviation-industrial
  - This use is largely represented by Boeing in the northwest corner of the airport. The Sabey property, if acquired, could be developed for aviation-industrial or cargo use.
- General aviation
  - The area dedicated to general aviation has limited opportunity for expansion. There are three to four acres west of the main runway identified for acquisition in the airport's Capital Improvements Program that could be dedicated to general aviation.
- Aviation-related/non-aviation
  - The current lease for the Washington Army National Guard's facilities at the north end of the airport expires in 2023; that area will be evaluated for opportunities to better serve a different user group.
  - The former Rosso site (tree farm) also at the north end is currently undeveloped and will be evaluated for opportunities as well, though it has some challenges for future development related to height limitations and the proximity to the RPZ.
  - The Museum of Flight is another user in this group who leases property from the airport.
- Airport support facilities
  - These facilities include the air traffic control tower (ATCT), fuel storage, aircraft rescue and firefighting (ARFF) and airport maintenance buildings.
  - New ARFF facilities will be opened in January 2017.
  - The fuel storage facilities are currently located in the RPZ and may need to be relocated in the future as the current site won't allow for expansion.
- In summary, the landside considerations that will drive the alternatives analysis include:
  - Future expansion/redevelopment options for general aviation and cargo, and the Boeing 737 flight test facility
  - Potential redevelopment options at the National Guard facilities and the former Rosso property
  - Fuel storage relocation
  - New site for future snow removal equipment (SRE) building
  - Maintenance of existing landside facilities

*Landside Facility Requirements – comments and questions*

- In our [private general aviation business], we experience congestion in the terminal area's aircraft parking from customs and international operations.
- There is additional color coding on the maps should show Boeing's aviation-industrial facilities off the airport.
- Is the abandonment of Norfolk Street an option (between KCIA and the Sabey property)?
  - King County needs to discuss this with the City of Seattle and City of Tukwila. It's an expensive process, but would open up an additional 62 acres and could allow for the expansion of Taxiway Bravo. This option will be evaluated in the alternatives analysis, and the cost will be determined in the feasibility study as part of the final plan.
- Cargo is a huge part of this airport, and we need a more comprehensive link between the airport and major arterial/freeway connections.
- Transit opportunities that connect Georgetown would be positive for that community. It would also benefit airport and Boeing employees if it connected to Airport Way and E Marginal Way.

- When siting new facilities, particularly on the east side of the airport (near Ellis Avenue South and South Albro Place), please consider the proximity to residential neighborhoods. The Boeing testing area is near residential properties, and is the source of most complaints from the Georgetown community.
- The process should consider whether there is a possibility of trading Boeing’s undeveloped acres with airport access across E Marginal Way for another area of equal acreage.
- If we’re looking to build a bigger fuel facility at the airport, it will trigger an examination of the existing layout of the airport. Consider bringing it in by barge via the Duwamish River as opposed to by truck.

**IV. Next steps and action items**

- The next AWG meeting will be scheduled in January 2017 to discuss the alternatives analysis and Working Paper #3. The feedback submitted by the AWG and members of the public will be incorporated into the development of the alternatives.
- The January AWG meeting will coincide with the second open house, to be held directly after the working group meeting.

The following action items were identified (organized by responsible owners):

<b>Task</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Review and send comments on Working Paper #2 (Capacity Analysis and Facility Requirements) to Gary Molyneaux at <a href="mailto:gary.molyneaux@kingcounty.gov">gary.molyneaux@kingcounty.gov</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Note:</b> Include “Working Paper #2” in the subject line.</li> </ul>	AWG members	October 21
Review and send comments on the Meeting #2 summary to Ryan Orth at <a href="mailto:rorth@enviroissues.com">rorth@enviroissues.com</a>	AWG members	October 31
Continue connecting with neighborhood groups to engage them in the process.	Airport staff and EnviroIssues	Fall 2016
Send all comments, questions, and inquiries to Gary Molyneaux.	AWG members and Airport Partners	Ongoing