
Meeting attendees

AWG Members in attendance

- Brad Jurkovich, Tomorrow@SeaTac, Seattle Chamber of Commerce
- Doug Wilson, FBO Partners
- Ed Parks, Community Representative, Beacon Hill/Rainier Valley
- Holly Krejci, Georgetown Community Council
- Joel Funfar, SPEEA
- Maria Batayola, Community Representative, Beacon Hills
- Peter Anderson, Galvin Flight Training, LLC
- Rick Lentz, General Aviation representative
- Tom Ysasi, Community Representative, Magnolia

Others in attendance

- Carter Timmerman, WSDOT
- Chuck Kegley, Gateway
- Eric Schneider, Gateway

- Garrett Holbrook, King County Council
- Harold Taniguchi, King County DOT
- Kenny Pittman, City of Seattle
- Laurie Geissinger, Seattle City Light
- Nora Gierloff, City of Tukwila
- Tim Croll, Seattle City Light
- Trent Brownlee, Signature
- Wayne Werner, PNBA

Airport staff consultant team

- Randy Berg, KCIA/BFI
- Gary Molyneaux, KCIA/BFI
- Alexander Lew, KCIA/BFI
- Michele Mwangemi, KCIA/BFI
- Mike Colmant, KCIA/BFI

Consultant team

- Cody Fussell, Mead & Hunt
- Mark McFarland, 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 (AWG) Meeting #3 on January 31, 2017. The objective of the meeting was to discuss and collect the AWG's feedback on an initial set of potential airside and landside development options that are being evaluated at the Airport.

The summary is organized into the following sections:

- I. Introductions and housekeeping items
- II. Priority topics for discussion
- III. Discussion of the initial set of options – Landside
- IV. Discussion of the initial set of options – Airside
- V. Next steps and action items

See the meeting presentation and technical planning memoranda for additional details.

I. Introductions and housekeeping items

Airport Planning Manager Gary Molyneaux welcomed members of the Airport Working Group (AWG), thanked them for their continued commitment to 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. Ryan and Gary noted several new AWG members:

- Doug Wilson (representing FBO partners)
- Peter Anderson (Galvin Flying flight school)
- Rick Lentz (representing GA)

Summary of Working Group Meeting #2

AWG members were invited to provide comments to the Meeting #2 summary document. Hearing none, Ryan noted that the summary will be finalized and published to the airport website.

Comment summary

Cody Fussell (Mead & Hunt) noted that all comments received from the working group regarding Working Paper #1 and #2 are being tracked in the comment summary. The planning team will continue to utilize the comment summary to track and respond to issues throughout the ongoing development of the master plan documentation.

Project schedule update

The airport planning team is evaluating the need to schedule an additional AWG meeting to focus on the alternative analysis, likely *before* the next scheduled meeting on Tuesday, May 23, 2017. The team will circle back to working group members, airport partners, and interested parties once a date is determined, pending approval from Airport Staff and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

King County also decided to reschedule the second community open house that focused on the Master Plan alternatives. The decision to reschedule was centered around providing time to incorporate the input received from the AWG on the potential benefits and trade-offs before seeking community review and input. The timing of the rescheduled open house will be determined as the analysis of options is available.

II. Priority topics for discussion

Before launching into discussion, Ryan asked AWG members to identify their priority topics for the discussion. Those topics identified include:

- Increasing the breadth of the airport and moving “outside the fence” (e.g., working with Boeing to expand the existing Boeing 737 delivery area to the west side of East Marginal Way)
 - Consideration of fee-simple acquisition vs. access or easement agreements
- Northwest development area and reducing noise, environmental, and quality-of-life impacts to the adjacent residential area
- Keeping general aviation support services competitive
- Maintaining the airport as a world-class facility, particularly with regards to jobs
- Consideration of biodiesel fuels

III. Discussion of the initial set of input/options – Landside

The planning for the airport’s landside development is to identify key strategic properties, both on and off the existing airport footprint and determine land uses that best align with King County’s long-term

development vision for the airport. This section includes a summary of the discussion highlights from AWG members on the current landside options. For a detailed view of the specific landside options under consideration, refer to the February 2017 Landside Planning Memo.

Passenger Terminal Area

Two options were presented on the passenger terminal area, 1) to maintain the existing building and access/parking areas or 2) to maintain the existing building and modify the airport entrance to accommodate two-way traffic. Both options include removing the South Arrivals building for redevelopment. Discussion highlights:

- The current surface parking area for cars could be converted to a more space-efficient vertical parking structure, making way for the aviation development. It would be good to see an alternative with this, including the price of a parking garage.
- A single two-way access road would be better than the current entrance/exit design; the reconfiguration would have to account for UPS road use.

Cargo

Several options were presented for the East, Southwest, and South areas of the airport. These include expansion of UPS area on the east side of the Airport, redevelopment of the Southwest T-hanger for future west side cargo facilities, and a few options to the South related to property acquisition or a through-the-fence agreement of the ProLogis property. Discussion highlights:

- General:
 - Cargo activity has been steady across the history of this airport, though UPS has been operating on a month-to-month lease for the past twenty years. The airport is the early stages of exploring a long-term lease with UPS, which, if successful, would be a great win for the airport.
- East:
 - The option that removes the current South Arrivals area would provide additional space for UPS to expand and give UPS exclusive access to a segment of Perimeter Road. However, Perimeter Road is used by bicyclists as a safer option to Airport Way. It would be good to discuss relocation opportunities for that bicycle connection between South Seattle and Tukwila.
- Southwest
 - The Woods Meadows property is being considered as a potential site for cargo. One thought, however, is that this area would be more suited for light general aviation, given its proximity to the Museum of Flight, Raisbeck Aviation High School, etc., to create a “propeller city.” The current 77 total airplanes stored in this area would be displaced with cargo expansion.
 - A land bridge across East Marginal Way from the Southwest Development Area to access Boeing’s facilities should be considered as well.
- South:
 - A potential acquisition of or “through the fence” agreement with the 62-acre Prologis property to the south of the airport could be used for cargo, and would require closure or partial closure of Norfolk St.
 - The parcel lies within both City of Tukwila and the City of Seattle, which have different permitting and development regulations.
 - This sort of expansion would accommodate the scenario with the greatest increase in cargo in the twenty-year forecast, with potential new cargo operations.

- The team should also consider the significant number of trucks and other service vehicles that this expansion would entail, and their impacts to the area roadways and to I-5, etc.

Aviation Industrial/Maintenance Areas

Two options were presented for aviation industrial facilities, including 1) modification or expansion of Boeing's aircraft parking position adjacent to Taxiway B3 and expansion of leasehold boundary to include the existing Washington Air National Guard property, and 2) acquisition of or through-the-fence access agreement with a portion of Boeing's property to allow for future taxiway access across E. Marginal Way S. Discussion highlights:

- West
 - Creating access to the Duwamish waterway would open the opportunity to bring in fuel by barge.
 - The construction of a roadway underpass/taxiway overpass could create a grade-separated transit corridor across E Marginal Way connecting to Boeing's property.
 - The planning team noted that this option could be considered, though it would be a significant cost to the airport.
 - The planning team should conduct outreach to the South Park community for any additional options that open up significant activity to the western side of E Marginal Way.
- North/East
 - Landscaping along the perimeter of the airport's maintenance yard that abuts the residential area on Ellis would be the Georgetown community's preference. It would be nice if the airport talked to Boeing about doing the same along their property. There may be code that stipulates this.

General Aviation

Several options were presented for general aviation redevelopment and/or expansion within the airport's boundaries. Redevelopment opportunities for general aviation include the former BAX Global Cargo area to the East, acquisition of the Woods Meadows property in the Southwest, and a new helicopter/drone area on vacant airport property in the West on Lot 13. Expansion opportunities include the Southeast GA area (Alpha "10") and a new area in the North. Discussion highlights:

- North
 - One of the potential areas for general aviation redevelopment is the Rosso property. If this were pursued for general aviation, the airport would improve the boundary between the airport and the community, and would intend to work with Georgetown Community Council and local artists to create a community-supported buffer area. The Rosso property is also a site that Georgetown community members are interested in for redevelopment into a dog park.
 - Additionally, the airport is looking to redevelop the triangle at the intersection of S Albro Pl and S Hardy St (West of 13th Ave S) to provide better amenities. Georgetown and Beacon Hill would like to be involved in the planning of that redevelopment.
 - In the consolidation of general aviation areas, the airport should consider the fact that buildings are more compatible with adjacent residential use than airplanes. An additional option should look at moving building facilities to the north end of the airport, rather than hangers.

- The existing fuel farm facility in this area will be relocated, and could make way for additional hangar facilities. If small corporate aircraft is developed in this area, hangars that are configured parallel to the property line could be beneficial for blocking noise.
- Southwest
 - One option includes introducing a large area for corporate general aviation aircraft.
 - Lot 13, currently reserved for general aviation use, could be converted to a community park for airplane viewing (there is large community interest in this use), and a portion of the site is currently being used for this purpose.
 - A portion of this area is also being considered for future rotocraft (helicopters) operations

Airport Support Facilities

Several options were presented for relocating and/or upgrading the airport's Fuel Farm, Snow Removal Equipment Building, Air Traffic Control Tower, and Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Facilities. Discussion highlights:

- Fuel Farm
 - In response to the option of moving the fuel farm to the northeast general aviation parking area, several AWG members noted that they do not support the displacing airplanes to make way for cars. The parking serving that aircraft area could be minimized and does not necessarily need to be replaced.
 - Fuel could be delivered by barge or rail to a new fuel storage site. However, fuel dispensing needs to occur on the east side of the airport
 - The planning team should collect input from the current fuel providers regarding future redevelopment options.
- Snow Removal Equipment (SRE)
 - The planning team is working on an option to redevelop the current airport maintenance building area, which will include the addition of a SRE building. This option will include a new access roadway to the Steam Plant and a connection between the maintenance building and the National Guard facilities.

IV. Discussion of the initial set of input/options – Airside

The planning goal for airside characteristics is to consider airfield features to efficiently accommodate the forecast aircraft fleet safely, with facilities properly sized to accommodate the projected demand. This section includes a summary of the discussion highlights from AWG members on the current airside options. For a detailed view of the specific airside options under consideration, please refer to the February 2017 Airside Planning Memo.

The airport planning team noted that there are several non-standard airside-related conditions at the airport related to runway/taxiway geometry and RPZs, hot spots, etc. Because of these non-standard conditions, airside options are influenced by FAA regulations, and that there is not as much flexibility for decision-making or feedback opportunities for this set of options. The team does not anticipate large changes. A subgroup of interested AWG members, however, were interested in learning more about these options and asked questions, including:

- What is the driver to moving taxiways in taxiway options 1 and 2? Will this impact the size of aircraft that can access the east side of the airport?
 - The FAA is interested in eliminating angled taxiways in an effort to standardize them. This redesign will not impact the accessibility of the eastern half of the airport under the

current fleet; Boeing 767s will still be able to access the air cargo development areas on the east side of the Airport.

- What is a hot spot?
 - A hot spot is an area where there is the opportunity for confusion, during taxiing, including aircraft intrusions onto the taxiway. The FAA is interested in mitigating these areas.
- A potential change in the visibility minima associated with one of the instrument approach procedures (the option increases visibility from 4,000 to 5,000 feet) could potentially impact the size of the RW 13R approach RPZ.
 - There is the potential to convert the existing Runway 13R/31L PPR pavement to regular-use pavement.
 - The FAA hasn't recognized the accuracy equivalent between ILS and RNP. If FAA recognized that the RNP procedure is as reliable as the ILS, it could increase airport capacity and potentially reduce noise complaints. The NextGen program will address this issue at a future date, but not within the timeline of this master plan.

V. Next steps and action items

- The airport planning team will consider feedback collected at the Alternatives Workshop (Meeting #3) as they continue to refine and analyze draft options. In developing the next document for AWG review, AWG members requested that the planning team call out alternatives that are not up for discussion (e.g., airfield geometry cannot be changed due to FAA requirements).
- An additional AWG meeting date may be scheduled sometime before May to discuss the refined alternatives and alternatives analysis.
- The second community open house will either coincide with the additional AWG meeting, to be held directly after the working group meeting or be rescheduled with the May 23, 2017 meeting. Stay tuned for a date announcement. The team will notify neighborhood associations once an open house date is selected. The team will also communicate the open house rescheduling at the next Airport Roundtable meeting.
- The next neighborhood briefing will be held in Tukwila for Allentown and Duwamish neighbors on Tuesday, Feb. 7 from 7-8:30 pm at the Tukwila Community Center.

Specific action items include (organized by responsible owners):

Task	Who	Deadline
Review and send comments on the Planning Memoranda (Airside and Landside) to Gary Molyneaux at gary.molyneaux@kingcounty.gov <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: Include “Alternatives Planning Memos” in the subject line. 	AWG members	Mar. 3
Distribute calendar notification about the additional AWG meeting	EnviroIssues	ASAP
Distribute and upload to website final Meeting #2 summary	EnviroIssues	Feb. 27
Review and send comments on the Meeting #3 summary (this document) to Ryan Orth at rorth@enviroissues.com	AWG members	March 7
Continue connecting with neighborhood groups to engage them in the process.	Airport staff and EnviroIssues	Ongoing
Send all comments, questions, and inquiries to Gary Molyneaux	AWG members and Airport Partners	Ongoing

Airside & Landside Alternatives Workshop/
Airport Work Group (AWG)
Meeting

January 31, 2017

MASTER PLAN UP DATE



**King County
International Airport/
Boeing Field**

Agenda

- **Review Airside & Landside Planning Goals & Issues**
- **Review/Discuss Draft Airside Alternatives Planning Memo**
- **Review/Discuss Draft Landside Alternatives Planning Memo**
- **Next Steps**
- **Adjourn**

BFI Master Update Planning Goals

- ***Airside:***

- Plan Airport to efficiently accommodate the forecast aircraft fleet safely, with facilities properly sized to accommodate the projected demand.

- ***Landside:***

- Identify key strategic properties, both on and off existing BFI footprint and determine land uses that best align with King County's long-term development vision for the Airport.

Airside Development Issues

■ **Confirm Airside Dimensional Criteria & Layout**

- Existing Modification of Standards (MOS)/Non-Standard Conditions
 - *Maintain vs. Correct*

- Runway/Taxiway Geometry
 - *Exit Taxiway Realignment*
 - *Taxiway Width Reduction*

- Existing Hot Spots (#1 & #2)
 - *Mitigate vs. Correct*

Airside Development Issues

▪ Confirm Airside Dimensional Criteria & Layout

- Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) & Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)
 - *Maintain Minimums vs. Improve Minimums*
 - *Maintain/Reposition/Revise RPZs*

- Runway 13R PPR Pavement/Declared Distances
 - *Runway Length*

- Potential Access Taxiway Development
 - *Northwest Development Area (Existing Airport Property)*
 - *South Development Area (Off Airport Property – Sabey)*
 - *West Development Area (Off Airport Property – Boeing)*

Airside Development Alternatives

- **Review Airside Alternatives Planning Memo**

Landside Development Areas

- **Passenger Terminal Development Area**
 - Maintain Existing Facilities/Preserve Expansion Capability
- **Air Cargo Development Areas**
 - Existing East Side - UPS (Maintain/Reconfigure/Expand)
 - Potential Expansion Areas (West Side & Off-Airport South – (PROLOGIS Property/former Sabey Property)
- **Aviation Industrial/Maintenance Development Areas (Boeing)**
 - B-737 Flight Test Facility & Delivery Center Side (Maintain/Expand)
 - Boeing Military Flight Center & Test Facility Side (Maintain/Expand)
 - Potential Expansion Areas (Off-Airport West Side of East Marginal Way & Off-Airport South– Sabey Property)

Landside Development Areas

- **General Aviation Development Areas**

- Commercial Aviation (Maintain)
- Corporate Aviation (Future Expansion)
- Recreational GA (Maintain/Reconfigure/Expand)

- **Support Facilities**

- New SRE Building (Site/Construct)
- New Airport Fuel Farm (Relocate/Expand)
- Airport Maintenance Building (Relocate/Upgrade)
- ATCT (Relocate vs. Upgrade - Future/Post-Planning)

Landside Development Areas

- **Aviation-Related/Non-Aviation Development**

- Potential Washington Army National Guard Facility Redevelopment

- **Airport Vehicular Access/Circulation**

- Airport Way S.

- East Marginal Way S.

- Norfolk St.

- S. Hardy St.

- Airport Perimeter Road (Public Use)

Landside Development Alternatives

- **Review Landside Alternatives Planning Memo**

Comments, Questions, & Discussion

MASTER PLAN UP DATE



**King County
International Airport/
Boeing Field**

Contacts

- **Gary Molyneaux, Manager Airport Planning & Program Development**
 - King County International Airport/Boeing Field
 - Phone Number. 206.263.2457
 - Email Address. Gary.Molyneaux@kingcounty.gov

- **Cody Fussell, Project Manager**
 - Mead & Hunt, Inc.
 - Phone Number. 918.586.7273
 - Email Address. cody.fussell@meadhunt.com