

LONG-TERM AIR TRANSPORTATION STUDY (LATS)

Washington State Aviation Planning Council

MEETING SUMMARY

June 5, 2008

Present:

Council Members: Donald Garvett, David Field, John Townsley, Penelope Loomis, Paul Roberts, Carol Moser, Neal Sealock, James McNamara, John Sibold, Juli Wilkerson

Ex-Officio Member: Jill Satran (Governor's Office)

Staff: John Shambaugh and Nisha Marvel

Consultant Team: Dave Hollander (SH&E), John Yarnish (URS), Rita Brogan (PRR), and Kimbra Wellock (PRR)

Guests: Jason Beloso, WSDOT Policy Development and Regional Coordination Office, Climate Change and Sustainability Division Lead; Paul Parker, Sr. Policy Analyst, Washington State Transportation Commission

Chair Moser opened the meeting and reviewed the meeting objective, to review draft statewide aviation policies to forward for public comment.

Public Comment

No public comment was given at the start of the meeting.

Approve May 1, 2008 Workshop Summary

The Council approved the May 1, 2008 workshop summary.

Follow Up from Previous Meeting

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that public outreach will occur this summer, with two Regional Public Meetings to be held on July 22 (Mukilteo) and July 24 (Wenatchee). There will also be a briefing to the Transportation Commission and meetings with resource agencies this summer.

Page 1 of 24

Council Member Roberts noted that Council members are welcome to attend the regional public meetings. Council members who cannot attend will have an opportunity to review public comment. Roberts noted that he is unable to attend the meetings due to a scheduling conflict.

Chair Moser asked for information on how the regional public meetings will be organized.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that PRR will be facilitating the meetings, which will be organized as open houses, and will be preparing a summary report of the comments submitted.

Council Members Field, Garvett, Sibold, Townsley and Loomis expressed interest in attending the Mukilteo meeting. Council Members Field, Moser, Townsley, Loomis and Sealock expressed interest in attending the Wenatchee meeting. Staff will send out an email in the upcoming weeks to confirm which council members will attend which meetings.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) reported that a briefing will be provided to Paula Hammond, Secretary of Transportation.

Chair Moser reported that Senator Karen Keiser has also requested a review of the draft policies. Jill Satran will contact legislative staff to arrange for briefings.

Council Business

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) reported that the August Council meeting will be held in Vancouver. The morning will be used for subcommittee work sessions to review public comment received at the July Regional Public Meetings, and the afternoon will be devoted to a session on revenue and criteria for evaluating alternatives. In September, policy subcommittees will report to the full Council on recommended actions on draft policies. The full Council will review alternatives. There will be no Council meeting in October, due to the second round of regional public meetings. November's meeting will focus on review of public comment and refining draft policies and alternatives. The draft Council report is due in February.

Land Use and Environment Subcommittee Report

Council Member Roberts reported on the work of the Land Use and Environment subcommittee, highlighting key changes made to the first draft of the land use and environment policies.

Land Use Policy 1:

Problem Statement: Washington State public use airports are being threatened by the encroachment of incompatible development. The state encourages federal, state, tribes, and local governments and airports to work together to identify effective policy solutions and regulations to protect airports as essential public facilities. These efforts should include:

- a. Leadership on developing research and strategies to address impacts on airports through the Transportation Research Board (TRB), aviation stakeholders and the FAA.*
- b. Strengthen state and local legislation to prohibit incompatible land uses and promote appropriate land uses.*
- c. Encourage regional transportation planning organizations to include strategies within their plans to support compatible land uses across jurisdictional boundaries.*

***Accountability is placed on the airport rather than deciding authority when local jurisdictions fail to discourage incompatible development.*

Council Member Roberts noted that the focus is placed on not only on prohibiting incompatible uses, but also how to promote compatible land uses. The subcommittee feels it is important to encourage good decision-making, not just telling what you cannot do. The goal is to give jurisdictions tools to deal with existing development and the ability to plan for new development.

Council Member Garvett asked how the subcommittee addressed the issue of the loss of property value.

Council Member Roberts responded that it is more difficult when dealing with changing use of an existing development. Perhaps over time, one can find an acceptable way of making that transition.

Council Member McNamara added that the Growth Management Act tries to address this issue, and added that it is an issue that we need to be aware of as we talk about restricting use of land around airports.

Chair Moser asked about the flipside, in the case of privately-owned airports, where the owner has made investments in the airport, and the local jurisdiction does something to either take the land away, or detract from ability of the airport to function.

Council Member McNamara responded that it is not clear. It depends on the circumstances of the individual situations.

Council Member Sealock added that for policy 1, zoning and the Growth Management Act address this. The issue is with permitting, when permits are given with exceptions to

zoning regulations that have protections for essential public facilities. Once a precedent has been set, people will ask for equity for their project. The real challenge is when laws are not adhered to. We need to go beyond zoning and deal with the permitting issue.

Council Member Townsley added that we need to have a mechanism in place that insulates the local decision makers from unpopular decisions.

Council Member Sibold added that we have a Growth Hearings Board, but the problem is that it takes an advocate to bring these issues forward. The government has the ability, but traditionally, it is an advocate that steps forward, making it a voluntary process, not a regulatory process. It relies upon someone wanting to appeal.

Council Member McNamara added that when jurisdictions adopt comprehensive plans, unless issues are challenged within 60 days, the comprehensive plan is adopted, and it is usually in place for seven years. Without a hearings board challenge, no one will look at inconsistencies.

Council Member Roberts responded that we noted in our work that not all jurisdictions are planning under the Growth Management Act. Part of our job is to address those inconsistencies and to try to address areas where there are holes. To Council Member Sealock's point, permitting issues would not come to a hearings board under any circumstances. We tried addressing this with policy 1, but we need to know if policy 1 gets it right. We should also hear from the public to see if they think we addressed the issue.

Council Member Sealock added that the issue comes up when the guidance is not specific enough. Often times, if something is not specifically prohibited, then it is interpreted as being allowable.

Dave Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) added that it seems there should be some sort of notification requirement.

Council Member Roberts added that he was working on some language this morning, as the notification issue has been raised during subcommittee discussions. Council Member Roberts suggested holding this question until we finish discussing the other policies, as it might be discussed later.

Land Use Policy 2: Washington State should ensure that local governments address land use requirements to protect airports as essential public facilities and to discourage the encroachment of incompatible land uses adjacent to public use airports in the following ways:

a. Adopt land use plans and zoning ordinances that will at a minimum:

- *Identify uses that are incompatible with airport operations and prohibit such uses*
 - *Identify uses that are compatible with airport operation and encourage such uses*
- b. *Direct financial resources to effectively provide assistance to local government to develop comprehensive plan policies and development regulations consistent with the Growth Management Act.*
- c. *Initiate new legislation to prohibit the development of incompatible uses such as: residential, schools, hospitals, daycare, airspace hazards, explosive hazards, large concentration of people etc. . . within the airport influence areas.*
- d. *Prohibit expenditure of public funds for incompatible uses including but not limited to: schools, hospitals, stadiums etc.*
- e. *Advance the Airport Land Use Compatibility program through outreach strategies and incentive programs that target noncompliant jurisdictions.*
- f. *Work with state agencies and the legislature to develop procedural requirements or new legislation that addresses incompatible development adjacent to airports on the following:*
- *Identify airport influence areas based on airport operations, flight characteristics, topography, the built environment and other uses that may diminish the airport's long-term ability to operate efficiently.*
 - *Promote the development of compatible land uses adjacent to public use airports such as commercial or industrial activities.*
 - *Prohibit incompatible development such as residential uses, airspace hazards, hazardous/explosive materials, large concentrations of people and special use facilities such as schools, hospitals and day care centers.*
 - *Prohibit the placement of special use facilities adjacent to airports within the airport influence area.*
 - *Require disclosure notices for incompatible development located adjacent to public use.*
 - *Identify land use tools and regulations that are most effective in prohibiting incompatible development.*

Council Member Loomis asked in response to Council Member Sealock's earlier point, if the omission leaves room for challenge.

Council Member Roberts responded that this is not statutory language. The subcommittee added the word "etcetera" to imply that there is more than what is specifically listed.

Chair Moser added that the capacity and technology subcommittee worked under the assumption that policies should be more general, and that additional detail should be added in the implementation strategies. As such, the actual policy statement should not include the detail of the second policy's sub-bullets (a-f).

Council Member Sealock asked if there is aviation representation on Regional Transportation Boards (RTPOs).

Council Member Sibold responded that there should be, but that not all do. WSDOT Aviation is trying to make progress in this area, to ensure aviation is represented on RTPOs.

Chair Moser asked if we want all the bullets to be part of policy 2 and asked if we should consider putting the bullets into the implementation strategy.

Council Member Sealock responded that Capacity and Technology subcommittee kept track of anything it deleted, so that it could be added to either the guiding principles or to an implementation strategy. Council Member Sealock added that if you say "require" it becomes implementation, not a policy, which would say "should."

Council Member Wilkerson responded that we were trying to make a statement that was more firm, which is why the words "prohibit" or "require" were used. "Shall" gives clear direction. If the public or Council disagrees, we can revisit the issue.

Council Member Garvett noted that the policies are not consistent. Some policies are very clear; others use "etc" and other words. You may wish to consider revisiting to show context.

Council Member Roberts responded that if you are dealing with issues inside the fence, your options are more prescribed. If you are dealing with outside the fence issues, there are more variables to deal with. The notion of trying to simplify, and have consistent words, makes sense. That said, if you take the essence of policy 2, what we are trying to get at is to adopt plans and ordinances that stop incompatible land uses, and encourage compatible land uses, work to identify influence areas, work with funding, require disclosure notices, identify the tools to do this (all that is in the bullets). This needs to get captured in state statute, administrative code, and local ordinances. Out belief is that the present status has not sufficiently accomplished the mission.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) proposed changing policy 2 to read, "Washington State should use a combination..."

Council Member Sealock added that permitting secondary uses is a big issue. Economic development of a community, FAA rules are all factors, and often present competing interests. While the specificity is good, how can we make the language more clear? What do we think the actual tool will be, or the authority? At present, the only thing that

happens is that the airport gets held accountable, through grant assurances, or by being denied funding. We need to be clear what we are asking the state to do, and who we are asking.

Council Member Sibold asked if this is an issue that we need to clarify.

Council Member Roberts responded that this was an issue for the subcommittee. There was lively discussion about what it means and what we should do.

Council Member Wilkerson noted that some of the bulleted items could be dealt with in a WAC update.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that CTED is updating the WAC procedural codes now. We found a lack of procedures in the administrative code to implement the compatibility elements. We can request this language be added.

Council Member Sibold added that this is an issue for WSDOT Aviation with airport closures. We always struggle to know when to hammer down on issue of closures. We usually leave it to local discretion to deal with the issue. The State does not typically withhold funds or take legal action.

Chair Moser asked if the state ever gets involved in the permitting process, be it special use, or standard, if it feels the action violates the intent of state law.

Council Member McNamara responded that it would only come up only in a land use petition, but the state does not usually get involved.

Council Member Sealock responded that the one exception is in aviation. Airports can comment on the SEPA checklist, but that is all we can do. Aviation has been active in showing up at hearings and commenting.

Chair Moser asked if there was something we can do in implementation of policy 2 to strengthen assurance.

Council Member Roberts responded that it seems the only recourse is with withholding funds. There is not a lot of case law to support it.

Council Member Wilkerson responded that the only example of withholding funds is public works funds.

Council Member Roberts added that withholding funds would be the only way it has been done. If we are serious, we need to recognize the burden this places on agencies, and the issues of the state preempting local decision.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) suggested that the Council explore an institutional framework to enable a mechanism to make these decisions at a statewide level. We might consider moving this policy out of capacity, and moving it elsewhere, such as stewardship.

Council Member Roberts added that the state preempts local decision for environmental issues. While it is not popular locally, there are existing models we can look at.

Council Member Townsley added that there are examples where we have mechanisms to deal with multi-jurisdictional coordination (clean water, clean air, etc). We might want to hear from public, as the ability to move goods and services around the state is an important issue.

Council Member Loomis added that in smaller communities, Councils, Mayors and municipal staff are very cautious about audit findings. With recently enacted performance audits, we might see if this is an avenue to pursue. Our hammer might be the audit of performance with regard to grant assurances. Communities do not want findings.

Council Member Townsley added that this policy is biased toward the Growth Management Act. This idea is good as it covers the state and pulls in non-GMA counties.

Council Member Roberts responded that we need to think about this discussion, all of which is good. Comments from agencies might be helpful as well.

Council Member Sibold added that we often find the FAA struggles to figure out how to weigh in on land use. We need to support federal legislation that supports state land use policy. There is often disagreement between state and federal government about how to deal with land use. The feds are waking up to the fact that they need to protect their assets. Somewhere in there, we could try to push the federal government to recognize the importance of having a coordinated effort.

Council Member Roberts responded that there is no reason why we can't take this to the FAA.

Land Use Policy 3: Develop statewide performance measures to assess the effectiveness of local jurisdictions comprehensive plan policies and development regulations to discourage incompatible development adjacent to public use. Require local jurisdictions' comprehensive plans and regulations be certified by regional transportation planning organizations for compliance.

Council Member Roberts noted that the previous discussion applies to policy 3.

Land Use Policy 4: The State should prohibit the penetration of airspace around airports and runway approach paths from structural, visual, or wildlife hazards that may affect or

impact airport operations or endanger the health safety and welfare of aviation users or the public by taking the following measures:

- a. Work with local, state and federal agencies and interests to develop strategies intended to prohibit the penetration of critical airspace from obstructions, and appropriately manage wildlife and wildlife habitat.*
- b. Strengthen current state regulatory requirements to protect critical airspace as needed to address current state and federal airspace regulations and policies.*
- c. Empower airport operators to identify and protect critical airspace from intrusion and penetration (per FAR Part 177) resulting from local land use actions.*
- d. Clearly assign liability for permitting any intrusion or penetration to the permitting entity.*

Land Use Policy 5: Regional Transportation Planning Organizations must approve development around airports to ensure consistency with the land use and air transportation components of the comprehensive plans.

Council Member Roberts stated that Policy 4 deals with intrusions into air space. The subcommittee tried different language and tried to include issues of wildlife management. The bullets deal with local, state and federal agency interests to stop air space intrusions. Private property owners or organizations may also have a role to play – the issue is broader than government.

Council Member Field suggested removing the reference to Part 177.

Council Member Roberts added that bullet “c” was intended to clearly assign liability for permitting the intrusion. We need to be clear about the assignment of liability for intrusions.

Council Member Garvett added that it is clear that it is bad to put a tall building in front of a runway. But it is also a problem if there is something in the way that causes an airplane to lose payload or go out of its way. It might not block it in an obvious way, but it is also an intrusion if it reduces efficiency of an operation. FARs require a minimum level of safety, but many operators like to operate above the minimum standard. We need to decide if we make policy that addresses only the minimum, or above the minimum.

Council Member Field responded that one avenue is to give WSDOT some authority to approve an airport’s plan. That plan should have accounted for the needs of the users of the airport. It depends on the plan more than the specific regulation.

Council Member Townsley asked if an airport plan has to address the zoning of the surrounding land. The development would be outside the fence – it expands the facility plan, to include the surrounding zoning.

Council Member Sealock noted that you start to get into property rights issues. There is case law that apply to affecting things outside of the airport's influence.

Council Member McNamara added that you start to get into the issue of protecting the airport's economic interest above other interests.

Council Member Roberts noted that we are talking about general policies to take out to the public. There isn't one policy that we can capture at this level. We have a wide variety of communities in the State. If it isn't in the underlying planning, it's very difficult. If we haven't figured it out in the underlying land use piece, we need to try to get these issues in the planning piece.

Council Member Garvett added that it would probably be seen by public as good to have airlines unencumbered. We may not have a cure, but it is the intent of the policies that land use policy should not reduce the safety or economic capacity of airport/craft operators.

Council Member Roberts added that it is an important issue, but we need to get this into the land use.

Council Member Townsley stated that while we like the Growth Management Act, it is arcane. Most citizens don't understand the intricacies and even those with some clue, do not have the energy or resources to comb comprehensive plans and documents within a 60-day review window. Is part of the fix something more structural, that we assign a review role to the RTPO or WSDOT Aviation?

Dave Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) added that there could be a requirement for the State to review and to approve to look at issues relevant to protecting airports.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) stated that Policy #3 discusses certification by the RTPOs. We should decide if this better done at the state or region level.

Council Member Roberts asked that in the interest of time, we should talk to CTED and WSDOT to find out what roles would be appropriate for them.

Chair Moser noted that Policy 3 seems a bit vague. It does not state that we want RTPO review of airport plans and expansion plans.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that RTPOs are required to certify the transportation element of the comp plan. There is no authority for them to review land use to look at if the land use element is in the way of transportation operation.

Council Member Sibold stated that tall sticks are one of the leading issues in our airspace. This is not just an airport operation issue. It could be an economic issue as airlines may

not fly into areas that allow tall sticks. It is an emerging issue nationally. It could become more of an issue than incompatible land use.

Council Member Roberts responded that it needs to be captured in initial planning. We need to get this into the local regulatory framework. We should have a work session to redraft these policies, informed by FAA and agency discussions. Then we circulate by email, before going to the public.

Council Member Garvett added in response to Council Member Sibold's comment that it is a fair statement. He can think of times when he has decided not to serve a community because of this issue.

Environment Policies:

Policy 1: Coordinate with federal, state, tribal and local agencies to develop solutions to address environmental impacts proportional to air transportation impacts and contributions such as:

Policy 2: Washington State should require airports to appropriately mitigate adverse environmental impacts to rare species and habitats occurring on airport facilities while reducing hazardous wildlife attractants that create hazards to airport operations.

Policy 3: Airport facility and operations plans should incorporate environmental policies and management practices, and explore new opportunities to apply sustainable practices, including:

- *Energy conservation and use of alternative energy sources*
- *Recycled materials *(Waste reduction) and recycling*
- *Alternative construction methods. *(Green building or energy efficient construction methods.)*
- *Require airports to develop aircraft noise abatement ("good neighbor" policies at public use airports using best management practices*

Policy 4: Washington's airports will follow sound environmental protection practices, including pollution prevention, energy conservation, impact avoidance and mitigation, compliance with all pertinent environmental laws. These undertakings extend to the construction, maintenance and operation of its systems and facilities by demonstrating the effectiveness of its environmental investments, permit compliance record. Furthermore, it should consistently review these indicators as to improve the environmental performance. Legal obligations in these matters are established by applicable laws and regulations; this Policy Statement is not intended to create further or additional legally-enforceable requirements.

Policy 5: Incorporate state and federal greenhouse gas emissions reduction policies and strategies within the air transportation system to minimize the adverse health and

environmental impacts on air quality and the climate while promoting jobs and economic development in a sustainable manner.

Policy 6: Promote research on greenhouse gas emissions reduction strategies, alternative fuels, and air traffic management procedures on aviation through the Transportation Research Board (TRB).

Policy 7: Develop statewide and regional strategies to coordinate, develop and provide a range of transportation mode choices to public use airports through airport and highway design projects.

Council Member Roberts noted Policy 5 is an attempt to look at sustainability inside the fence, but we also need to look at how people get to the airport, such as reducing vehicle miles traveled, etc. There is a role for RTPOs here.

Council Member Field asked for clarification about the meaning of “proportional” in policy 1.

Council Member Sibold added that from the state’s perspective, we should be tasked to look at the environmental impacts of all transportation modes. Not just aviation.

Council Member Loomis stated that it is desirable to address the noise issue, but we want to be careful to require a change from existing standards. Whenever possible, an airport should be able to adhere to default standard procedures.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) asked if good neighbor policies are voluntary.

Council Member Sibold added that we need to be careful here, as these are federal issues.

Chair Moser added that without a structure in place to protect the neighbor, the community feels there is unlimited protection for airports.

Council Member Loomis noted that we need to be careful not to introduce procedures that create safety issues.

Council Member Townsley pointed out that some airfields may not need noise abatement.

Council Member Roberts added that LATS I and II did not discuss the issue of greenhouse gas emissions. It is a moving target, and it is difficult to measure the impacts. It is a tough policy to craft. The intent is to reflect that the issue needs to be addressed, and that the issue is evolving.

Council Member Garvett asked why the subcommittee called out the Transportation Research Board in Policy 6. While they are credible, there are other credible organizations.

Council Member Roberts asked if Policies 5 and 6 capture the work on CAT 2.

Council Member Wilkerson responded that CAT 2 is focused on Vehicle Miles Traveled.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) stated that a subgroup will work on redrafting policies based on today's discussion. We will circulate the draft and get concurrence from the Council on the revised policy before moving to public comment. We will set up a go-to meeting to discuss the revised draft as a Council.

Council Member Sealock moved that the land use and Environment subcommittee refine the policies as discussed by full council today, and to forward these revised policies to the public for review this summer. Roberts seconded the motion. The Council voted unanimously in support of the motion.

Council Member Roberts requested that the meeting summary reflect the discussion we are focused on, the coordination of land use with federal, state local, to coordinate with CTED and WSDOT, and the tall stick issue (the airport operations piece). We are not talking about wholesale rewrite, but specific revisions to address these issues. Staff will set up a Go-To meeting to facilitate the subcommittee work session on this topic.

Capacity and Technology Subcommittee Report

Council Member Sealock reported on the work of the Capacity and Technology subcommittee. The subcommittee met twice and held a Go-To meeting to develop the policies being presented today. The subcommittee used track changes to show where text was deleted from policy statements and to show text that is proposed to be included in implementation or guiding principle instead of in policy statements.

Council Member Sealock continued that there have not been any real initiatives to increase capacity in some time. Only two major airports built in the US since the 1950s, and in that time, we have lost a large number of airports in the state and nation.

Capacity Policy 1: The State of Washington must take a lead role in addressing its long-term aviation capacity needs from a system-wide perspective.

Council Member Sealock stated that we started our work with a discussion about what role state should take in aviation. The state must take a lead role – this is inclusive language, not limiting language.

Council Member Loomis added we do not know what exactly the role of the state is, whether it is an advocacy, subsidy, or regulatory role. We wanted to keep it general to give the state the flexibility to address issues as they arise.

Chair Moser asked if the subcommittee developed an implementation strategy for this.

Council Member Loomis responded no, not at this time.

Council Member Townsley responded that he likes that it is broadly written as it provides flexibility to address other areas, such as land use, work force development, etc.

Chair Moser added that this is an issue for Vista Field. People ask us what the state might do. We might want to be more specific about what we are proposing for the public.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that we are considering an amendment of the guiding principles to address the realm of potential issues.

Chair Moser added that the Washington Transportation Plan is clear that the state will preserve ROW, and that she sees that this is part of that umbrella plan to protect existing capacity.

Council Member Garvett asked if the omnibus plan might serve the overall interest of the residents, but in at the micro level, it might impair some.

Paul Parker, Washington State Transportation Commission added that you always have to address this issue in dealing with policy, particularly as it relates to funding decisions.

Council Member Sealock added that it is difficult to provide implementation guidance when we do have information about funding. We might get to address this more, as we move through the other policies. Capacity Policy 1 answers the question -is there a role for the state to play? Our answer was yes. Council Member Sealock asked the Council if this is an appropriate start point.

Chair Moser asked in response to Council Member Garvett's point, do we mean if we would promote one mode over another if is in the best interest of all.

Council Member Garvett responded that it is one way to look at it. Or you could fund one road over another, allowing one to deteriorate.

Council Member Sealock proposed moving onto other policies, and to return to the discussion if the issues being raised are still relevant in context of the other policies.

Council Member Sibold pointed out that these are recommendations to the government. This is an important one. Many people would say no, the state does not have role. But we think it does.

Capacity Policy 2: The statewide airport classification system developed as part of the Long-term Air Transportation Study should be implemented to help guide decisions on future air transportation needs and investments. The airport classification system divides the system of airports into categories based on the activity level and service role of the airport.

Council Member Sealock noted that Capacity policy 2 may be more of a stewardship guideline, but we agreed that a classification system is essential as a tool that should be implemented as it is a good basis for decision-making. The action is to implement the classification system. We are not being judgmental about the categories. We feel that airports can move between categories as they make investments.

Council Member Roberts asked how the LATS airport classification system relates to any kind of FAA classification system.

Council Member Sealock responded that the FAA has different criteria particularly as you look at different types of airports. The state's system is good to help make decisions about its system.

Council Member Field added that the FAA system is different, and will continue to use its own system. The state system distinguishes between some airports that the FAA system does not.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) added that the FAA has a general category for general aviation, which includes almost all of the airports except for commercial airports and reliever airports. The state's classification attempts to add more detail to show the diversity.

Council Member Field noted that the FAA system does not show remote airports, which are important to Washington State.

Council Member Sibold noted that we have been looking at community airports as being different from regional airports. We want to drill down further than the FAA.

Council Member Garvett added that the state system provides more information. It is not perfect, for example some seaplane bases are commercial. But the categories serve an important purpose.

Council Member Roberts added that it helps us to understand where capacity should go in the future. We need to look at the funding mechanisms.

Capacity Policy 3: Washington State should place a funding and planning priority on maximizing the efficiency and capacity of its existing system before considering the creation of new airports.

Capacity Policy 4: If Washington State's existing system cannot provide sufficient aviation capacity to meet existing and future demand, it should establish an institutional framework for making appropriate decisions for expansion or siting of aviation facilities.

Council Member Seacock stated that the objective of Policy 3 is to implement it as a tool.

Council Member Townsley cautioned that we need to carefully consider what we are saying. It is also about utility, such as providing additional capacity for disaster relief. I think we are okay, but we need to ensure this type of issue is included.

Council Member Seacock responded that we intend this policy to be inclusive. Our challenge in offering this kind of verbiage is that building an airport does not ensure you attract service (for example, St. Louis). You need to look at the ability to attract the service if you add capacity. The principle behind policy 3 is to look at this issue before committing billions of dollars. Also, one should look at how one can apply technology, procedures to add capacity, before building.

Council Member Sibold responded that we are not distinguishing between constrained or unconstrained in our statement, but clearly you have to look at this when you're making decisions.

Chair Moser added that when dealing with highway capacity issues, we look at level of service. If level of service deteriorates, you lose economy because of congestion. Chair Moser asked if airport planning looks at level of service.

Council Member Seacock noted that airport mission statements include the idea of level of service, but there isn't a specific example of a level of service measure.

Council Member Sibold noted that this is one of the most powerful policies that we have to deal with, what the state does when there is a capacity issue at an airport. There are many people that think we should be creating more capacity. This policy says we may or may not need to add capacity depending on circumstances. It says that we need to look at getting more out of what we have before building. We realize constrained capacity might be an issue that we need to address. It may be a good thing for communities wanting to expand airports, but not good for communities not wanting to expand airports.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) asked what we do in a case like Moses Lake, where we have capacity, but not demand. Does this policy say we are looking to expand capacity where the population and demand is?

Council Member Seacock responded that this is a good point, but it is more about commercial. Policy 3 recognizes that there are other issues to consider, such as general aviation. This leaves open possibility of realignment, transfer to other modes. The other issue is the international and national system. We need to be inclusive of all things. We chose this language on purpose, to be inclusive

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) asked if we need to be explicit that we're considering the need for additional capacity in specific areas. We don't say this in the policy. Do we need to say that we address capacity where the demand is.

Council Member Sealock responded that it is unreasonable to add capacity at an airport like SeaTac or elsewhere, without considering connections. China is planning to build 93 airports, with a goal that everyone will live within 100 kilometers of an airport. But it isn't all inclusive; it just deals with commercial service.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) asked if it makes sense to add the issue of adding capacity where demand is to a different policy, noting that it does not seem to fit in Policy 3. It might make sense as a sub-bullet to Policy 1 or in Policy 4.

Council Member Townsley added that the state must take a lead role while considering local and regional demand.

Council Member Sealock pointed out that the state cannot control the market and decisions of airports. We cannot ask for the state to take on a role it cannot fulfill.

Council Member Garvett noted that efficiency is a key point. You can build a lot of capacity, but if it isn't efficient, it does not mean anything.

Council Member Townsley asked if it is possible to create some metric to measure efficiency.

Council Member Sibold noted that the reason Policy 3 is a key policy is that it is telling the state that existing capacity should be used more efficiently before it takes on building a new airport. It tells the state to work with airports and build on what exists, before asking for federal funds for a new airport. It is an important direction to the state about what it should be doing. There are people that think that we will make recommendations about siting new airports. This policy says to me that before we a recommendation to build a new airport, we will look at better utilizing exiting airports.

Council Member Sealock added that over 30 percent of people flying from Spokane have to go through Seattle. Many people would prefer not to go through Seattle, but we do not have a choice, because that is how the industry chooses to route its planes.

Council Member Roberts summarized his take of the capacity policies. Policy 1 says that the state has a lead role, and encourages that the state do more than it is currently doing. Policy 2 says use the classification system to help drive decisions, and Policy 3 says that that funding and planning piece has to look at full use of existing capacity before building a new airport. Policy 4 says that if a new airport is needed, we need an institutional framework to make the decision after you've exhausted all other options. It works.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) suggested replacing capacity with utility in Policy 3, as it helps say that you do not mean expansion.

Paul Parker, Washington State Transportation Commission asked if Portland International Airport and Lewiston are included in the framework.

Council Member Sealock responded that this is getting into a bricks and mortar discussion. There are other issues to consider, such as airspace. Therefore, we're trying to be inclusive, to show we're talking about more than the on the ground issues.

Getting back to Policy 1, the argument is that the state must have a lead role. It is the only intention for this policy. The rest get more into the detail. We realize that the state's budget is very small. We are trying to look at all possibilities. The big pot of money is federal money. But the AIP is not safe. In 25 days, we are out of authorization, and we do not have federal money for the fourth quarter. The crux of the matter is that the federal dollars go to the largest demand. It is a triage affair. We need to decide if we want to make the statement to say that we want to redistribute the pot.

Council Member Sibold added that there are some that think it is unfair. Florida has decided to fund commercial aviation itself. Alaska is at the other end where it takes all federal earmarks.

Council Member Sealock asked if we should propose that the state advocate for redistribution of federal dollars. The group responded no, so given that, Policy 3 is only addressing the state resources.

Council Member Loomis added that the state funding mechanism was developed at a time when the system was smaller. The funding mechanism hasn't kept pace with system growth.

Council Member Townsley noted that it sounds like we are saying that the state should start a lobbying campaign, which seems to be outside of our legislative mandate.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that part of the process is to develop capital plan. We will be at the table. While we are at the table now, there isn't a good process in place.

Council Member Sibold added that it would help if Washington was a block grant state like Texas. It provides more control over the money. The state fights for apportionment directly with the FAA. It requires more state resources.

Council Member Townsley noted that Policy 3 implies allocation of funding we have. We do not have a policy that implies we want to increase the portion of the funds that go to aviation.

Council Member Townsley moved that the Capacity and Technology subcommittee refine the policies as discussed by full council today, and to forward these revised policies to the public for review this summer. Roberts seconded the motion. The Council voted unanimously in support of the motion.

Technology Policy 1: Washington State should place a priority on applying aviation technologies that improve the accessibility, efficiency, safety and security of the state's aviation system while reducing environmental impacts.

Council Member Townsley noted that the word “while” suggests that we only want technology if it both improves accessibility, efficiency, safety, security and reduces environmental impact.

Policy 1 was revised to address this comment.

Jill Satran, Ex-Officio Member asked for clarification of “priority” and what is being given priority.

Council Member Townsley replied that the state does not apply technology itself; it is the airport owners and operators that apply technology. The policy is about encouraging and facilitating the application of technology.

Council Member Sealock responded that there is an exception in the case of state owned airfields.

Council Member Sibold added that the state does get involved sometimes in the application of technology, such as with installation of camera systems. However, there are things that other states have done that Washington State could do.

Council Member Townsley moved that the Capacity and Technology subcommittee refine the policies as discussed by the full Council today, and to forward the revised Technology policy to the public for review this summer. Roberts seconded the motion. The Council voted unanimously in support of the motion.

Public Comment

Marggy Leggett asked the Council to look at doing something to grandfather existing airports. Ms. Leggett is fearful that the City Council will accelerate its process to close down her airport, and is looking to the Council for help to protect against this.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) asked if it was appropriate for the Council to write a letter.

Chair Moser responded that there is a need to alert the Transportation Commission that some local governments might see these policies as a threat. It is important to open the lines of communication with the local governments to help address these issues.

Council Member Roberts noted that it raises a question about what the Council's role is in terms of stepping in to deal with a specific issue. While I appreciate this issue is not unrelated, it seems like it is more of a challenge for WSDOT to face. If this is important, the state needs to step up, to talk to the Transportation Commission and Legislature to express these concerns.

Chair Moser asked for WSDOT to help interpret the essential public facility issue, to see if we need to come back with another policy.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that staff would review this issue.

Council Member Townsley stated that he feels this issue is outside the purview of the Council.

Policy Development – Full Council Work Session

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reviewed the guiding principles with the Council and requested the Council's approval to move the guiding principles forward for public review this summer.

Ms. Brogan also reviewed changes to the guiding principles proposed by the Capacity and Technology subcommittee.

The Council agreed to change Guiding Principle 1 to read:

Washington's communities depend on their ability to access Washington State's aviation system to move people and goods safely and securely throughout the State, nation and the world. Washington's aviation system is an essential and integral component of local, state and national economies and must be sustained.

The Council agreed to change Guiding Principle 2 to read:

Washington State's aviation system should be considered in terms of commercial aviation, general aviation and aviation support facilities (landside and airside) as well as airspace. Furthermore, decisions about Washington's aviation system should be considered in the context of national and international aviation.

The Council agreed to change Guiding Principle 3 to read:

It will take strong partnerships to effectively address the challenges facing Washington's aviation system between airports, the aviation industry, business community, local, regional and tribal government, educational institutions, Washington State, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

The Council requested replacing "Long Term Air Transportation Plan" with "state" and adding "funding" and "work force" after land use so that Guiding Principle 4 reads:

To safeguard Washington State's aviation system for future generations, the state must address multiple challenges in a timely manner including: capacity exacerbated by growing demand, delayed maintenance, incompatible land use, funding, work force, and the special needs of small communities.

The Council requested inserting "efficient and complimentary" after effective and deleting "cost-effective" so that Guiding Principle 7 reads:

Washington's aviation system should be planned to coordinate with other transportation modes to assure effective, efficient, and complementary transportation options for people and goods.

No changes were made to Guiding Principles 5, 6, 8, and 9.

Council Member Sealock moved to forward the draft guiding principles for public review, as amended. Council Member seconded the motion. The Council voted unanimously in support of the motion.

The Council discussed revisions to Economic, Mobility, Stewardship, and Safety policies.

Economic Policy 1: Factor state and/or regional economic benefits (such as economic development, job creation, and competitive advantage) into any cost-benefit analysis of aviation investments.

Council Member Sealock stated that the concept is okay, but we are not investing resources at the state level.

Council Member Sibold added that the state does invest in economic studies, which costs money.

Council Member Garvett added that some airlines are domiciled in Washington State and asked if we should favor those airlines given that they provide more economic benefit and jobs.

Council Member Townsley asked if a tax policy that favors any resident company, in any industry would work.

Council Member Garvett replied that it could, but it may not be broad enough.

Chair Moser stated that this is a legislative priority.

Council Member Loomis added that this is a very complex topic with significant ramifications and encouraged that the Council consider forming a subcommittee to address this issues.

Council Member Garvett asked if it is a general state policy to give preference to Washington businesses.

Council Member Sibold stated that since economic development is a complicated, critical issue for airports, the Council should we take more time to address it.

Council Member Roberts added that we do not have the expertise to address this issue, but it is a fair question.

Economic Policy 2: Coordinate with state and local economic development agencies to improve access to aviation facilities that will enhance economic growth across all sectors of the economy.

Council members expressed confusion over what is meant by “improve access to.”

Council Member Sibold responded that it that air service is an economic engine, not just a mode of transportation.

Chair Moser asked for clarification on the meaning of “access.”

Council Member Townsley responded that access means physically being able to get to the airport.

Council Member Loomis noted that assistance from the state would be important.

Council Member Sealock noted that there are only two economic policies, and asked if this accurately reflects the importance of the topics. Sealock proposed asking Council Member Wilkerson’s staff to look at other potential policies.

Council Member Townsley proposed additional policies:

Washington State should strongly encourage and support educational infrastructure to train and educate the skilled workforce necessary to support a technically advanced aviation system that will serve all citizens of the State.

Washington State should encourage public-private partnerships and create incentives to encourage private investment in airport infrastructure and aviation equipment to support sustainable job and business growth of aviation enterprises.

Work with local, regional and state agencies to boost economic development and attract businesses through the development of airport infrastructure and compatible land use initiatives.

The Council agreed to move Council Member Townsley's proposed economic policies forward to the public, with additional wordsmithing as needed.

Due to time constraints, the Council decided not to review the mobility, stewardship, and safety policies. Council staff agreed to follow up with Council members to gather comments on these policies. Council staff will incorporate comments submitted by Council members by June 20th and the policies will be forwarded to the public for review.

Action: Approval in principle of draft policies

Chair Moser moved to forward all draft policies to the public, and to address the safety, mobility, and stewardship policies as discussed. Motion seconded by Garvett. The Council voted unanimously in favor of this motion.

Discussion: Approach to Funding and Financing

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) asked if the Council would like to form a subcommittee to help address the funding and financing issue.

Council Member Sealock replied that he does not feel the Council has enough expertise in this area.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) asked for guidance from the Council on what kind of information (graphics and displays) would help staff and consultants to provide the necessary information.

Chair Moser stated that the Council feels staff should work on this task, and bring the results to the full Council for discussion.

Council Member Roberts requested more information on the relationship between state and FAA funding for aviation, and how it relates to the Council's decision-making on funding issues.

Work Program Update

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) reviewed the work program. In August, the Council will review existing funding sources and in September, the Council will look at proposed revenue sources.

Review of Upcoming Public Involvement Activities

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) announced the dates for the upcoming regional public meetings – July 22 in Mukilteo and July 24 in Wenatchee. The electronic town hall will be held in July or August, and WSDOT Aviation staff will be conducting briefings as well. Mr. Shambaugh encouraged members of the public to contact WSDOT to schedule a community briefing.

Next Steps

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) announced that the next Council meeting will be on August 7th in Vancouver, followed by a meeting on September 4th in Seattle.

Chair Moser adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.