

LONG-TERM AIR TRANSPORTATION STUDY (LATS) Washington State Aviation Planning Council

MEETING SUMMARY

May 26, 2009

Museum of Flight
9404 E Marginal Way S, Seattle, WA

Present:

Council Members: Carol Moser (Chair), Paul Roberts (Vice Chair), John Sibold, Dave Field, Don Garvett, Penni Loomis, Neal Sealock, John Townsley, James McNamara, Larry Williams

Staff: John Shambaugh, Nisha Marvel

Consultant Team: Sonjia Murray (SH&E), Helen Lin (SH &E), John Yarnish (URS), Rita Brogan (PRR), Kimbra Wellock (PRR), David Hollander (SH&E)

Chair Moser opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda.

Approve February 5, 2009 Meeting Summary

Council Member Townsley moved to approve the February 5, 2009 meeting summary. Motion seconded by Council Member Sealock. The meeting summary was approved.

Staff Report and Follow Up from Previous Meeting

John Shambaugh (Council Staff) reviewed the meeting objectives:

- Review of work program and state aviation system
- Review public input from online survey and regional public meetings and comment period
- Adopt guiding principles and policy recommendations
- Adopt recommendations for land use, stewardship and capacity

He then reviewed the Council work program, noting that in Stage One, the Council reviewed resource information, had presentations by aviation specialists, and developed draft statewide aviation policies. The alternative strategies were developed based on this work and extensive public outreach throughout the project. Stage Five and today's meeting is focused on developing final recommendations.

Review State Aviation System

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E), presented background information on the state aviation system. LATS is comprised of three phases. Phase I looked at what we have, including an airport inventory, capacity and airspace assessment, the first time in twenty years this analysis has been completed in the state. In Phase II, analysts looked at demand and completed a 25-year commercial service market forecasts and special assessments of air cargo and high speed rail. In Phase III, the Governor appointed Aviation Planning Council is developing recommendations to address capacity issues.

Ms. Murray explained that Washington has one of the most dynamic aviation systems in the nation, with over 17 million enplaning passengers, 3.7 million aircraft landings/departures, and carrying more than 600,000 tons of air cargo. Aviation contributes 171,000 jobs, \$4.1 million in wages, and \$18.6 billion in total output. There is a strong need for long range aviation planning in the state, given Washington's anticipated population growth, limited funding, concentration of activity in key regions, local land use conflicts, and fluctuating economy.

Ms. Murray reviewed activity forecasts, which identify expected demand in commercial passenger traffic, general aviation activity, and air cargo volume in Washington through 2030. The following growth is forecast:

ACTIVITY	2005	2030	GROWTH
Passenger Enplanements	16.5 million	31.3 million	90% increase / 2.6% per year
Commercial operations	670,000	1,110,000	66% increase / 2.1% per year
GA operations	3.0 million	4.4 million	45% increase / 1.6% per year
GA based aircraft	8,100	11,800	45% increase / 1.5% per year
Air Cargo Volume	600,000 tons	1,407,000 tons	135% increase / 3.5% per year

Ms. Murray provided additional background on the state's aviation system:

- Washington is served by 16 Airports that Receive Scheduled Passenger Airline Service.
- Passenger Traffic Levels Are Highly Concentrated at Sea-Tac and Spokane.
- General aviation is an important and growing sector of the state aviation system, with over 8,100 general aviation aircraft and 3 million annual operations. Approximately 57% of all general aviation activity is related to business use.
- Ten commercial/regional service airports will exceed capacity by 2030.
- Fifteen general aviation airports will exceed their aircraft storage capacity by 2030

Ms. Murray then reviewed LATS findings pertaining to the Special Emphasis Regions, which were designated by the Washington State Legislature as warranting more detailed analysis because they constitute key centers of population, employment and economic activity.

The Puget Sound Special Emphasis Region consists of King, Snohomish, Pierce, and Kitsap Counties. It is the most populated region in Washington State and the busiest aviation area, with a total population of 3.5 million (approximately 55% of total Washington population). In 2005, the Puget Sound Region accounted for 14.3 million annual enplanements (87% of the 16.5 million total annual enplanements reported in the entire state), 49% of total operations in the state, 47% of Washington's total GA based aircraft, and 83% of state's air cargo tonnage.

The Southwest Washington Special Emphasis Area consists of Clark and Cowlitz Counties. It has a total population of 500,000 and is one of the fastest growing regions in the state in terms of based aircraft and GA operations. Four of the eight airports in this region are privately owned and face significant land use encroachment issues. Evergreen Field closed in 2006 due to competing land uses. Of the four publicly owned airports, two airports have limited ability to expand.

The Spokane Special Emphasis Area consists of Spokane County and accounts for the second largest concentration of commercial and general aviation activity in the state after the Puget Sound Region. Spokane airports are facing land use encroachment issues. The region has a total population of 440,000. In 2005, Spokane accounted for 7.1% of statewide based aircraft, 9.4% of statewide enplanements, and 16% of the state's air cargo tonnage. Three airports in the Spokane Region are expected to be at or exceed aircraft storage capacity by 2030.

The Tri-Cities Special Emphasis Area consists of Benton and Franklin Counties and has a total population on 220,000. Land use encroachment and alternative land use make the airports in the Tri-Cities region vulnerable to closure. The Tri-Cities Region has four public use airports. Tri-Cities is the third busiest commercial airport in the state after SeaTac and Spokane. Three airports are located within 20 miles of each other and include Pasco, Richland and Vista Field. Vista Field may close in the future due to alternative land use. It is unknown whether there is sufficient capacity at the remaining airports to accommodate demand.

Ms. Murray noted that many small communities across Washington have lost a substantial amount of commercial scheduled air service over the past 10-15 years. All of these communities are located outside of the four special emphasis areas. Small community airports include: Walla Walla, Yakima, Wenatchee, Moses Lake, Pullman, Port Angeles, Friday Harbor, and East Sound.

Council Member Sealock asked how much current economic conditions were factored into LATS.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) responded that the study methodology factored in many different data points, including demographics. She noted that it is possible given current conditions that the forecasted activity levels might be delayed by as many as 5-6 years, but the important point is that forecasted activity will occur.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) commented that the forecasts were completed in 2005. The state is implementing a forecasting tracking system that will give analysts a better sense of exactly when the forecasted activity levels will be reached. He noted that forecasting is always a difficult exercise, but the tracking system will help the state to better monitor activity.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) added that while the forecast is based on real 2005 data, she noted that activity in Seattle was up by 2% in 2007, which shows that the state's aviation activity continues to stay strong. At some point the state will reach forecasted numbers, and it needs to start planning now so that it is ready.

Vice Chair Roberts commented his recollection that at least one revision was made to the forecast since the start of LATS Phase III.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) responded that a revision was made, to refine the forecast based on new information provided by the airports.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) added that the changes were made in response to new data from SeaTac International Airport, and that revisions were made to note that SeaTac may reach its capacity levels later than was initially forecasted.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that we acknowledged that the trends are accurate, but the numbers may change slightly. He requested that this fact be reflected in the final report.

Council Member Sealock stressed the need to address the issue of connectivity and the economic impact of airports and that each airport plays a role in the domestic and international aviation system. We are planning for a whole system, not just one airport. It is this connectivity that drives the economy. If an airport is not preserved, the economic activity it generates is lost.

Chair Moser commented that the Council's first guiding principle captures Council Member Sealock's comment very well.

Council Member Sealock stressed the need to highlight this point in the final Council Report.

Review Public Input

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) explained that we wanted to hear from communities that are affected and serviced by airports, from people who use airports, and those whose businesses depend upon airports. Ms. Brogan reviewed the public involvement activities undertaken during LATS Phase III and explained that outreach activities were structured around key decision points. She noted that today's presentation would focus on results from the most recent outreach efforts including an online survey, regional public meetings, and comments on the draft alternative strategies.

An online survey was conducted April 3-17, 2009 in partnership with Knowledge Networks. Panel members were randomly recruited by telephone and provided with access to the Internet and are representative of population minority groups. A total of 1,322 Washington residents were invited to participate in the online survey. A total of 938 surveys were completed, for a 71% completion rate.

Ms. Brogan then reviewed the public comment process for the draft alternative strategies. The strategies were developed to address key issues facing the Washington State aviation system in the areas of capacity, stewardship, and land use represent major long-term challenges to the State's air transportation system and impact both commercial and general aviation users across the state. The public was invited to attend a regional meeting (Olympia on March 24th or Spokane on March 26th) or to submit a comment workbook or comment letter by fax, mail, or email during the 45-day comment period which extended from March 4-April 17, 2009. A total of 192 completed workbooks and 46 comment letters or emails were submitted by the public.

Alternative Capacity Strategies – Capacity Constraints by 2030

Ms. Brogan reported the results of the online survey for this issue area. Few (18%) support building one or more new airports as a means to meet future capacity needs. Almost half (45% or higher) support (somewhat to strongly) proposals for meeting future capacity needs:

- Look first at ways of making more efficient use of existing airports before thinking about building new ones
- Move some types of services to other airports
- Convert a current airport to commercial service without expanding its size
- Convert a current airport to commercial service through expansion
- Increase the capacity of existing airports through investments in advanced aviation technologies

There were only three strategies where there was clear consensus for this issue area:

- Should the state invest in advanced aviation technology? (strong support)
- Should the state use demand management techniques? (strong opposition)
- Should the state redistribute demand to nearby airports? (strong opposition)

When looking at all responses, opinion was divided on the state expanding airports with capacity constraints, and the state constructing new airports. Support was greater for these strategies outside of the Puget Sound region.

Vice Chair Roberts asked for a breakdown of where workbook respondents live.

Kimbra Wellock, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that approximately 50 of the 62 Puget Sound respondents were from Snohomish County and about 12 were from King County.

Council Member Townsley asked if we can tell if the comments we received comments were the result of an organized effort.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that it appears we received a number of identical responses. Ms. Brogan then reported on the written comments, in which several participants had questions about the accuracy of SeaTac capacity forecasts. Concern was expressed about expansion of service at Paine Field and the Olympia Airport. Participants encouraged the Council to explore non-aviation alternatives to relieve capacity for in-state travel and alternatives to airport expansion or new airport construction. Some expressed concerns that the LATS process and draft alternative strategies are biased

toward airport expansion. Others expressed concern that the process should be subject to an environmental review process.

Alternative Capacity Strategies –Airport Closures

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reported the results of the online survey for this issue area. When asked to identify priorities for addressing the issue of airport closures, at least half of respondents agree (somewhat to strongly) that: local land use laws should limit development around airports to uses that are compatible with airport operations, a funding priority should be placed on airports necessary to assure statewide access to the aviation system, regardless of size, active steps should be taken to identify and protect the most vulnerable airports, and projects that provide the greatest economic benefit to the state should receive funding priority. Almost one-third (28%) of respondents opposed the state purchasing select airports in danger of closing.

Workbook feedback indicated that participants supported the strategy of authorizing expanded state ownership. Opinion was divided on the state initiating an educational campaign, adding assurances to the state airport grant program, and introducing new legislation to prevent airport closures. The majority of Puget Sound respondents opposed these strategies, while support was greater in other areas of the state. Several Puget Sound area respondents expressed concern that an educational campaign would be a lobbying effort for airports and airplane owners, and would not focus on protecting communities negatively affected by noise and other aviation-related effects. Accountability was the key reason for those who supported adding assurances to the state airport grant program. For those who were against this strategy, the most common reason cited is the objection to using state funds to support airports. Those in support of introducing new legislation to prevent airport closures commented on the importance of airport preservation. Those against this strategy felt that closure decisions should be determined by the owner, that the free market should be allowed to operate.

Alternative Capacity Strategies –Small Communities

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reported the results of the online survey for this issue area. At least one-third of respondents (31-33%) indicated a low priority for supporting commercial service to smaller communities and to maintain the condition of smaller airports. Respondents in the Central Puget Sound region are more likely to give higher priority to ensuring that there is sufficient airport capacity to accommodate passenger demand. When asked to identify the highest funding priorities to preserve the aviation system, respondents chose to give the highest priority to supporting emergency services and the lowest priority to maintaining commercial service to smaller communities.

Workbook feedback indicated that participants expressed moderate support for the state encouraging local negotiations between small communities and airlines when looking at all responses. Support was greater for this strategy outside of the Puget Sound region. Half of all respondents opposed providing local, state and/or federal support to small communities. However, while there was strong opposition to this strategy in the Puget Sound region, there was stronger support elsewhere in the state. Those against this strategy expressed the opinion that the free market should be allowed to work without government intervention. The importance of economic development in smaller communities and the state's infrastructure were common themes among supporters of this strategy.

Stewardship Alternative Strategies

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reported the results of the online survey for the stewardship issue area. At least half or more of respondents (somewhat to strongly) supported the following ideas for maintaining Washington's existing aviation system: prioritize spending to preserve our existing system through proper maintenance, expand the use of some airports to include additional, new commercial service, avoid incompatible land uses near airports, and develop a revolving loan fund to help airport sponsors finance airport improvement projects. About 45% agree that a funding priority should be placed on airports that carry the most people, and that the free market should dictate which airports remain in service.

Workbook feedback indicated that there was consensus on several of the stewardship alternative strategies:

- Should the state prioritize system investments? (strong support)
- Should the state improve instrument approach capabilities? (strong support)
- Should the state establish incentive programs to remove obstructions and enhance safety? (strong support)
- Should the state install weather reporting equipment? (strong support)
- Should the state improve management of airport pavement? (moderate support)
- Should the state establish a program for landing aids and aircraft turnarounds at small airports? (moderate support)
- Should the state establish a revolving loan program? (moderate support)
- Should the state focus on having projects "shovel ready?" (neutral opinion)

Opinion was divided on the state establishing a grant assurances program and increasing its investment in planning. Accountability was the key reason for supporting the state establishing a grant assurances program. For those who are against it, the most common reason cited is the objection to the use of state funds to support airports. For those in support of increasing the state's investment in planning, they saw it as a way to promote system stewardship. Several Puget Sound area respondents expressed concern that this strategy would enable the State to buffer local politicians from controversial projects. Comment letters expressed concern that the alternative strategies are too focused on general aviation issues.

Stewardship Alternative Strategies

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reported the results of the online survey for the land use issue area. Nearly 70% of respondents supported or strongly supported local land use laws limiting development around airports to uses that are compatible with airport operations. When asked what type of role state government should play in protecting the long-term air transportation needs of Washington State, nearly 70% supported discouraging incompatible land uses near airports. Approximately 66% of respondents supported or strongly supported avoiding incompatible land uses near airports as a means to maintain Washington's existing aviation system. Ms. Brogan noted that online survey results are consistent with E-Town Hall 2 results - 70% of E-Town Hall 2 participants were supportive of limiting incompatible land uses around airports.

Ms. Brogan reported workbook responses indicated that when looking at all responses, opinion was divided on all of the land use strategies. In general, those who responded within the Puget Sound area were more likely to oppose the land use strategies while support was greater in other areas of the state. The responses of participants from outside of the Puget Sound region were had more similarities with results from the online survey and E-Town Halls with regard to land use.

Those in support of the state coordinating the planning process with local and regional agencies expressed the opinion that local government has a poor record when it comes to addressing land use/airport issues. Others stated that coordination leads to better decisions. Those opposing this strategy expressed concerned that this strategy is biased toward protection of the aviation system and against community interests. Others said local government should be in charge of land use decision-making.

For those in support of adding assurances to the state airport grant program to require recipients to adopt comprehensive plan policies and consistent development regulations to discourage incompatible development near airports, accountability is a key reason. They also indicated that this strategy helps insulate airports from local political pressure. For those against this strategy, the most common reason cited is the objection to the use of state funds to support airports. Others cautioned that assurances need to be reasonable, enforceable, and permanent and commented that local government should be in charge of land use decision-making.

Comments were similar in response to the state developing funding eligibility criteria and to the state strengthening legislation to protect public investments in airport. Those in support of these strategies indicated that a state role is needed based on the opinion that local government has a poor record when it comes to addressing land use/airport issues. Others expressed concern that funding typically favors airports and airlines, and not communities who may oppose an action. Participants again commented that local government should be in charge of land use decision-making.

Those in support of the state requiring land use certification commented that language should be stronger. Those against this strategy commented it favors the needs of airports over community concerns. Others commented that this strategy adds too many layers of bureaucracy

In comment letters, participants also expressed concern that the land use strategies place too much emphasis on needs of airports and about the neighborhood impacts of airport expansion.

Chair Moser asked for the Councils' thoughts on the public comment summary. She noted that it is a mixed bag of responses, adding that a large group from Puget Sound very effectively influenced the direction of the results. She added that it was important to break out responses by geography in order to show both statewide and local perspectives.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that he is sensitive to the points of view expressed in the comments received, especially given his role on the Council as a representative of the general public. He emphasized that he is a representative of the general public of Western Washington, and not a representative of a particular special interest group. He expressed concern that we can draw very different conclusions depending upon the results generated by each tool. There appears to have been an organized effort to comment, and we have an over abundance of comment from one area.

Council Member Garvett agreed with Vice Chair Roberts and noted that while all of the comments received are legitimate, they are not statistically valid. He added that we need to be certain we are being clear about the Council's mandate when making decisions.

Council Member Townsley commented that he agrees with Council Members Roberts and Garvett. He noted that the local interest from the Snohomish County area suggests that there are some underlying issues that the Council needs to think about as it develops its recommendations. The land use decision making process we have does not help us address long term interests. We need to consider this in our decision making.

Chair Moser commented that there is a saying in local government that you are either growing or you are dying. She commented that if it looks like nothing is happening on a site, it is easier to look at other uses. People look to the state to solve the issue of airport closures. She pointed one of the recommendations in AIRTRAC was to initiate an educational campaign but that it was not implemented. She commented that the feedback we received from the public points to a need for education about aviation-related issues.

Council Member Sealock commented he is not sure if the responses we received are an accurate representation of the state. He noted that the results do not speak to users of airports or those who live around them.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reminded the Council that we conducted a variety of outreach activities in an attempt to hear from as many points of view as possible, and as a means to cross check our findings.

Public Comment

John Dobson (Washington Pilots Association) commented that the State of Washington should pass legislation to allow lawsuits against governments to enforce rules as written. While he initially felt this was controversial, recent cases such as in Tonasket, Cle Elum, and Shelton demonstrate the existence of many issues. Mr. Dobson commented that there is a need to find a way to let the little guy play the game. If there is violation of the public meeting act, a person can file a complaint, but it does not solve the problem. He commented that the Growth Management Act does not protect the airport in its current form. In looking at land use issues, there is a need to find a way to let the average citizen protect the airport. This is the way to fix the issues that exist.

Greg Haugh (Save our Communities) noted that he lives in Mukilteo. He commented that he is disappointed in the Council's reaction to public comments. He commented that there is bias in the survey toward airports, and would like the Council to look more holistically, at both airports and communities. He commented that taxpayers have invested nearly \$4 billion in the projects such as light rail and in the third runway at SeaTac. He questioned the decision to base forecasts on 2005 data, noting that SeaTac's website shows that current activity is lower than it was in 2005. Further, the FAA's published growth rate is 1.5%, which is much lower as well. He noted that NextGen could increase capacity as much as 17%. Mr. Haugh continued stating that the LATS legislation calls for use of accurate and updated information. He commented that using 2005 is not right. Further, terminal capacity figures are based on 1987 FAA data, and now there is better technology, better cueing and other efficiencies that can help increase

efficiency on the ground side. He urged the Council to revisit its numbers, as LATS is charged with using updated, accurate data.

Chas Talbot (Operations Manager, Regional Commission on Airport Affairs) commented that the RCAA is a citizens group based in Normandy Park concerned about aviation impacts at SeaTac International and at other airports in Central Puget Sound. He noted that the RCAA had previously submitted a letter outlining concerns about the about the possibility that the Council will submit its recommendations to the Governor without providing the public with an opportunity to review and comment on them. Mr. Talbot concluded with the statement that this is not a good procedure.

Recommended Changes to Principles and Policies

Council Purpose and Need Statement

Chair Moser noted that one of the Council's first actions was to adopt a Purpose and Need statement. She asked Vice Chair Roberts to review the statement.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that the Council drafted this statement early in the process. The statement was intended to reflect ESSB 5121. The statement discusses the relationship between different size airports, those airports that move goods and those that move people, and role of smaller airports which provide vital links to those communities and provide for the role of essential commerce. Airports are critical pieces of the infrastructure that supports business in these communities. Vice Chair Roberts continued that the Council's recommendations will be based upon state policy and that the Council's job is to work within the framework of existing policies and statues, not rewrite them. He expressed his appreciation to WSDOT staff and the consulting team for their work to support the Council. Vice Chair Roberts then asked if any Council Members had changes to the purpose and need statement to propose.

Council Member Garvett commented that employment is a bigger concern now than it was when we drafted this statement. He noted that while the Council considered employment in drafting the statement, he suggested that it might make sense to call it out specifically in the statement. The group concurred with the addition of employment to the second sub-bullet; there were no objections to this revision.

The revised Purpose and Need Statement is as follows:

Maintaining a healthy aviation system is in the interests of the nation and the citizens of Washington State.

Washington's aviation system provides intrastate, national and international access for passengers and goods and is an important component of our national defense capability. Washington State's aviation system is an essential function of our overall transportation system, because it:

- Moves people and goods
- Supports business, employment, and commerce
- Promotes quality of life
- Provides access for critical emergency and disaster management services that other transportation modes cannot accommodate.

Airports in the system range from large airports that serve major population centers to small community airports that are a critical link to sparsely populated expanses and local economies. Although Washington's airports are diverse, with different roles and needs, they must function together as a healthy, balanced system.

The Washington State Aviation Planning Council was established by the Legislature and appointed by the Governor to develop recommendations to the Governor and Legislature for policies and capital investment strategies needed to maintain a healthy aviation system.

The Council's recommendations will be based upon current State policy goals, the analysis presented in the Long-term Air Transportation study (LATS), public input, and additional technical research. As directed by the Legislature, technical and administrative support will be provided by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Aviation Division and a technical consultant team.

Guiding Principles

Council Member Loomis reviewed recommended revisions to the Guiding Principles. She noted that she and Council Member Field reviewed the guiding principles and are proposing revisions in order to make the guiding principles concise as possible, and written in an actionable language.

Council Member Loomis reviewed proposed revisions to guiding principles 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8. For guiding principle 1, the proposal is to reverse the order of the sentences. In guiding principle 2, the proposed language acknowledges the importance of the aerospace industry to the State economy, so that it is called out specifically in the guiding principles. Original and proposed language for guiding principles 1 and 2 is as follows:

- Original language – guiding principle 1: 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.
- Proposed revised language – guiding principle 1: Washington's aviation system is an essential component of local, state and national economies and must be sustained. Washington's communities depend on their ability to access Washington State's aviation system to move people and goods safely throughout the state, nation, and world.
- Original language – guiding principle 2: 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.
- Proposed revised language – guiding principle 2: Washington State's aviation system includes commercial aviation and general aviation airports and supporting businesses and facilities, the aerospace industry and airspace. Furthermore, decisions about Washington's aviation system should be considered in the context of state, national and international impacts.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that he appreciates the Council Member Field's and Loomis' work to address this issue. The aerospace industry is an essential economic pillar of the state. He noted that people tend to understand the role of aviation and aerospace, but not always defense. This is an important business in this state. The proposed revisions benefit two very important industries in this state.

Council Member Loomis reviewed changes to guiding principle 5. The proposed revisions are designed to make the language more specific to funding in the state and to acknowledge the interaction of different modes of transportation and the important role that aviation plays, and the contribution of aviation to the general fund.

- Original language – guiding principle 5: Washington's aviation system currently suffers from a significant funding shortfall that is leading to deferred maintenance that will cost even more to address over the long run. Without adequate maintenance, Washington's aviation system will deteriorate. Needed revenue for maintenance and preservation of airports should be collected and distributed in an equitable manner.
- Proposed revised language – guiding principle 5: Though Washington's aviation system provides significant economic benefit to the State, it currently suffers from a significant funding shortfall leading to deferred maintenance that will cost even more to address over the long run. As a component of the overall transportation system within the state, funding mechanisms must be considered and funding sources identified which equitably take into account the revenue and benefit derived from aviation activities.

Council Member Loomis proposed combining combine guiding principles 6 and 8 into one principle.

- Original language – guiding principle 6: To maximize value and impact of public investment in the aviation system statewide will require strategic and targeted investment that looks first to making the best use of our current assets. We must preserve the system we have in place, and then enhance the capacity of existing facilities with technological innovation and system management best practices. In doing so, we must take into account different roles of airports, serving Washington's diverse communities.
- Original language – guiding principle 8: Capacity investments must be considered in the context of environmental and social impacts such as noise, air quality, water quality, impacts on adjacent communities, and climate change.
- Proposed combined guiding principle: The public investment in the aviation system can be maximized by first making the best use of our current assets. Enhancement and expansion of the system must consider environmental and social impacts upon communities and the state.

Council Member McNamara suggested adding the word local to guiding principle 2.

Council Member Garvett noted that we use the word interstate in the purpose and need statement, and asked if it should be added to guiding principle 2. The group did not agree with using interstate, but did agree with local.

Council Member Field moved to adopt the guiding principles as shown on PowerPoint slides 60 and 61, with the inclusion of local preceding state in guiding principle 2. Motion seconded by John Townsley. The revised guiding principles were adopted by unanimous vote, as follows:

1. Washington's aviation system is an essential component of local, state and national economies and must be sustained. Washington's communities depend on their ability to access Washington State's aviation system to move people and goods safely throughout the state, nation, and world.
2. Washington State's aviation system includes commercial aviation and general aviation airports and supporting businesses and facilities, the aerospace industry and airspace. Furthermore, decisions about Washington's aviation system should be considered in the context of local, state, national and international impacts.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Though Washington's aviation system provides significant economic benefit to the State, it currently suffers from a significant funding shortfall leading to deferred maintenance that will cost even more to address over the long run. As a component of the overall transportation system within the state, funding mechanisms must be considered and funding sources identified which equitably take into account the revenue and benefit derived from aviation activities.
6. The public investment in the aviation system can be maximized by first making the best use of our current assets. Enhancement and expansion of the system must consider environmental and social impacts upon communities and the state.
7. The decision-making about the expansion or siting of airports should be made through an open and public process, taking into account the ultimate need to serve the broadest long term interest of the residents of Washington State and our national security.
8. 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.

Statewide Aviation Policies

Council Member Loomis proposed combining two existing environment policies into a new policy as follows:

- Original language:
 - Airport facilities and operations plans should use best management practices e.g. energy conservation, alternative fuels, and waste reduction.

- Incorporate state and federal greenhouse gas reductions associated with air transportation to minimize the adverse health and environmental impacts on air quality and the climate while promoting jobs and economic development in a sustainable manner.
- Proposed combined policy: Washington State should encourage sustainable environmental and energy best management practices in design and operation of airport facilities, consistent with state and federal law.

Vice Chair Roberts stated that he opposes the proposed language noting that the original language is more specific. He commented that in light of discussions about conservation, climate, and recent EPA actions, it is important that we are specific about both issues covered in the original language, best management practices and reducing the health and environmental impacts of airport operation. He added that this seems to be more consistent with the Governor's climate change initiative, and that more specific language is better.

Council Member Loomis expressed her opinion that the more specific language should be in the recommendations and that the language at the policy level should be more general. She commented that the Council has not discussed the Governor's climate change initiative.

Council Member Sibold expressed concern that the Council has not discussed health and environmental impacts in great detail.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that the Clean Air Act applies and that there is already a statutory framework in place to address these issues. He added that it is not any different than other recommendation which fit within existing state/federal statutory framework.

Council Member Townsley suggested adding being consistent with executive orders to the language in addition to state and federal law.

Council Member Sealock commented that he understands Vice Chair Roberts comment, but noted that we are talking about compliance, which should be included in the spirit of the policy recommendation.

Council Member Garvett commented that the new language is wonderfully boiled down. He noted that the original language indicated a mandate, while the new language says encourage. He asked if this was an intentional change.

Council Member Loomis responded that sustainable practices are very specific to each airport. There would be different practices implemented at SeaTac than there would be at a smaller airport.

Council Member Garvett commented that it is important to answer this question as one is stronger than the other. The Council needs to decide which version is more appropriate.

Council Member Sealock asked if the stronger language implies the need for inspection to ensure compliance.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that he is not sure that it does. He noted that he appreciate s the fact that practices would be different at smaller airports than at large airports. He commented that the original

language makes it clear that best management practices apply, and those are site specific by nature. The second policy discusses minimizing the adverse impacts of burning fossil fuels. He commented that this Council needs to address this issue. Other groups will weigh in on how it gets done; the Council should not skirt the issue.

Council Member Garvett asked if we want to minimize adverse effects in general, or if we want to minimize effects in a cost effective manner. He noted that taking “minimize” literally could be interpreted to mean shutting down transportation.

Council Member Townsley commented that Council Member Garvett has raised a good point, that one version is permissive, while the other is obligatory.

Chair Moser commented that she served on the climate action team, and they were purposefully silent on aviation with regard to greenhouse gas emissions. The team addressed vehicle miles traveled (VMT) but not as it relates to airport. She noted that she is more comfortable with language that allows for flexibility, and indicated that “encourage” may be better than “will use,” especially for smaller airports.

Council Member Garvett suggested that focusing on best management practices might be good compromise language as it takes context specific issues into consideration.

Chair Moser explained that we will discuss the other policies first, and then make final revisions and adopt the revised language later in the meeting.

Council Member Loomis proposed amending stewardship policy 3 as follows:

- Original language – stewardship policy 3 – sub-bullet b: At each update cycle, reevaluate Washington State Airport Classification System designations for airports to respond to changing conditions and ensure that airport facilities are meeting established performance standards.
- Proposed revised language – stewardship policy 3 – sub-bullet b: During each System Plan update, review the progress toward achievement and relevance of the policies recommended by the Aviation Planning Council.

Council Member Sealock moved to accept the proposed revision. Motion seconded by Field. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Council Member Loomis proposed eliminating stewardship policy 5 based on the opinion that it should be addressed as part of the system plan recommendations: Stewardship Policy 5 is: Provide technical assistance to airports and promote methods that optimize the net public benefit, as consistent with the WASP, airport master plans, and state and federal assurances and guidelines.

Council Member Townsley commented that the purpose of this policy was to help the smaller jurisdictions that do not have the capacity to do the analysis and planning that we are proposing. He commented that including this only in the system plan does not carry the same weight as it would if it is a policy.

Chair Moser asked if WSDOT Aviation is already providing technical assistance to airports.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) responded yes, and that the policy as written is very similar to WSDOT Aviation's authorizing legislation.

Council Member Garvett commented that including it as a policy is a good reminder.

Council Member Loomis commented that the proposal is to move the language to the system plan, not to delete it.

Chair Moser asked if there was concurrence to eliminate stewardship policy 5.

Council Member Sealock asked for confirmation that WSDOT Aviation's enabling legislation addresses this issue.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) responded that it does.

Council Member Sealock moved to delete stewardship policy 5. Motion seconded by Field. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Council Member Loomis proposed revising stewardship policy 6 as follows:

- Original language – stewardship policy 6 : Support joint public-private partnership and private sector initiatives to provide transportation facilities and services that protects the public's best interest, such that:
 - Public expenditures can be reduced
 - Access to aviation facilities is enhanced
 - The quality, quantity and stability of service is maintained and/or
 - Environmental impacts are reduced.
- Proposed revised language – stewardship policy 6: In order to provide funding for preservation and necessary development of the aviation system, the State shall return a portion of the general fund revenue generated by aviation system activity to the Department of Transportation – Aviation Division for support of such improvements.

Council Member Townsley commented that the intent of this policy is to identify ways to secure funding for airport improvements.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) commented that she believed that the subcommittee does not have language to recommend, and proposed that the Council take no action on this proposal.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) commented that WSDOT Aviation would want to discuss this idea with the FAA before making any decisions, out of concern that this language would preclude the state from receiving federal funding.

Chair Moser confirmed that the Council would defer discussion of this policy.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) returned to the previous discussion about revisions to the environment policies. She proposed the following revised language: .Washington state should or will use sustainable environmental best practices consistent with executive orders, state law, and federal law.

Council Member Garvett commented that the language calls out executive orders, which are laws, and state and federal laws, but it does not call out regulation. He asked if it needs to be added, if law is inclusive of regulation.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that regulations cannot exist without a statutory framework.

Council Member Sealock moved to accept the following revised language for the environment policy: Washington State should encourage sustainable environmental and energy best management practices in design and operation of airport facilities, consistent with state and federal law. Motion seconded by Council Member Loomis. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Capacity Recommendations

Council Member Sealock reviewed the original strategy concepts that were presented to the public for review at the regional public meetings and during the 45-day public comment period.

Original Strategy Concepts for Capacity Constraints:

- Should the State invest in advanced aviation technology?
- Should the State use demand management techniques?
- Should the State redistribute demand to nearby airports?
- Should the State expand airports with capacity constraints?
- Should the State construct new airports?

Original Strategy Concepts for Airport Closures:

- Should the State initiate an educational campaign?
- Should the State add assurances to the Airport Grant program?
- Should the State introduce new legislation to prevent airport closures?
- Should we authorize expanded State ownership?

Original Strategy Concepts for Loss of Private Airports

- Should the State encourage local negotiations between small communities and airlines?
- Should local, state and/or Federal support be provided to small communities?

Council Member Sealock then introduced the proposed language for the capacity recommendations for Council discussion:

It is recommended that the State take a lead role in addressing aviation capacity needs and place a priority on funding and planning the state's air transportation system, including general aviation, to meet future needs. The Legislature and WSDOT will take measures to:

- Enact legislative policy to use existing capacity in the air transportation system before considering constructing new airports.
- Invest in advanced aviation technologies for Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) systems, instrument approaches, and other pertinent technologies, as needed, to

- address safety, capacity and access for all commercial, regional and community airports identified in the state's system plan.
- When additional aviation capacity is needed, and no other airport capacity is available within the region, the legislature should fund a site selection study for the placement of new airport(s) if no sponsor is available.

Council Member Garvett questioned whether the third bullet should say “When additional aviation capacity is needed” or if it should say, “When additional aviation capacity is desirable.” He commented that there is a threshold difference between needed and desirable, and using needed could be used as an excuse not to invest in these technologies.

Chair Moser commented that “desirable” seems to indicate that it is something that is a want.

Council Member Sealock suggested using the word “applicable” instead.

Council Member Field suggested removing the word needed altogether.

Council Member McNamara commented that if we wait to start the process of building a new airport until it is needed, it is too late.

Council Member Sealock responded that we want to be clear that we are not establishing new triggers as triggers for undertaking capacity planning already exist in the system.

Council Member Loomis expressed concern about the phrase, “and no other airport capacity is available” in the third bullet. She noted that it could be interpreted to mean that we should wait until there is no other capacity available in the region before initiating a site selection study.

Council Member Sibold responded that he did not interpret the language this way.

Council Member Sealock commented the purpose of this statement is to reiterate that we will use existing capacity before building new.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team, (SH&E) suggested saying “available and feasible.”

Council Member Loomis responded that saying “available and feasible” addresses her concern. She noted that while there might be capacity in a given location, it may not be appropriate capacity to address the shortfall.

Council Member Sealock suggested the following revision, “When the threshold for additional aviation capacity is reached, the legislature should fund a site selection study.....” He noted that we are trying to address public comment that we heard earlier in the meeting about forecasts, commenting that in his opinion the current economic conditions are an anomaly.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) replied that this seems to say that a site selection process should only be started if a particular airport reaches capacity.

Council Member Sealock replied that the text is meant to indicate that we are talking about regional capacity, not capacity at a specific airport.

Vice Chair Roberts agreed with David Hollander's interpretation. He agrees that the text should discuss capacity in the broad sense, not at a particular airport. He noted that the question of capacity is complex and cautioned that we should be careful about how we address the issue. He noted that if we were to think about constructing a new airport, the decision would be made based on the most current forecast estimates available. He added that this is the essential question we have been asked to address, and that we want to make best use of the existing system. He expressed concern about the language being interpreted to say that we should start a site selection process before exploring all other options.

Council Member Sibold commented that the original language is needed, to indicate that we are talking about capacity of the region.

Council Member McNamara suggested saying, "When regional threshold capacity is reached..."

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) suggested the following language:

When additional aviation capacity is forecast to be needed, and no airport capacity is available within the region, the legislature should fund a site selection study for the placement of new airport(s) if no sponsor is available.

Council Member Townsley asked if this could be interpreted to mean that if we have, for example, some capacity available in Olympia, then we do not address capacity constraints at SeaTac, which is not necessarily feasible for Bellingham.

Council Member Sealock replied that he understands Council Member Townsley's concern, but that he is sensitive to the issue of this being interpreted to mean that we automatically look at building a new airport as a means to address capacity constraints. He noted that we are trying not to be too prescriptive, but instead offer a full palette of choices.

Chair Moser suggested saying "feasible" instead of "available."

Council Member Townsley responded that feasible takes into consideration the ground side investment, and suggest the need to consider the need to build infrastructure to support the new airport construction.

Council Member Field commented that this also addresses the Olympia to Bellingham issue.

Chair Moser noted that there seems to be consensus about replacing "available" with "feasible."

Council Member Loomis commented that individuals who may not be familiar with site selection process might have thought that the Council's mandate was to undertake a site selection process. She stressed the importance of being clear that this is not the Council's mandate.

Council Member Sealock moved to adopt the capacity recommendations as amended. Motion seconded by Council Member. The motion carried.

The capacity recommendations adopted by the Council are as follows:

It is recommended that the State take a lead role in addressing aviation capacity needs and place a priority on funding and planning the state's air transportation system, including general aviation, to meet future needs. The Legislature and WSDOT will take measures to:

- Enact legislative policy to use existing capacity in the air transportation system before considering constructing new airports.
- Invest in advanced aviation technologies for Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) systems, instrument approaches, and other pertinent technologies to address safety, capacity and access for all commercial, regional and community airports identified in the state's system plan.
- When additional aviation capacity is forecast to be needed, and no feasible airport capacity is available within the region, the legislature should fund a site selection study for the placement of new airport(s) if no sponsor is available.

Land Use Recommendations

Vice Chair Roberts reviewed the original strategy concepts that were presented to the public for review at the regional public meetings and during the 45-day public comment period.

Original Strategy Concepts for Land Use:

- Should the State coordinate the planning process with local and regional agencies?
- Should the State develop funding eligibility criteria?
- Should the State add assurances to the Airport Grant program?
- Should the State strengthen legislation to protect public investments in airports?
- Should the State require land use certification?

Vice Chair Roberts noted that the recommendations being presented today deal with compliance and not funding eligibility criteria and grant assurances and address the recommendation made by the subcommittee to strengthen the language.

Mr. Roberts noted that a number of the public comments received expressed the belief that it is not the airports that need to be protected, but everything else. He commented that he does not believe the LATS legislation is different than other pieces of statutory language such as the Growth Management Act (GMA). He believes that GMA sets for the framework under which the Council must work. Therefore, the proposed recommendations are intended to strengthen existing statutes under state law.

Mr. Roberts then introduced the proposed language for the land use recommendations for Council discussion:

The Aviation Planning Council recommends the State reaffirm and strengthen land use legislation to protect public use airports from encroachment of incompatible land uses, and safeguard the public's investment in the air transportation system. Legislation should specifically be designed to:

1. Amend the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.510 General Aviation Airports and RCW 36.70A.200 - essential public facilities -), and planning enabling statutes (RCW 36.70.547 – General

Aviation Airports), to require “protection” of airports from encroachment of incompatible land uses, as well as providing for the “siting” of such uses as Essential Public Facilities.

2. Prohibit the placement of noise sensitive uses near public use airports within the traffic pattern and approach and departure areas. Examples of such uses include but are not limited to residential, schools, hospitals, and adult care facilities. Where such uses exist within an existing traffic pattern, or approach or departure area of a public use airport, require they be considered non-conforming under GMA and planning enabling laws and further require local governments to amend or update their land use plans to prohibit expansion of such uses and, preferably, phase them out. Similar protections should be extended to contiguous jurisdictions where the airport areas involve more than one city or county.
3. Revise Washington Administrative Codes (WACs) and or Revised Codes of Washington (RCWs) governing the siting of public schools to prohibit new construction of schools in airport traffic, approach or departure areas. Work with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction spell this out (OSPI) to ensure public schools in Washington State are notified of these recommendations.
4. *Revise WACs and or RCWs* to prohibit structural, visual, electrical and wildlife hazards that interfere with critical airspace surfaces, negatively impact airport operations or endanger the public's safety.
5. Strengthen the authority of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), regional transportation planning organizations (RTPOs) and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to certify that transportation and land use elements of comprehensive plans provide sufficient protection to airports. Transportation funds provided by these organizations (WSDOT, RTPOs and MPOs), should be provided to Jurisdictions that protect these resources.
6. Require local jurisdictions and airport sponsors to coordinate land use planning, site master planning, and permitting so as to protect airport operations and avoid conflicts.
7. Provide standing for airport operators and the State of Washington to take such actions as necessary to enforce measures intended to protect airports from encroachment.

Vice Chair Roberts explained that the first recommendation attempts to address the opinion that the statutes outlined within the recommendation are not strong enough. He noted that the proposed language deals with the facility as it now exists and the protection of its function, whereas GMA deals with siting of new facilities.

Mr. Roberts commented from the airport’s point of view, noise complaints are made regardless of whether or not they meet the technical definition of noise.

Council Member Garvett asked if sideline was excluded on purpose.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that it was not.

Council Member Sibold commented that the language needs to address the entire area.

Council Member Garvett asked if there is a need to include sideline, or if the text after “within an existing traffic pattern” should be deleted.

Council Member Sibold asked if we are deliberately leaving out reference to technical aspects of noise.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that in drafting the language, he approached it as a land use issue, how to avoid land use conflicts as a result of noise sensitive uses and not from the perspective of whether or not you technically meet the definition of noise.

Council Member McNamara commented that he is not sure than the Growth Management Act discusses the issues outlined in the second recommendation.

Council Member Loomis asked John Shambaugh to discuss the guidelines about downwind areas of influents, and whether or not these uses are allowed.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) responded that some of these uses are not allowed in these areas.

Vice Chair Roberts proposed removing the list of uses.

Council Member Field commented that noise sensitivity is not very clear and that traffic pattern is somewhat subjective. He noted that in implementing this recommendation, it would be difficult to work through the issues that might arise. He cautioned that without developing criteria it will never be adopted and that it would help if the state has criteria.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that there are many different kinds of configurations, and that the goal is to give some general direction.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) commented that the Council is proposing that new legislation would be proposed by the Legislature. The hope is that Council members and WSDOT Aviation would be part of crafting that legislation.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that there isn’t really a finish line here, and that he agrees with Mr. Shambaugh. This is not a cookie-cutter approach.

Chair Moser asked Council Member McNamara if this would pass muster with the Growth Management Act.

Council Member McNamara responded that it provides direction to guide development of legislation. Alternative, the Council could recommend leaving it to the discretion of local community which would have to determine if the proposal meets the direction provided by this recommendation. He commented that in his opinion, the recommendation is specific enough at this stage.

Council Member Sibold agreed with Council Member McNamara. He commented that we are leaving the responsibility of meeting the intent of the recommendation to the locals.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that one of the most useful outcomes would be to have the airport and the local communities engage in discussion as that is not happening now.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) suggested amending recommendation 3 to say, “in areas impacted by the airport traffic patterns.”

Council Member Garvett recommended saying activity instead of traffic.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) noted that the traffic pattern is clearly defined in the airport master plan.

Council Member Townsley commented that saying “in areas impact by the traffic pattern” helps provide clarity.

Council Member Seacock commented that we are not just talking about noise, but also safety. He commented that we do not want people to think we are only talking about land use from the perspective of noise. Noise is just one factor and this language captures this.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that this requires a conversation with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OPSI) to discuss funding and other issues.

Mr. Roberts then explained that recommendation 5 tries to address funding incentives, as well as provide standing to other entities to step in and note when compliance is not being achieved.

Council Member Townsley commented that one of the proposed stewardship recommendations is that the state should strengthen legislation to protect land use and asked if this land use recommendation is intended to address this.

Vice Chair Roberts explained that recommendation 7 addresses the standing question directly. He noted this is a question for CTED as well as for WSDOT.

Council Member McNamara commented that the issue is not to find money for airport land use issues, but rather to facilitate the process by which they would have to comply. He asked if we are talking about standing under the Growth Management Act.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that there are two parts. The first is to that there are incentives available to get this right, by doing the right planning and making yourself more eligible, not less eligible. The other part deals with GMA/non-GMA jurisdictions.

Council Member McNamara why we would grant them special standing, and not require them to participate in the process like others are required to.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that some of the airport operators belong to the same organizations that do the planning. This recommendation would require engaging the airport. The goal is to provide standing so that if the engagement is not done properly, there is a means to address it.

Council Member McNamara expressed concern about the precedent this would set, giving standing to an airport operator just because they dislike a particular plan.

Vice Chair Roberts noted that this is how it works under the Clean Air Act, which provides a statutory framework.

Council Member Seacock expressed concern that we have not addressed issues that occur beyond the planning aspect. He noted that planning relates to zoning, but airports face challenges beyond zoning, including variances, and approval of non-conforming uses that enable projects to move forward. He commented that this is a huge challenge for airports. The goal should be to prohibit non-conforming uses.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that this is addressed in recommendation #2. He added that he does not know how to address the issue of uses which have already been vested. He noted that if it is vested, it would have legal non-conforming status. Recommendation #2 attempts to phase those uses out, not let them expand.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) asked if in recommendation #5, when talking about the land use element of comprehensive plans, it would make sense to say comprehensive plans and regulations, noting that it adds some additional language in case comprehensive plans and regulations are not concurrent.

Council Member Sibold asked if regulations define the process for granting a variance.

Council Member McNamara responded yes, and suggested adding development before regulation. He noted that recommendation #7 would give standing, and that is what is needed to deal with the enforcement issue.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that recommendation #7 does not stand alone, but rather works together with the other recommendations, to paint the whole picture.

Council Member Seacock commented that this recommendation works, and helps avoid the local vs. state jurisdiction issue. He added that it gets us as close as possible without preempting local action.

Council Member Garvett commented that Vice Chair Roberts made a clear and persuasive point as to why we look at protecting airports others. He asked how we communicate that we considered these issues.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) commented that the guiding principles contain language that speaks to the need to protect communities.

Council Member Garvett commented that there is one set of language that says we considered it, and another that says we left it out and asked how we explain the reasoning behind it.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that we will include language in the Council report narrative.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) asked if recommendations 2 and 3 should say airport traffic pattern.

Council Member Townsley moved to accept the proposed land use recommendations. Motion seconded by Council Member Seacock. Motion carried.

The land use recommendations adopted by the Council are as follows:

The Aviation Planning Council recommends the State reaffirm and strengthen land use legislation to protect public use airports from encroachment of incompatible land uses, and safeguard the public's investment in the air transportation system. Legislation should specifically be designed to:

1. Amend the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.510 General Aviation Airports and RCW 36.70A.200 - essential public facilities -), and planning enabling statutes (RCW 36.70.547 – General Aviation Airports), to require “protection” of airports from encroachment of incompatible land uses, as well as providing for the “siting” of such uses as Essential Public Facilities.
2. Prohibit the placement of noise sensitive uses within the traffic pattern of public use airports. Examples of such uses include but are not limited to residential, schools, hospitals, and adult care facilities. Where such uses exist, require they be considered non-conforming and further require local governments to amend or update their land use plans to prohibit expansion of such uses and, preferably, phase them out. Similar protections should be extended to contiguous jurisdictions where the airport areas involve more than one city or county.
3. Revise Washington Administrative Codes (WACs) and or Revised Codes of Washington (RCWs) governing the siting of public schools to prohibit new construction of schools in areas impacted by the airport traffic pattern. Work with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to ensure public schools in Washington State are notified of these recommendations.
4. *Revise WACs and or RCWs* to prohibit structural, visual, electrical and wildlife hazards that interfere with critical airspace surfaces, negatively impact airport operations or endanger the public's safety.
5. Strengthen the authority of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), regional transportation planning organizations (RTPOs) and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to certify that transportation and land use elements of comprehensive plans and development regulations provide sufficient protection to airports. Transportation funds provided by these organizations (WSDOT, RTPOs and MPOs), should be provided to Jurisdictions that protect these resources.
6. Require local jurisdictions and airport sponsors to coordinate land use planning, site master planning, and permitting so as to protect airport operations and avoid conflicts.
7. Provide standing for airport operators and the State of Washington to take such actions as necessary to enforce measures intended to protect airports from encroachment.

Stewardship Recommendations

Council Member Townsley reviewed the original strategy concepts that were presented to the public for review at the regional public meetings and during the 45-day public comment period. He noted that public comment indicated that there was general support for the state supporting airport development and safety issues.

Original Strategy Concepts for Stewardship:

- Should the State prioritize system investments?
- Should the State improve instrument approach capabilities?
- Should the State establish incentive programs to remove obstructions and enhance safety?
- Should the State install weather reporting equipment?
- Should the State improvement management of airport pavement?
- Should the state establish a program for landing aids and aircraft turnarounds at small airports?
- Should the state establish a grant assurances program?
- Should the State increase its investment in planning?
- Should the State focus on having projects “shovel ready”?
- Should the State establish a revolving loan program?

Council Member Townsley introduced the proposed stewardship recommendations. He noted that the first bullet addresses the fact that the state collects a lot of revenue from aircraft fuel taxes. A substantial portion of the approximate \$10 million that is collected goes to the general fund. It is the only vehicle fuel tax revenue that is directed to the general fund. Council Member Townsley noted that there some of the public comments received expressed concern about using public funds for aviation infrastructure. It makes sense to look first as using aviation-generated revenue as a funding resource for aviation infrastructure projects.

Chair Moser commented that the Legislature needs to decide for itself how the state will raise funds for aviation and that the Legislature will likely want to take a comprehensive look at funding options for aviation.

Council Member Loomis commented that she agrees with this new text, that it is important to look at the entire taxation system. She added that we should not assume that the fuel tax is the right place to start looking for infrastructure funding. Other alternatives should be explored as well.

Council Member Townsley commented on the second bullet, noting that if we providing some kind of incentive to owners of public use, privately owned airports would save public investment in the long term, and would prevent acceleration of the projected capacity crunch.

Council Member Loomis asked if there should be a requirement that eligible public use, privately owned meet a certain capacity threshold in terms of their impact on the system, or if all airports would be eligible or assumed to have similar significance in the to the system.

Council Member Townsley responded that we would need to suggest criteria if we establish an eligibility a threshold. He added that we need to include all airports, or we need to provide criteria.

Council Member Loomis asked if there are other examples of this kind of preferential tax treatment within other industries.

Council Member Williams responded that there other industries to receive tax incentives, such as solar energy, and electric cars.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) commented that the Council had directed staff to provide a white paper to address the issue of incentives. He reported that at least six or seven states have established programs to provide incentives to aviation. He added that Governor Gregoire recently signed legislation offering public funds to private rail, and as Council Member Williams pointed out earlier, other industries within the state receive incentives.

Chair Moser commented that in order to offer incentives, the project must provide some short of quantifiable public benefit.

Council Member Williams clarified that grant money has to be distributed to a public entity.

Chair Moser added that that while a public jurisdiction must apply for the funds, the funds can benefit a private project, so long as there is public benefit.

Council Member Williams clarified that this applies to grant funding, but incentive funds can be distributed to private entities.

Council Member Loomis asked for if we are suggesting that private owners be eligible for airport grants.

Council Member Townsley responded no, that this would be structured as tax relief measure not as grant funding. He noted that in John Shambaugh's white paper on incentives, Florida's program uses incentives to help offset high insurance premiums.

Council Member Townsley then reviewed the text of the fourth bullet.

Chair Moser commented that all other users of the transportation system except for aviation do benchmarking, so as to measure progress toward attainment of goals. She noted that in her experience, what is measured is done. She suggested that as we develop the aviation system plan, we need to make sure we are benchmarking the things were trying to attain and then visibly report on attainment. We need to be able to point out instances in which we do not make progress toward a goal because we did not have the necessary resources, either funding or adequate teeth in legislation

Council Member Townsley then reviewed the proposal to change the airport classification system terminology from "recreation/remote" to either "rural access" or "rural essential" and asked for the Council's feedback. He noted that he prefers the term "rural essential."

Council Member Sealock agreed that rural essential is better, as it more adequately describes the function of these airports. He added that "recreation/remote" conjures up the wrong image of the role of these airports in the system.

Council Member Townsley noted that aviation provides a service that is unique to all other modes, and as such, there is an element of essentiality for all small airports.

Council Member Williams asked for a definition of rural.

Council Member Townsley responded that according to the Census, rural refers to a relatively remote, smaller population that draws people either for commercial or recreation purposes.

Council Member Williams commented that the State looks at it on a county basis, noting that there are rural counties and urban counties. He commented that if there is rural airport in an urban county, it might not be recognized by the state.

Chair Moser suggested that we define rural in the system plan glossary. She asked if we will forward the proposal to change the classification change to the Governor.

Council Member Townsley responded no.

Council Member Townsley moved to accept the proposed stewardship recommendations and the change in airport classification system terminology to rural essential. Motion seconded by Council Member Garvett. Motion carried.

The stewardship recommendations adopted by the Council are as follows:

The State should enact legislation and other measures to preserve the existing capacity of the air transportation system and to ensure that adequate measures are in place to fund airport facility infrastructure that are necessary to meet the needs of intra-state commerce, national mobility, access to communities, access to economic development and provide for emergency services. Measures should include:

- Enact legislation to conduct an assessment of state aviation taxes and fees derived from aviation activities conducted within Washington. Prepare a report to the Governor that identifies recommendations to fund investments in public airport infrastructure.
- Enact legislation to provide tax incentives to encourage owners of public use, privately owned airports to maintain and develop their facilities for the benefit of Washington's citizens.
- Enact legislation to establish an annual statewide air transportation 5-year capital investment program consistent with the aviation system plan to assist in identifying airport infrastructure needs and prioritizing system investments. The capital investment program should be supported by contractual considerations and closely coordinated with airport sponsors and the Federal Aviation Administration.
- An annual report to the Governor, Legislature, Transportation Commission and RTPOs shall be prepared evaluating the attainment of aviation performance objectives.

Next Steps

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reviewed next steps following the meeting. She noted that the draft Council Report and System Plan circulated to Council Members for review by June 4, and that the Council's comments are due by June 15. The Council Report will then go into production, and will be delivered to the Governor by July 1. We will schedule a media event to announce the release of the recommendations.

Council Member Field commented that we approved text today, but there is a Council Report coming that we have not yet reviewed. He asked if there should be some evidence that the council has reviewed and approved this document prior to its release the public.

Chair Moser suggested holding a Go To Meeting to review the document.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that we can schedule a Go To Meeting if needed. She added that it is our intent that the report represents the best thinking of the Council. With regard to the media event, we recommend that we schedule a media event in Olympia to coincide with our release of the report to the Governor. Members of the Council would transmit the report to the Governor and appropriate members of the Legislature. A press conference would provide the Council with an opportunity to explain in its own words the rationale behind the recommendations.

Chair Moser commented that the Go To Meeting needs to be a public meeting, and provide a conference call in number so that the public can listen in. She noted that for Transportation Commission meetings, they typically have some members attend in person at WSDOT Headquarters, and the rest call in. This provides a way for the public to attend the meeting in Olympia.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) replied that staff would research options for accommodating the public. He asked Council members to return comments as soon as possible, so there is ample time to return the report around, and possibly provide more than one review cycle. He added that the Go To Meeting would be held after the June 15th comment deadline.

Council Member Garvett asked if we need to submit the report before July 1st, since that is the date the Council is set to disband.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that the media event could potentially be held after July 1.

Council Member Field asked if the Council needs to take action on the system plan document.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT Aviation) responded that the Council received the first draft of the system plan in February, but that the team would like the Council to review the revised draft and provide any comments or suggested changes. He added that we view the system plan as the supporting information to the Council's recommendation. It is important for the council to review the document for consistency with the recommendations.

Chair Moser commented that the media event provides us with the opportunity to highlight what we think are the most important points about the report and our recommendations. She added that it is critical to get the right messaging out when we release the report.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.