LONG-TERM AIR TRANSPORTATION STUDY (LATS)

Washington State Aviation Planning Council

MEETING SUMMARY

March 6, 2008

Present:

Council Members:	Jim McNamara, Dave Field, John Townsley, John Sibold, Penni Loomis, Neal Sealock, Don Garvett, Juli Wilkerson, Paul Roberts, and Carol Moser.
Staff:	John Shambaugh, Nisha Marvel, and Marilee Pribble
Consultant Team:	David Williams (WHP), Sara Funk (WHP), Sonjia Murray (SH&E) John Yarnish (URS), Rita Brogan (PRR), and Kimbra Wellock (PRR)
Guest Speakers:	Mike Meigs (FAA), Jack Scott (FAA), Leonard Bauer (CTED), Kerri Woehler (WSDOT)

Meeting Objectives

Chair Moser opened the meeting and reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda:

- Review of aviation legislation and policy
- Understand access, preservation and safety issues
- Concurrence on Council Purpose and Need Statement

Introductions

Council members, staff, and consultants introduced themselves and their role on the Council.

Neal Sealock: Commercial Airport Operator

John Townsley: Eastern Washington General Public Representative

David Field: FAA Technical Expert

Juli Wilkerson: Director, Washington State Department of Community Trade and Economic Development (CTED)

Penni Loomis: Washington Airport Management Association Representative

Paul Roberts: Western Washington General Public Representative

Chair Carol Moser: Transportation Commission Member

John Sibold: WSDOT Aviation Director

Don Garvett: Airline Representative

Rita Brogan, Council Staff, PRR, Inc.

Kimbra Wellock, Council Staff, PRR, Inc.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff, WSDOT Aviation

Sonja Murray, SH&E, Technical Consultant

Public Comment

Chair Moser encouraged members of the public to complete a comment form, and then opened the floor for 10 minutes of public comment.

Stuart Weiss, resident of the Rainier Beach area, stated that he is a lifelong resident of Seattle and said that the United States Congress enacted criminal legislation that allows jet planes to make as much noise as they want and put as much poison into the air as they want. If people did this they would be imprisoned and fined. This Council is not looking at other locations for a regional airport. This is another attempt to keep airplane mobsters at SeaTac. We have higher rates of disease, lung cancer and emphysema. We want more regional airports, to give SeaTac-area residents some relief.

Ben Stark, resident of Des Moines, spoke about his concerns about global warming. Mr. Stark would like the Council to consider spreading out the impact of traffic around airports by recommending adding more airport capacity in other parts of the state. This would spread out the traffic impact to other areas, rather than having all the impact concentrated around SeaTac.

Russell Porterfield, resident of Bremerton, stated that this was his first Council meeting. Mr. Porterfield is interested in increasing aviation activity in Bremerton and stated that he plans to attend all future Council meetings.

George Hadley, is the Mayor Pro Tem of Normandy Park. Mr. Hadley stated that Senator Kaiser would have polled citizens if she wanted air transportation decisions to be made by citizens. The legislature wants to hear recommendations from knowledgeable people, which is why the Council was selected. Council members were selected to represent all interests, to look at what is best for all groups and stakeholders. Mr. Hadley stated that cities most affected by commercial aviation at SeaTac do not have a representative on the Council. Places such as Burien and Normandy Park have fought long for protections from SeaTac and the third runway. We want to

keep those protections. The Council's job is to determine where capacity is needed in next 25 years – more runways, airports, to serve future needs. It's for the next generation. Where are they going to be flying to and from?

Council Member Sealock pointed out that that Council members were appointed based on our backgrounds, not as representatives of specific groups, per the Council's enabling legislation.

Approve February 7, 2008 Meeting Summary

Chair Moser requested a revision on page 2 to state that she spoke with John Elder, a staff member in Senator Karen Kaiser's office, and not to Senator Kaiser.

Chair Moser asked for additional revisions to the February 7 Meeting Summary. Motion to adopt the February 7 Meeting Summary by Council Member Field. Seconded by Council Member Sealock. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Previous Meeting Follow Up

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) provided updates on items discussed and questions raised at the February 7th meeting.

- Relationship between Council recommendations and the 2010 update of the Washington Transportation Plan (WTP) update: Mr. Shambaugh reported that a specific process for the 2010 update has not yet been developed and proposed to invite representatives for the Transportation Commission, OFM, and WSDOT planning staff to the Council's June meeting to discuss SSB 5412 and how the Council's work will fit with the WTP update.

  Chair Moser pointed out that unfunded needs in the current WTP for aviation represent low and medium priorities and that Council needs to address this.

  Mr. Shambaugh responded that only 2% of needs mandates in the WTP are aviation-specific, which represents 4 projects. These four projects were forwarded to the Transportation Commission for inclusion in the WTP because we did not have data to support other projects. This Council may help further define issues to consider in the 2010 update.

- The LATS webpage has been updated to state that LATS briefings will be offered to anyone who requests one.

- Council members had requested the support of an economist to help determine economic impact of alternatives under consideration by the Council. Mr. Shambaugh proposed inviting an economist involved in economic impact analysis done by the state in 2002 to make a presentation during the alternatives analysis phase and to provide support to examine alternatives under consideration by the Council.

- Council members had requested information to understand existing policies and status of implementation. Mr. Shambaugh reported that a white paper on this topic is provided in this month's Council packet.

- Airport directors have been invited to the April Council meeting to hear the information being presented and to serve as subject matter experts to address Council questions.

- The work program has been updated to include the Council meeting schedule. The schedule is also provided on the Council meeting agenda.

- Subcommittees – Chair Moser and council staff will be meeting in the upcoming week to discuss a subcommittee structure. An update will be provided at the April meeting.

Access, Preservation, and Safety Panel

AVIATION SAFETY OVERVIEW

Mike Meigs, from the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Office of Runway Safety gave a presentation on the FAA's safety initiatives and outlined aviation safety issues for the Council to consider.

The FAA Flight Plan is the agency's strategic plan to help achieve the lowest possible accident rate and constantly improve safety. Today's presentation will focus on efforts to reduce commercial air carrier fatalities, reduce the number of fatal accidents in general aviation, and to reduce the risk of runway incursions.

The FAA has a target to cut the rate of air carrier fatalities per 100 million persons on board in half by 2025. In FY 07, the fatality rate was 8.88 per 100 million persons. The FY 2012 goal is 7.649; the FY 2025 goal is 4.44. Initiatives to reduce air carrier fatalities include:

- Increasing availability of Required Navigation Performance Procedures (more precise instruments)
- Expand cost-effective safety oversight
- Continue accident human factors research
- Streamline and improve the Notice to Airmen process
- Upgrading runway safety areas
- Promote national data sharing and analysis on accidents and incidents

The FAA's goal in 2007 was to reduce the number of general aviation and non-scheduled Part 135 fatal accidents to 331. In FY07, there were 314 fatal general aviation accidents. Initiatives to reduce fatal accidents in general aviation include:

- Implementing new technologies to increase pilot situational awareness
- Increase availability of WAAS approaches – this will provide horizontal and vertical guidance (currently only horizontal guidance is available)
- Continuing research on human factors to reduce safety risks, including training and outreach through the FAA Safety Team

- Expanding and accelerating safety and air navigation programs in Alaska

The FAA's goal is to reduce Category A and B (the most serious type) runway incursions to a rate of no more than 0.530 per million operations. A runway incursion is when there is an "incorrect presence" of a person, or vehicle on a runway surface. The most common incursion happens when pilot crosses the hold line by mistake. Runway incursions are only counted at tower controlled airports because at no-tower airports there is no reliable reporting authority.

Runway incursions fall into four categories, A, B, C and D. The FY07 rate was 0.393 per million operations. Most runway incursions fall into category D, the least serious type. In FY 07, there were 31 A and B events. Twelve have occurred so far this year. While these events are not very common, the FAA takes them very seriously as they present a tremendous risk.

Initiatives to reduce runway incursions include:

- Improved training for pilots, ATC, mechanics, and other airport users
- Improved procedures and standards
- Improved evaluations of risks
- Modifying and improving surface movement technology infrastructure

Mr. Meigs noted that tools are mainly for air traffic controllers. Tools to help pilots are in development, which may be more appropriate for non-tower airports.

Council Member Sibold noted that Washington State has been proactive with general aviation to work with the FAA to improve safety at small airports.

Sonja Murray asked for data on Washington State's incursion rate.

Council Member Wilkerson asked for information on the most common causes of runway incursions.

Mr. Meigs responded that one third of incidents are caused by operator error (mostly by pilots). Vehicles (mostly driven by airport workers) cause about 15-20% of incidents. Runway incursions from outside sources are rare.

Airport-related safety initiatives include:

- Installing Runway Safety Areas to Part 139 airports (87% complete by 2010)
- Airspace Program, to review/approve proposed construction and changes, a critical component of the effort to make RNP/WAAS approaches possible
- Standard signs and markings – mandatory for Part 139
- Drivers training improvements to ensure knowledge of proper procedures

Runway safety issues at uncontrolled airports include – Mr. Meigs provided photos to illustrate key issues:

- Airport design – confusing taxiway/runway layout
- Security – control of runways/taxiways
- Airport information – providing accurate information to pilots

- Standard signs and markings
- Clear runway safety areas
- Communications

Council Member Townsley stated that there have been serious accidents at non-tower controlled airports and asked if voluntary reporting data would help the Council understand the risks at non-towered airports.

Mr. Meigs responded that this data provides some value.

Council Member Townsley asked if Washington-specific data is available to help the Council identify safety hotspots at non-towered facilities.

Mr. Meigs responded that NASA is the best source of data. Pilot survey data is helpful as well, but there may be some gaps.

Council Member McNamara asked if the FAA applies its programs to both towered and non-towered facilities.

Mr. Meigs responded yes, but only for commercial service.

Mr. Meigs encouraged the Council to consider the following issues in its work:

- Proper airport design
    - Geometry – full length taxiways, etc
    - Compliant runway safety areas
    - Signs and markings
- Land use compatibility
    - Support FAR Part 77 airspace protection
    - Wildlife hazards
- Improved instrument approaches
    - Airports must meet IFR design standards to be eligible
- Airport information
    - Publications
    - Weather cameras, other weather reporting
- Pilot education

Council Member Sealock pointed out that airports not in compliance with regulations and RCWs can lose access to state funds.

Chair Moser noted that safety is a top concern in the Washington Transportation Plan for highways and pointed out the interesting parallels between highway and aviation safety issues.

AIRPORT PAVEMENT PRESERVATION

Jack Scott, Regional Pavement Engineer, from FAA's Northwest Region gave a presentation on Pavement Preservation. Pavement preservation is an integral part of safety. Deferred

maintenance can also affect capacity, as rehabilitation takes longer than repair, keeping airport runways out of service longer.

The following factors affect pavement quality:

- Wheel Loads - one wheel of an aircraft carries as much weight as 18 wheels of a semi.
- Locked Wheel Turns – airports require high stability pavement, which is different and more expensive than highway pavement mixtures.
- Foreign Objects - objects on a highway may cause windshield damage, but the potential damage to planes can be much greater, potentially damaging the aircraft and potentially destroying an engine.
- Jet Blasts – pavement must be well bonded to protect against jet blasts, which can blow out pavement layers.
- Grooved Pavement - all runways have grooved payment. Good drainage is needed to prevent hydroplaning as plane tires do not have same treads as trucks.
- Temperature Extremes – summer heat causes pavement to expand; winter temperatures cause pavement to contract, leading to cracks in pavement. Cracked pavement can cause planes to lose control at high speeds. This is more of a problem in eastern Washington.
- Oxidation is an issue in arid areas (high desert, eastern Washington, less so in Seattle). The bituminous binder in asphalt degrades, leading to foreign object debris (FOD).
- Differential Frost Heave – the sun affects painted and unpainted areas differently creating uneven pavement.

Pavement maintenance and repair is cheaper than replacement. Pavement should be maintained above 70 on the pavement condition index (PCI). Above 70 PCI, pavement can be maintained with preventative maintenance. Pavement will require major rehabilitation between 40 and 70 PCI. Below 40 PCI, reconstruction is required

Pavement can be maintained in a variety of ways:

- Crack and joint sealing
- Fog and other seal coats
- Spall repairs
- Patching

Crack and joint sealing:

- Extends pavement service life.
- Prevents water intrusion, which can lead to loss of support in base and sub base, cracking, and potholes.
- Keeps stones and rocks (incompressibles) out of pavement cracks which can lead to foreign object damage, cause edges to push up during expansion, and decrease rideability.

Mr. Scott highlighted key issues relating to pavement preservation for the Council to consider:

- There is a direct link between preservation and safety.

- Capital preservation decisions should be guided by lowest lifecycle costs as well as initial investment amounts.
- Pavement maintenance programs should be implemented by airports to reduce catastrophic infrastructure failure.
- Pavement condition index performance standards are established as part of LATS.

PLANNING UNDER THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT

Leonard Bauer from CTED's Growth Management Services presented information on the Growth Management Act.

The Growth Management Act (GMA), adopted in 1990, sets forth a statewide system for land use planning. Washington State is one of only three states with a comprehensive growth management strategy.

Washington State's population continues to grow, with one million more people added to the population every 12 years.

Council Member Townsley asked how growth is projected by ethnicity.

Mr. Bauer responded that this information is available on the OFM website. In general, household sizes are smaller, urban areas are growing, and the State's population is growing older.

The GMA establishes 14 planning goals – all must be addressed and balanced in comprehensive plans.

- Sprawl reduction
- Urban growth
- Transportation
- Housing
- Economic development
- Property rights
- Timely permitting
- Natural resources industries
- Open space and recreation
- Environmental protection
- Citizen participation
- Public facilities and services
- Historic lands and buildings
- Shoreline management

Growth management basics:

- 20-year growth projections must be accommodated in plans
- Urban growth boundaries, rural and natural resource lands
- Consistency and coordination

- Local decisions (cities and counties)
- Early and continuous public involvement.

Countywide planning policies set a framework for local plans to designate and plan for urban growth areas, set the process for siting essential public facilities, consider affordable housing needs, and plan for economic development.

No local comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public facilities. Airports are identified as essential public facilities.

Chair Moser asked if there have been recommendations in previous aviation planning efforts around this issue and asked if the legislature was taking action this year, following the failure to pass concurrency legislation last year.

Leonard Bauer replied that no bills have been filed this year. It is a big issue – local control is sacred, but there is a need at times to supersede local control in order to address a statewide interest. Some counties have established a single process for siting essential public facilities (such as Spokane), while in other places the approach varies city by city.

Council Member Garvett asked if federal preemption ever applies.

Leonard Bauer responded no.

Council Member Roberts noted that the GMA specifically addresses development around airports, and said that this is an issue that the Council needs to discuss in detail to determine if this provision is working.

Council Member McNamara agreed that this is an issue and that the Council should discuss. He noted that land use compatibility was one of the lowest performing areas in LATS Phase II, and said that the Council should be looking at how to improve in this area.

Leonard Bauer outlined the elements of comprehensive plans: land use, housing, capital facilities, transportation, utilities, rural (counties only), and the Shoreline Master Program.

Counties, cities, and towns with general aviation airports must discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to the airport through the comprehensive plan and development regulations.

Council Member Sealock noted that there is often a breakdown at the local level, that during the development review process exceptions are made that little by little break down protections for airports.

Council Member Townsley asked if CTED looks at airport incompatibility when it approves comprehensive plans.

Leonard Bauer responded that CTED does review plans and looks for evidence that there has been communication between the local government and the airport.

Council Member Roberts noted that while CTED has a role to play, they are not in a position to deal with all these issues at the local level.

Council Member Sibold added that federal, state, and local government need to work together to protect the nationwide aviation system. It requires political will. The Council may wish to consider recommendations that bring some standardization to this problem.

Leonard Bauer added that it is easier to prevent land use compatibility issues before the land is developed, rather than after development has occurred.

Coordination between cities, counties and state is an important aspect of the GMA. Cities may not preclude siting of essential public facilities. State policies must implement local comprehensive plans. Cities must evaluate land use impacts on state transportation facilities. Transportation planning occurs regionally as well as locally.

The GMA established three Growth Management Hearings Boards which have jurisdiction over plans and regulations. In partially planning communities, disputes are handled by the courts.

Council Member Townsley noted that appeals to the hearings boards seem to stop things, rather than help make things happen.

Leonard Bauer clarified that the role of the hearing board is to look at whether or not a city/county action is consistent with the GMA, to see if the language of a plan is consistent with its interpretation of the GMA. Bauer noted that there is a 60-day window for appeals to be filed.

Mr. Bauer continued that comprehensive plans and development regulations must be reviewed, and revised, if needed, every seven years. Statutory updates must address GMA amendments, include 20-year growth projections, and adapt to changing local conditions. Updates are allowed once per year.

Key questions for the Council to consider are:

- What are future plans of Washington cities and counties for accommodating the next 20 years of growth?
- How do those plans affect the need for and ability to provide, air transportation service?
- How can airports best coordinate their master plans with city and county comprehensive plans?

Chair Moser noted that this might be a good topic for a subcommittee to address.

WSDOT AVIATION'S AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM

Kerri Woehler, WSDOT gave a presentation on WSDOT's airport and land use compatibility program. Land use compatibility is concerned with the location of development in relation to

runway, the height of structures near runways, and the types or land uses near airports, basically, how will those uses interact with runway operations. Airports are concerned with land uses that are noise sensitive, that generate smoke, or uses that attract wildlife.

Public-use airports are recognized as essential public facilities because they provide transportation access, promote and support economic development, provide capacity to the state and federal air transportation system, and enable emergency response and disaster relief.

Airport land use compatibility is an important part of WSDOT's efforts to promote safety, preservation, mobility, environment, and stewardship, which are legislatively mandated transportation planning goals.

The consequences of incompatible development include:

- Reduces airspace needed to support advanced technologies
- Impedes airport expansion required to accommodate future growth
- Generates political opposition to existing and future airport activities
- Increases exposure to noise, risk and other undesirable impacts

Photos of Evergreen Field in Vancouver were shown to illustrate the issue, which resulted in the airport's closure. The closure also resulted in a loss of aircraft storage space and capacity in a growing area of the State.

Council Member Wilkerson asked what the influence of Portland International Airport is given its close proximity to Vancouver.

Kerri Woehler responded that as a general aviation airport, Evergreen served a different role than Portland International Airport.

Council Member McNamara asked what the impact of Evergreen's closure was on aircraft storage at Pearson airport.

Kerri Woehler responded that it e exacerbated the problem of inadequate general aviation storage capacity.

Sonja Murray, SH&E (Council Staff) noted that the loss of general aviation activity means loss of revenue.

Kerri Woehler continued with her presentation, noting that all stakeholders have responsibility for airport land use compatibility planning, including airport constituents, airport sponsors, cities, counties, regional planning organizations, port districts, state and federal governments.

WSDOT Aviation plays an important role in airport land use compatibility planning by:

- Facilitating coordination
- Providing tools and resources
- Answering questions
- Reviewing draft policies and regulations

- Providing formal comment at hearings

There is a perception of a lack of urgency about the airport land use compatibility issue. It can appear that airports are surrounded by compatible uses, but if planning does not happen before development occurs, the chance to prevent incompatible uses is lost. There is also a lack of understanding about the issues. Given that planning is based on local wishes, it can be difficult to protect airports, even though it is an important state goal.

Council Member Sealock pointed out that the FAA is allowed to weigh in on the issue of height control through the submittal of 7460. Other areas are left to policy. The system breaks down when exceptions to zoning are made.

Council Member McNamara raised the issue of counter staff decisions on development review that go against the comprehensive plan. Work needs to be done at the City or County Council level to ensure that this is not allowed to happen.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) stated that determining land use compatibility is a local decision.

Council Member Roberts responded that he understood the issue raised by Council Member McNamara, but feels that it is something that should be resolved at the Council (elected) level.

Council Member Sealock agreed, but noted that if something is omitted from local regulation, the legal decision is that it is allowed. The real challenge is ensuring adequate oversight. Otherwise, protection for airports against incompatible development erodes over time.

Kerri Woehler noted that WSDOT is working with pilot associations to help them understand the importance of planning.

Leonard Bauer noted that CTED is in the process of updating the administrative rules governing the GMA and encouraged the Council to provide comments.

Chair Moser noted that a lot of decisions that have impacts on issues such as airport land use compatibility are not made intentionally by local officials, stating that often times elected officials do not necessarily have a strong planning background, and they sometimes unintentionally make decisions that negatively impact airports. Elected officials and Planning Commissions need to have access to information so that they can make informed decisions.

Kerri Woehler noted that there is often a perception that airport land use compatibility is not an urgent issue. However, if the appropriate regulations are not in place, municipalities lack the tools to proactively plan for airports.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that it is important to communicate that good planning can preserve both airports and the quality of life for residents.

Council Member Sealock noted that there are competing demands and policies at play when trying to plan. We need to use the term "irreplaceable" when talking about airport planning. It is impossible to replace Evergreen. We are not building new airports, so we need to safeguard what we have. The Council should talk about enforcement and look at changing RCWs so that they not only discourage incompatible land uses, but prohibit development of incompatible uses around airports.

KEY ISSUES & CHALLENGES

Sara Funk, WH Pacific presented information on findings from LATS Phases I and II relating to the airport classification system and access, preservation and safety issues.

There are six state airport classifications:

- Commercial Service Airports (16 airports)
- Regional Service Airports (19 airports)
- Community Service Airports (23 airports)
- Local Service Airports (33 airports)
- Recreation or Remote Airports (39 airports)
- Seaplane Bases (9 airports)

Performance of Washington State's airports against the state's performance objectives:

- All but one percent of the state's residents live within 90 minutes of a regional service or commercial service airport
- Airports with pavements currently perform well on pavement condition objectives
- Land use protection is inadequate for airports in all classifications
- The availability of navigation equipment is a weakness in the performance of the state air transportation system.
- Development of a new northeast Washington airport near Colville is recommended to achieve the state's goal of providing adequate access to Regional Service Airports
- Development of a new Regional Service Airport may be needed in Southeast Washington, as the area's current Regional Service Airport (Kelso-Longview) is located approximately 1 hour from the population Center (Vancouver)

Access – 99% of the State's population is within 90 minutes of a commercial service or regional service airport.

Ms. Funk presented information on condition of pavement for runways, taxiways, and aprons compared to state performance objectives.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) encouraged the Council to review the executive summary of the PCI report and noted that the Council may wish to consider establishing different PCIs based on airport use.

Ms. Funk presented information on land use protection issues identified during LATS Phase I and II:

- Compliance with land use objectives is lower than in other measures

- Only 35% of airports are protected by comprehensive plan policies
- Only 22% of airports are protected by zoning ordinances
- 53% of airports have height hazard controls

Chair Moser asked if the cell tower construction and other related development contributes to the low level of compliance with land use objectives.

Council Member Sibold responded that this is not a serious issue today, but it could become more of an issue in the future.

Council Member Roberts commented that larger airports tend to do a better job at planning for expansion needs than smaller airports. It is a two-way street; airports need to help themselves as well as local government undertaking adequate planning.

Council Member Sealock agreed with Roberts, but noted that funding is an issue, particularly for general aviation airports.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) added that a good policy foundation is needed, and zoning regulations are the key to a strong foundation.

Council Member Garvett asked if airports are all considered to be essential public facilities, are some airports more important than others.

Council Member Roberts noted that all airports are essential, but some more so than others. Airports are essential, but are hard to site.

Council Member McNamara commented that he finds it hard to believe that we have too many airports – it is not likely an argument one will hear.

Council Member Garvett raised the issue of airport consolidation in areas where there are two airports – if land use compatibility is an issue, consolidation might be a good solution.

Council Member Roberts responded that it is a fair question, something to explore.

Sara Funk, WH Pacific continued with her presentation to present information on how well airports comply with instrument approach procedure objectives – this is an important indicator of all-weather, 24-hour airport access, which opens an airport to many types of aircraft to support economic development, emergency medical transportation, and business aviation uses:

- Commercial service – 63%
- Regional service – 37%
- Community service – 22%

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that the instrument approach procedures objective supports the safety and economic development objectives in the Washington Transportation Plan.

Council Member Townsley asked if seaplanes were included in the data.

Council Member Sibold responded yes and added that it may not be possible for Lake Washington seaplane base planes to comply with this performance measure. It may make sense to remove seaplanes from the mix for this objective.

Sara Funk, WH Pacific presented information on airport compliance with other safety-related performance objectives, including runway safety area and weather reporting performance assessments. Ms. Funk noted that while local service and recreation/remote airports performed poorly on the runway safety area performance assessment (17% and 15% compliance respectively), it may be harder to justify funding as these airports are not used as much.

Summary of key points for Council consideration:

- General points: Classifying airports by system role and setting performance objectives for classifications can help prioritize airport investments to achieve access, preservation, safety, and other goals.
- Access: Washington's residents have good airport access, but more airports need to be all-weather.
- Preservation: Airport pavement preservation has been far more successful than airport preservation (land use compatibility).
- Safety: Smaller airports are less successful at meeting safety objectives than larger airports.

Council Member Townsley asked if inclusion of seaplanes in data will impede the Council's understanding of issues when it comes time to make a recommendation.

Council Member Sibold asked if seaplane data should be pulled out and analyzed separately, adding that staff should decide and ensure that it is clear to the Council.

Rita Brogan, Council Staff (PRR) posed discussion questions to the Council:

- Should the state play a broader role in assuring land development that protects air and airport neighbors?

  Chair Moser stated that the issue of incompatible land use affects a variety of land uses besides airports, such as correctional facilities.

  Council Member Loomis thanked WSDOT Aviation for its land use compatibility work, but noted that it is incumbent on local communities to deal with this issue and stated that she is not in favor of bigger state government. The aviation community needs to avail itself of resources available to protect it.

  Council Member Garvett noted that airports are located in individual communities, but they serve a wider interest that may require attention at state and national levels of government as well.

Council Member Wilkerson added that the Growth Management Act contains provisions for projects of statewide significance, stating that she is willing to look at whether or not it would make sense to consider making the statewide aviation system plan a project of statewide significance. She noted that changing the Growth Management Act to deal with all land use issues the state is facing will take a lot of political will. It is an area she can help facilitate if the Council wants to explore this path.

Council Member Roberts added that we need to recognize that there are two dynamics at play here – policy dynamics and what is happening in local communities. At the policy level, the state has changed statutes to protect airports. But at the community level, development encroachment may have happened before regulations protecting airports were in place. We need to plan for the expansion of airports – this happens at the local level – and identify strategies to help communities deal with incompatible land uses.

Council Member Field added that he feels that there is a role for the state to play in this area. The state's emphasis should be on protection.

Council Member Sealock agrees with the discussion relating to policy, but noted that the challenge is on the execution side.

Council Member Wilkerson asked for examples of situations where exceptions have been made and are causing problems, stating that we need to fully understand the issues before we can know what changes need to be made in state law.

Council Member Sealock responded that he would be willing to help gather information on this issue.

Council Member McNamara added that he is not sure the state needs to play a broader role, but possibly a different role. It may not take a change in state law, adding that as Kerri Woehler pointed out, there is a perception of lack of urgency. The state could help increase awareness of the issue. Local jurisdictions are focused on job creation. Housing and shopping center development creates jobs, and it is a more immediate payoff. Airport protection may contribute to economic development, but it is a longer term prospect. We may have the right tools, but we are not using them fully. Airport representatives do not go to hearing boards. They will come to a development hearing for a subdivision project, but at that point, it is too late.

Council Member Wilkerson asked if compliance with performance objectives is required to get state grants.

Council Member Sibold responded that the state is moving in this direction – local communities cannot obtain grants if its comprehensive plan does not include protections for airports. Council Member Sibold added that they just published an introduction to land use planning for airport advocates with the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. Airport advocates need to be made aware of these issues, and airport advocates need to

get involved by obtaining seats on planning councils and other elected positions in order to make a difference.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) added that one recommendation could be to strengthen guidance in countywide plans for airport compatibility. RTPOs are required to review plans and provide comments, but currently, only PSRC does this. AIRTRAC put this recommendation forward.

Chair Carol Moser added that we may need further clarification in the RCWs to prevent exceptions from being made in the development review process that threaten airports.

Council Member Wilkerson suggested that instead of amending laws, we could work to build awareness of the issues. The Council could recommend working within existing laws, but focus on technical assistance and education or possibly propose to withhold state funding to cities and counties that are not in compliance with Growth Management Act provisions.

Council Member McNamara replied that that approach only works if the local jurisdiction is reported.

Council Member Townsley added that it could be helpful to facilitate communication between the levels of government that touch this issue.

- Does having an airport classification system make sense? Does it make sense to have different performance objectives for each classification?

  Council Member Sealock defers to WSDOT Aviation on this issue. If a classification system is necessary, to what use, and to what benefit to WSDOT Aviation. There is no other rationalization for it.

  Council Member Sibold stated that it is impossible to maintain airports to the same standard. The classification system helps us to prioritize limited funding.

  Council Member Loomis responded that there is a concern that smaller airports will be excluded from funding if classification system is put into place. All airports are part of the state system, and funding is necessary in some shape or form. It might help to distinguish between NPIAS and non-NPIAS airports and base state funding considerations on whether or not airports are eligible for federal funds.

  John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) added that performance objectives are based on airport use and noted that the Council may want to raise these questions when we talk about how we arrived at the classification system. The performance objectives are tied to future trends.

  Council Member Sealock added that it makes sense that the classification system may enable informed funding decisions.

Council Member Field added that we need to be careful about encouraging access to an airport that doesn't meet safety standards.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that classifications are logical for establishing and executing policy.

Chair Moser noted that state highways are classified using level of service standards. It makes sense to bring a classification system to the aviation system.

Council Member Garvett agreed with Moser.

- Does it make sense to establish funding priorities based on performance objectives and classification system?

  Council Member Townsley asked if it makes sense to establish different standards based on use. For example, relaxing standards for recreation/remote airports would reduce infrastructure costs, but increase risk.

  Council Member Sealock asked how much state funding is dedicated to aviation?

  Council Member Sibold responded that state funding is $1 million per year (excluding funds given to large Commercial Aviation airports), which is leveraged with additional $4-$5 million in FAA funding. In contrast, over $300 million is needed to address pavement needs in the next six years. Choices must be made given funding limitations.

  Council Member Sealock added that funding sources cannot meet all of the system's needs. The Council will not be able to impact distribution of AIP funds.

  Council Member Field responded that we may not be able to influence funding for next year, but over time it might be possible. In theory, NPIAS integrates all state plans. The Council work could influence future funding decisions relating to NPIAS. Funding is a key issue that the Council needs to address.

  Council Member Townsley noted that ensuring safety standards are met requires adequately trained personnel and highly skilled workforce. It seems appropriate for the Council to address human infrastructure needs. Enrollment in mechanic school is dropping, and in pilot school enrollment is flat. There may be a place to address some of these issues with policy recommendations.

  Council Member Sibold responded that the Governor is aware of these issues, and the Council could tie into that work.

  Council Member Townsley added that airports need to be accessible airports to entice interest in aviation.

Aviation Legislation and Policy Review Legislative Overview

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that today's presentation is intended as an introduction to the topic and encouraged the Council to review the white paper provided in its packets as this topic will be covered in greater detail at the April meeting.

Mr. Shambaugh provided an overview of aviation legislation:

Early Aviation Legislation

- Municipal Airports Act, 1941
- Municipal Airports Act, 1945
- Airport Zoning, 1945
- RCW 47.68

More recent legislation:

- Growth Management Act
- RCW 47.04.280 which establishes five policy goals for the planning, operation, performance of, and investment in the state's transportation system: preservation, safety, mobility, environment, stewardship

Mr. Shambaugh continued with a review of previous policy planning efforts including AIRTRAC, the Washington State Aviation Policy, and the Washington Transportation Plan.

AIRTRAC (1993)

- Calls for a larger state role in transportation planning
- Builds on State's "bottom-up" approach to planning
- Sets forth 33 recommendations in 5 broad policy areas - all but 14 have been implemented

Council Member McNamara asked for information on the impact of the implemented recommendations, and wanted to know if they had the intended affect.

Washington State Aviation Policy (1998)

- Identifies the State's interest in aviation
- Provides short-term strategies rather than long-term policy direction
- All recommendations have been implemented or are being addressed by current planning efforts

Washington Transportation Plan (2007-2027)

- Sets forth commendations under five investment guidelines: preservation, safety, economic vitality, mobility, environmental quality and health
- Only two recommendations are specific to aviation
- Aviation Planning Council recommendations to inform the 2010 update

Chair Moser noted that aviation projects in the Washington Transportation Plan represented lower and medium priority projects and added that the Council needs to elevate the status of aviation in the Washington Transportation Plan.

Mr. Shambaugh identified comment themes in previous policy efforts:

- Air transportation is a critical part of the state's transportation system
- Air transportation is critical to the State's economy
- A greater State role is needed:
  - Multi-modal coordination
  - Land use compatibility
  - Environmental mitigation
  - Resolving conflict
- Funding resources are limited

Mr. Shambaugh summarized his presentation noting that:

- AIRTRAC focused attention on need to integrate air transportation into existing local comprehensive plans and regional transportation planning
- WA State Transportation Policy identifies gaps in the state aviation system and makes recommendations to address system shortfalls

Looking forward:

- Transportation Commission will look to the Aviation Planning Council to inform aviation policy recommendations in the 2010 WTP update
- 1998 Policy focus was on preserving existing capacity; we need to address adding new capacity to the system in the next 25 years
- Greater state role is needed
- Need to refocus thinking on a system-wide approach

Council Member Townsley asked that Council staff identify the most relevant background materials on the resource list.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) advised the Council to review executive summaries whenever possible.

Council Member Sealock encouraged the Council to look beyond bricks and mortar issues to include industry views, air cargo issues, and other emerging issues. Washington's aviation system is an entrance to the national system. It needs to be sustained and accessible to the industry – if not, the industry will move elsewhere. We need to identify capacity needs.

Sonja Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) added that next generation aircraft will be an important issue to address.

Council Member Garvett added that competition from China and other parts of Asia, and new technology are changing the air cargo industry.

Mr. Shambaugh noted that industry experts will be addressing the Council at future meetings to discuss commercial and general aviation trends, including domestic and international issues, and freight issues. We anticipate seeing an increase in charter travel and smaller jet traffic. We need to understand how we are going to meet new demand.

Chair Moser added that Washington has an amazing transportation system with amazing staff in every division; we are further ahead of many other states. The Council has great potential to influence how the state will work on air transportation in the future.

Actions – Concurrence on Purpose and Needs Statement

Chair Moser reviewed changes to the Council Purpose and Need Statement, made in response to discussion at the February meeting and entertained a motion to concur. Motion to concur on Purpose and Need Statement by Sealock. Seconded by Field. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Work Program Update
No updates were discussed.

Next Steps

The Council agreed to a 9:00 am start time for the April meeting in order to accommodate the longer agenda.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that representatives from WSDOT Strategic Planning, OFM, and Transportation Commission will attend the June meeting to discuss SSB 5412.

Council Member Townsley asked if it made sense to have a speaker address workforce development issues at the May meeting.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that staff will look into this.

Council Member Wilkerson offered to help identify speakers.

Chair Moser closed the meeting at 2:55 pm.