

Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission

Meeting Summary

Location: ZOOM Meeting
Date: March 30, 2023
Time: 12:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Attendees: Warren Hendrickson, Tony Bean, Lorin Carr, Rep. Tom Dent, Steve Edmiston, Mark Englizian, Andrea Goodpasture, Wendy Janway, Eric Johnson, Shane Jones, Larry Krauter, Stroud Kunkle, Jim Kuntz, Rudy Rudolph, Robin Toth, Kerri Woehler and guests
Absent: Lois Bollenback, Sen. Karen Keiser, Sen. Curtis King, Rep. Tina Orwall, Robert Rodriguez, Jason Thibedeau, and Bryce Yadon

Welcome

Warren Hendrickson thanked those members who recently left the Commission for their contributions and welcomed all members and the audience to the March 2023 meeting of the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission (CACC).

Public Comment Period

James Halmo – Shared information regarding the two greenfield sites in Pierce County. Regarding distance, there is approximately 38 miles between Paine Field and SeaTac International, and 36 miles between Joint Base Lewis McChord (JBLM) and SeaTac. What is needed is four miles separation to the north of Paine Field and at least 40 miles south of the boundary to JBLM. To the south is Lewis County, a heavily forested area. If legislation still looks at greenfields, that is a fatal flaw, greenfields are largely associated with flood plains, shallow water, and low-level aquifers. Forested areas can easily be cleared with new access roads to I-5 and close to the railroad lines with construction of a spur line for trains to deliver aviation fuels. The two proposed Pierce County sites are on top of the central Pierce County's sole-source aquifer. Both the Department of Ecology and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency staffs are concerned with what is going on but they cannot comment. The Pierce County east side conflicts with the Bonneville Power high power line and the runway would have to go under the power line. The staff at Bonneville stated that they cannot move that major power line.

Stew Souders – Expressed his opposition to the Thurston County greenfield site. He is concerned with the proximity, the changes to the environment, property values, and struggles with the reality that Yakima would like to have a facility on the eastern side of the state. He asked the Commission to consider the impacts this is having on residents and recognize that everything is about trade-offs. There are probably better options out there.

Tim O'Brien – Representing the Enumclaw Plateau Community Association, knows Southeast King and Enumclaw Plateau has been in consideration throughout the process even though a final decision by the CACC is not allowed to consider that particular spot. The criteria used on that site to be considered by the consultant and WSDOT appears to be flawed, by the people that live here and know it much better than the consultants. It looks like it is near population and corridors but as you realize how far it is from the I-5 corridor and some of the geographical

barriers that make it difficult to get to, the cost and difficulties to build ground transportation would make it extremely difficult to use that site in southeast King Enumclaw Plateau as a viable site for the airport. The site is not physically large enough unless you want to fill in the large gorges that are a mile across (White River Gorge and Green River Gorge and valley). To bridge the gorges would be at least \$1 billion apiece and probably four to six bridges are needed. That does not include the other needed infrastructure. The time it takes now to drive from Tukwila or Seattle to the Enumclaw Plateau is 1 ½ hours with normal traffic and with the 90-minute cutoff, we are already there and it could be even more difficult in the future. There are terrain impacts that have not been fully considered. There are airspace constraints because it is already part of the SeaTac airspace design. He agrees with some of the other respondents that it would be better to consider a wider array of sites such as Yakima, who has already stated they would accept that proposal.

Jake Pool – I live in the Central Pierce County location. I'm one of the organizers of the coalition that is against the Graham, Eatonville, Roy airport. There's a whole laundry list of issues with the locations selected, the two in Pierce County and the one in Thurston, and it has been very clearly demonstrated that none of the sites are viable to move forward, so he highly encourages the voting members and the non-voting members to consider removing those sites and not proceed forward. The legislators have heard us and the majority have put out legislation to end this work and to proceed in a better manner with better parameters. He would hope that the Commission decides to remove the site now and release the public from the trauma that has been created and the environmental concerns. Move forward in a better productive manner with the new work group under [house bill] 1791 legislation that's sitting in the Senate right now.

Susan Cummings – is a resident of Thurston County and her home and farm are within the circle of the greenfield site that is proposed for Thurston. She is also the author of a petition on change.org proposing the Thurston site which, as of this morning has received 9,618 signatures. If any of the Commission members have not seen the petition so far, it was sent to the CACC earlier on, when it was originally posted in the fall. To reiterate everything that is in the petition: the concerns about environmental justice within the Nisqually tribe and the environmental threat to endangered species. This proposed site directly overlaps the McAllister Springs geological sensitive area and the wells there supply drinking water to most of Olympia and the Nisqually reservation. The group also questions the CACC's growth predictions for the aviation industry, and why is it a given that the aviation industry must grow unchecked in this region given the concerns about climate destruction. Also, why is high-speed rail not part of the discussion if we are looking to address growth in the region and addressing transportation needs for the future.

Jeff Cohen – The CACC insists on following the law, to select a site, while at the same time selectively ignoring the restriction against interfering with military operations. The Thurston site for example, overlaps significantly with a JBLM training area. The CACC paid over \$150,000 to consultants who specialize in community engagement, public affairs and social marketing, yet every one of the cities in and around the three sites were omitted from the CACC's public outreach while the CACC was claiming the goal was to reach us. We only learned about this plan from a random letter to the editor from one concerned resident. Only six of over 5,590 neighbors we connected with in a Facebook group, that we started on October 5th, were aware of the plan despite it being in progress for over three years. While the pandemic might have had

some impact on the CACC's work, we were all online even more and would have engaged if the CACC would have included us. Considering the unanimous opposition to these three sites from residents, all local leaders, the Tribes, JBLM, etc., he requests that the CACC put an end to the stress caused and remove the three greenfield sites from consideration immediately.

Kym Anton – Is a member of the Enumclaw Plateau Community Association, and our airport opposition group is named Save the Plateau. We haven't really reached out to the CACC because the Enumclaw site, we were told, was off the table for the CACC. It is our understanding that the Washington Aviation System Plan (WASP) did do analysis of the King County site as a fourth site and did not really disclose this publicly. When exploring the potential locations in King County, the WASP reviewed Enumclaw and found it to be unsuitable. We are concerned that the new work group would allow Enumclaw Plateau to be pursued as a host for a new airport despite the fact that both the WASP and the CACC saw the site as unsuitable for a new airport. There are several reasons why Enumclaw Plateau was rightfully excluded from consideration by the CACC and these reasons should not be ignored nor reconsidered. The King County Council has stated the Enumclaw Plateau is inappropriate for an airport given its ecological importance, the significant investments that have been made to improve salmon habitat, remove fish barriers, protect wetlands, watersheds, and preserve farmland. If the Legislature wants to reopen an airport study work group, we request that all King County sites are excluded from consideration.

Derek Peterson – I just wanted to re-emphasize, and I agree with, the Native Americans have an agreement that has been violated. The airspace overlaps with JBLM that is a violation. The Commission is volunteer, and they have done an outstanding job of trying to tackle this impossible task, but they have had their hands tied since they started. He just found out about this last year. Yakima does want this. None of the greenfield sites in this Commission's purview are viable. If they want to get with Yakima, they will have city, county, state, and Federal government resources for infrastructure which is not addressed with any of the sites in Thurston or Pierce counties. It will take a couple of hours to get over there, but if they build an infrastructure to get over there from Seattle, from Tacoma, from Olympia, people will go out there, and they need to consider that. I would appreciate them putting out to the public what their plans are. The last comment is that the public comments should probably come after you guys have had your say and given the update on where you stand.

Joe Zaichkin – Lives in the Graham area where Site 2 is, it could be right in the middle of the runway. He hears everybody speaking against this and is against it as well. We need to look at the big picture and see that something like this is probably going to happen. He does not want to see another three years of uncertainty going on if it will end up here anyway. Why not make our recommendation, and then move forward. He understands all the comments against it, but another three years of uncertainty isn't going to help either. So, either let us know that it is going to be here or let us know it is not going to be here. Do not pass a law and leave us waiting around another three years to figure out what is going on with our property.

Carol Green – Would like to comment on the few things that people have already said, and that is the stress that is being caused by the uncertainty to homeowners. In her neighborhood, it is someone thinking we are going to lose our homes for very little money and not knowing what is happening. It is very stressful to a lot of people. We have a lot of seniors in our neighborhood who do not know where they are going to go. She does not want it to be on her house, she lives

in Thurston County, but thinks something needs to be decided because people really are concerned, and it's stressful for all.

Public Engagement Update

Lynsey Burgess, PRR, shared the public engagement updates. The first slide was a recap of public engagement opportunities provided to date and the level of input received. The responses have been tremendous and we are so appreciative of the time and effort community members have put into sharing their thoughts.

Since starting the project, we have:

- fielded a statistically representative survey that went to 33,000 households;
- held three online open houses with more than 50,000 users,
 - received 64,537 multiple choice question answers, and more than 14,000 open-ended comments through those online open houses;
- 393 people attended two series of virtual public meetings;
- 419 attendees at a series of virtual drop-in sessions;
- our listserv goes out to 920 subscribers;
- have put out several infographics (*like the snippet of the one shown on the slide*);
- Christina and her team, and Warren have:
 - held dozens of briefings for community groups,
 - given media interviews,
 - worked with local government and elected officials,
 - held four meetings of our community-based organization working group; and
- the CACC inbox has received more than 2,500 emails.

Most recently, in March, we held an online open house looking for input before this meeting. That open house was up March 1-22, 2023, and a virtual public meeting was held on March 8 and 9. As with prior open houses, there were quite a few different language options, and a phone hotline version was available for those who could not access the online version. There were 349 comments received for that open house from nearly 14,000 unique users. Most of the input, consistent with the last open house, was about the sites currently being studied by the Commission. There was support given for a Yakima location, support for high-speed rail, opposition to any aviation expansion due to environmental concerns, frustration about the process or support for restarting with new legislation, and support for a location in Olympia. All this really boils down to this short statement, that overwhelmingly, we have heard that people want the state to meet the demand for aviation, particularly in a way that is environmentally sustainable. Also, most people say they do not want an airport in their backyard.

Discussion:

Steve E. commented about the presentation of results in December 2021, and even though it did not relate to the three sites, the numbers were still extraordinary. Even back then, 96 percent of the recommendations were the CACC should be environmentally responsible and 71 percent said that was extremely important. Steve asked PRR, based on the information from the public, is there anything you can use this information for to help us make a decision between the three sites?

Lynsey B. stated this was a tough question and was going to throw in a fourth site. There are people who have said they are opposed to expanding Paine Field but there is support for expanding capacity. People have encouraged us to use existing airports. Among the three greenfield sites, in terms of public input, there is not a strong difference in terms of numbers for or against any of those three sites.

Steve E. commented this information received from the public engagement feedback does not give a clear choice to help the commissioners.

Warren H. commented about the public outreach he has been involved in and shared that not a single local government or Tribal Nation is in favor of any of the three identified greenfield sites. However, Yakima would like to be considered as the preferred commercial aviation facility, though it is not one of the sites that has been studied.

Warren H. then discussed the current legislation, ESHB 1791, concerning the discontinuance of the existing CACC and the establishment of a new commercial aviation workgroup in its place.

Commission Chair Actions

David Fleckenstein, previous Commission Chair, has left the Commission so the Vice-Chair, Warren Hendrickson, has stepped in as Acting Chair. Warren started the discussion to select a new chair and reminded everyone that this decision, in keeping with past CACC practice, is a simple majority vote of all Commission members, both voting and non-voting. He also stated that having a voting member in the chair position would be his preference.

Warren H. commented with approximately only three months left for the Commission to complete its work, and if it is the will of the majority to continue status quo, he would reluctantly accept the chair position. He then opened the floor for nominations.

- Lorin Carr nominated Warren Hendrickson.
- Warren asked for any other nominations.
- Larry Krauter moved to close nominations and call for the question.
- Tony Bean seconded the motion.

Warren asked for discussion, there was none.

Warren called for a vote to close the nominations.

Voice vote conducted with no one opposed, nominations closed

Larry Krauter moved that Warren Hendrickson be appointed as the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission Chair.

Mark Englizian seconded.

No discussion

Voice vote conducted with no one opposed. Warren Hendrickson is appointed as chair.

Warren H. conducted a roll call of voting members to see if a quorum were in attendance.

Lorin Carr	Steve Edmiston	Mark Englizian	Andrea Goodpasture	Eric Johnson
Shane Jones	Larry Krauter	Stroud Kunkle	Jim Kuntz	Robin Toth

A quorum would need to be 12 voting members and 10 were in attendance. Warren discussed how the Commission decided on this number, which was not through legislation or law, rather

self-imposed by a simple majority vote of all members when approving the Charter. A final recommendation would require a 60 percent majority of 15 member positions which is nine.

Warren H. then asked if we should maintain the existing quorum or should the Commission consider an amendment to the Charter at this meeting to change the number of a quorum (nine) due to the limited time left to conduct business and the vacant voting member positions.

Mark E. asked if we needed a quorum to change that.

Warren H. stated a quorum is not needed to do that, then quoted directly from the charter regarding decision making and for those votes, "identifying a preferred location for a new primary commercial aviation facility voting shall be restricted to voting members, the minimum quorum of voting members shall be 12, the minimum number of affirmative votes to achieve a final decision shall be 9, and the specific votes are:

- Recommending a final short list of no more than six locations by February 15, 2022,
- Identifying the top two locations from the final six locations by October 15, 2022,
- Identifying a single preferred location for a new primary commercial aviation facility by June 15".

No other action before the Commission, therefore, by our own charter, requires a quorum.

Mark E. suggested that the Commission make the nine votes end on a quorum or situation. They both do not need to be true. If there is a quorum of 12, then whatever action is taken is taken, but if there is affirmative votes of nine, then that is the decision.

Lorin C. commented that it seems this is well within the charter and would be acceptable. He did not think we should make the change to the requirement today and then take action based on that change at the same time. It does not provide an opportunity for the members who are absent to have participated in the vote to make the change which kind of unduly takes away their ability to vote on an actual actionable item.

Mark E. commented that it was made abundantly clear that a quorum was highly preferred for today's meeting so he disagreed with the assertion that we have not given people an opportunity to express themselves as voting members.

Steve E. was generally concerned about simplifying or making it easier to cast a vote or find a quorum when there is time pressure to take action. It does expose the CACC to criticism. If we take action and the headline is 'CACC changes rules to get to a vote', that is not a good headline nor is it good practice. We may struggle to have another meeting, but that is a better struggle than making voting today more expedient.

Rudy R. asked if we reach June 15, and by that time we have not been able to assimilate a quorum and make a recommendation as prescribed what is the consequence?

Warren H. commented that from his position, if we fail to have a quorum, fail to have nine affirmative votes to reach a recommendation to the Legislature, then our report would so indicate that we were not able to comply with the internal governing documents that the Commission has created, nor were we able to make a final recommendation to a 60 percent majority that the original founding law that created the Commission required.

Representative Dent commented that from a Legislature's point of view, we believe that the legislation in House Bill 1791 is going to pass. Once it is signed, then the CACC will no longer be in existence. If you cannot comply with the rules of this organization [CACC], then you can't comply, and therefore you wouldn't be able to make a recommendation.

Stroud K. commented that the way we are set up now, if we do not have 12 votes, there is no vote.

Lorin C. clarified that he is not against making the change to allow for the vote to be made more easily, just against making the change and taking action upon that change in the same meeting.

Warren H. agreed and asked if the Commission should maintain that same quorum requirement for a future meeting.

Shane J. agrees with Lorin's position, it is not proper to make the change now and then make a decision at this same meeting. However, it is within our governance structure for us to make the change, and to therefore give reasonable notice to the Commission members so at the next meeting we could take action under the new adopted principles. He supports moving forward with that recommendation.

Lorin C. made a motion to change the quorum from 12 to nine voting members for future CACC meetings.

Stroud K. seconded.

Warren H. asked for discussion. A short discussion ensued.

Warren H. then asked for a verbal vote, there were no opposed, motion carried.

Warren H. clarified and repeated what he stated earlier, the work of the Aviation System Plan update, led by the consulting team Kimley-Horn, is not the work of the CACC. It is a system plan update that is being done under the aegis of WSDOT Aviation. Its data has been very helpful to us. We are observers and participants in the information provided but it is not the work of the CACC. The CACC was not funded for such independent analysis and research, and we have been able to leverage the work of the Aviation System Plan update for our assistance. He also reminded everyone that when we talk about greenfield sites and greenfield airports we are talking about locations that simply do not have an existing airport.

Aviation System Plan Update

The Kimley-Horn team: Pam Keidel-Adams, Project Principal; David Williams, Project Manager; and Michael Yablonski, Airspace; and the Ricondo team: Laura Holthus, Senior Aviation Planner, and Ken Bukauskas, Air Cargo/Forecasting presented the Washington Aviation System Plan (WASP) information on the greenfield sites covering secondary screening analysis, airspace review, and air cargo forecasts. The King County Southeast site is not included in the options for the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission but is reviewed in the WASP.

Some of the secondary screening evaluation elements covered were airspace impacts and constraints, ground transportation connectivity and transit connectivity, utilities access, farmland impacts, aquifers and water supply impacts, Tribal interests impacts, and essential

public facilities impacts. These topics were discussed for Pierce County East, Pierce County Central and Thurston County Central.

The approach to airspace analysis for the Pierce County East, Pierce County Central and Thurston County Central sites included the following assumptions. No changes to existing airspace were analyzed or proposed, new greenfield airport assumed to require Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Class C airspace, developed airspace model for greenfield airport within existing airspace using FAA TARGETS tool, and evaluated each site based on four measures: airspace complexity, airspace terrain penetration, military operations, and runway procedure access. The result summary concluded that all sites present significant impacts to existing airspace structure, implementation would require substantial coordination with military and civilian stakeholders, and airspace design is highly complex and will require further specialized study.

Preliminary air cargo forecast information was shared. The top three regional airports (Sea-Tac, Boeing Field, Spokane) account for 98 percent of 2021 statewide total cargo tonnage. Several forecasting techniques were used in the WASP air cargo forecasts. Econometric modeling allows for establishing the significance of underlying economic factors such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), industrial production, world trade, and links the WASP forecast to future expectations of those factors. This methodology is most useful for medium- and long-range forecasts in regional markets. Methodologies employed for cargo forecasts include both a bottom-up (breaking the overall market into its component carrier groups) and top-down approaches that use time-series extrapolation and market share analysis. Total cargo tonnage from 2017-2021 grew at 1.3 percent Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR). Total cargo volume declined 2.1 percent in 2020 and total tonnage grew 4.1 percent in 2021 (from 2020). Total cargo is expected to experience steady growth over the 20-year planning period at 3.1 percent CAGR. As a point of comparison, the Puget Sound Regional Council forecast only included Sea-Tac and King County and growth rates were 2.75 percent CAGR for 2017-2050. Automation is rapidly becoming a key success factor in e-commerce logistics by enabling increasingly quick fulfillment and distribution.

There was some discussion with the CACC members.

Next Steps

Warren H. reviewed the following questions and reminded everyone that the primary tasks are to identify a single preferred location for a new primary commercial aviation facility, and provide a projected timeline to ensure it is completed and functional by 2040.

1. Shall the Commission make its final recommendation today or call for one additional meeting in early May?
 - a. We do not have a quorum so no final recommendation can be made today. Another meeting will need to be held.
2. Shall the single preferred location for a new primary commercial aviation facility be Paine Field or a greenfield site?
3. If a greenfield site is preferred, shall it be Pierce County East, Pierce County Central, Thurston County Central, or a yet-to-be identified greenfield site?
4. What shall the projected timeline be to ensure a complete and functional facility by 2040?
5. What additional recommendations does the Commission wish to provide?
6. Does a voting member wish to submit a minority report?

Warren H. then opened discussions on Q.2.

Robin T. responded that Paine Field is great to fly in to and has great service, but it may not meet the need that was expressed by this legislation.

Shane J. agreed that we have the flexibility to make multiple recommendations, which does not have to be Paine Field or a greenfield site. He agrees that Paine Field can grow but it may not handle the long-term needs of the region. With the challenges of a timeline and the current greenfield sites, it is worth considering Paine Field as a minimum interim step while additional sites continue to be studied and perhaps recommended for further growth. Airspace is a very complex issue and there are a lot of examples of complex aerospace being operated in a very safe manner across the country, across the world.

Lorin C. asked, regarding airspace, had anyone looked at and compared the airspace impact for the three potential greenfield sites to locations such as the Bay Area or New York? Those sorts of locations, despite the significant impact, usually can find a way to make it work. So, in terms of the airspace impact, it may not be the most pressing concern because without further investigation it probably is not necessarily a showstopper for any of the sites under consideration. Any site we choose to recommend is going to have opposition. Paine Field is a good interim solution.

Rudy R. commented that, using the aviation metaphor here, he thinks we are focused on 'staying on glide slope and center line' and he wants to offer an alternative perspective. Maybe we should be going 'missed approach'. The members agreed to be part of this Commission for our own reasons, and everyone has put in a tremendous amount of work. The Legislature has created legislation which will render this Commission moot so the best things we can do is to ensure all of our data is keyed up and packaged to hand off to the next group that will come along. He is not a voting member but wanted to offer that perspective.

Warren H. asked what the Commission members would think about going down that path? Does that path either provide a compliance question that we have not done any assigned task, or is it an alternative that should probably be considered? Just trying to get a feel for the pulse of what all Commission members might be thinking along those regards.

Steve E. generally likes that approach. He is still looking for someone to make a recommendation to the Commission based on all of the information gathered.

Tony B. does have some experience. He is reluctant to do the go around and look at what a future commission could do. We should focus on the charter for this Commission. If the answer to that, from the voting members, is that we really do not have an answer then that is a deliverable that needs to be given back to the Legislature and that is a sound deliverable. The Legislature deserves an answer.

Warren H. agrees that Paine Field is an interim first step but may not meet all of the capacity needs. He believes the decision the Commission made in the first year, that we cannot meet the capacity needs in 2050 without a greenfield site, is still an accurate and valid one. He does not believe we have identified the right greenfield site yet.

Warren H. then brought up Question 3 and shared that Robert Rodriguez, from Joint Base Lewis McChord (JBLM) could not join us today, but he has articulated to Warren, through the Garrison Commanders, that all three of these greenfield sites do pose a negative impact.

Lorin C. asked if the Commission could get more information on the negative impact to JBLM for the next meeting. He then added that from a logistical standpoint, the eastern side of Washington, and this is where his commercial background comes into play, is probably not going to work in the manner in which people hope and that choosing something that distant with the natural barriers and impediments to ingress and egress from the region will create a situation where significant resources could be invested in a facility that does not get the use for which it is designed or intended. We certainly can mention Yakima and he applauds their willingness to be a part of the solution.

Warren H. then asked the members what other information they need before our next meeting, to include the JBLM information already requested.

Steve E. believes the information he wants is not available. He also believes, moving forward, we need a budget to drill deeper into some of the concerns expressed about public health and the environment prior to the NEPA work normally done after site selection.

Recap

- We have now established a permanent chair.
- We have established a new quorum which meets the intent of legislation and should not tie our hands artificially.
- Warren is very proud of the work that we have accomplished. We have at least created a tremendous body of knowledge even if we have not achieved that perfect solution. This is a set of circumstances that requires all of us at every level of government and community to be involved in a positive outcome. We are not there yet. He encourages the public to remain engaged with this work.

Adjourned

Warren H. adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:02 p.m.