Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission  
Meeting Summary

Location: TEAMS Meeting  
Date: January 6, 2022  
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.  
Absent: Tony Bean, Lois Bollenback, and Larry Krauter

Welcome  
David Fleckenstein welcomed Commission members and the members of the audience, to the January meeting of the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission (CACC). He then reviewed the agenda.

Public Comment Period  
Jeni Woock, Gig Harbor City Council member, commented that those in the city of Gig Harbor and all of the citizens there have grave concerns over any expansion to the Tacoma Narrows Airport. Looking at the master plan from the Tacoma Narrows Airport, the challenges are many and not suitable for airport expansion. Noise and particulates are something our community does not want to see. Her concern is Pierce County Council, who is the sponsor for this Tacoma Narrows Airport, sent a letter in to the Commission asking to have this airport removed from consideration and it has not been removed from consideration. She would like to know what they need to do to get it removed from consideration from any airport expansion. David Fleckenstein responded by saying there are airports that remain on the list given their potential to meet some of the general aviation demand.

Updates  
- The Aviation System Plan work has begun in earnest. WSDOT staff will be working with Kimley-Horn and Associates as that work proceeds and we receive updates on CACC specific interests. Sometime in mid-spring we will plan to have the consultants provide an update to the Commission members.
- WSDOT staff will be preparing the draft report due to the legislature on February 15, 2022. Similar to the 2020 report we will provide that draft report to the Commission members for their comments prior to submitting it to the Legislators.
- One new voting Commission member is Lorin Carr from American Airlines, filling the vacant airline industry position. David welcomed Lorin and thanked him in advance for his time and participation.
- Spencer Hanson, representing the freight forwarding industry, has relocated and we believe FedEx is in the process of submitting for his replacement. David thanked Spencer for his contributions to the Commission.

Charter Resolution  
Following up from the last meeting Warren started the discussion on the charter language. There is a particular paragraph dealing with decision making that has resulted in a few issues complicating the
Commission’s work. Warren shared the existing language in the charter as written and approved in January 2020. Due to the COVID pandemic, the one change with the decision-making section of the charter that did occur was the dates were amended by SSB 5165 as passed by the Legislature earlier this year. Warren went over the identified issues and dates leaving the question, what to do.

A non-binding survey of Commission members over the last few months regarding various options to address the identified issues in terms of quorums, proxies, and voting was inconclusive because the opinions were wide and varied. To reach an acceptable conclusion and to move this process forward Commission Chair, David Fleckenstein, called for the formation of a voting guidelines subcommittee chaired by Warren Hendrickson, Commission Vice-Chair, to devise revised decision-making language for the charter. Volunteers for the subcommittee were two voting members, Arif Ghouse and Robin Toth, and two non-voting members, Representative Tom Dent and Warren. They met virtually on December 6 to review the issues and reach a consensus decision on new language and format to address all the identified issues. Warren then shared the changes and recommendations from the subcommittee.

Proposed new language:

- Robert’s Rules of Order shall govern all votes. Proxies shall not be used. Abstentions are permissible. The Commission Chair may opt to use roll call votes.
- The Commission is encouraged to strive for group agreement in its general recommendations. If consensus agreement cannot be reached, a vote of all Commission members may be necessary, and the voting majority shall prevail. The meeting summary will document majority and minority opinions.
- 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 twelve
  - The minimum number of affirmative votes to achieve a final decision shall be nine
  - These 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, and
    - Identifying a single preferred location for a new primary commercial aviation facility by February 15, 2023.

Discussion:
David Fleckenstein thinks this is prudent given all the difficulties people are facing now. We had challenges just this morning with two of our members literally out helping their crews shoveling snow to clear airports. He can see this continuing to be a challenge to have a quorum based on the current charter, so he supports this change.

Warren clarified that this motion vote be conducted, as was the original charter, by all Commission members (voting and non-voting) that are present in this meeting today to approve this change in language. He then asked for a motion from any member if they wish to approve these changes in the decision-making language. Warren then asked for a motion to approve this decision-making language.

Shane Jones so moved; Lorin Carr seconded. No other discussion.
Representative Dent stated that he believes that under Robert’s Rules of Order Warren cannot ask for a motion it has to come from the Chair.
To keep this clean, David Fleckenstein then started again and asked if he had a motion to approve the language as written and displayed (*PowerPt presentation and listed above*).

Shane Jones so moved; Lorin Carr seconded.

David then asked for a voice call vote: Ayes (verbal responses heard); Opposed (no response heard). David asked again for anyone opposed, no response heard. Ayes have it, motion carries.

**Recapping Airport Analysis**

Rob Hodgman gave a quick orientation/recap on what work has been accomplished to identify airport sites which have potential to meet anticipated demand. With the strategic approach adopted by the Commission (*March 2020*) and the airport site selection factors (*July 2020*) the Commission agreed on the most resilient strategy of expanding existing airports and pursuing a greenfield site. There have been no changes to that strategy. The Commission also agreed on initial site selection factors. Using these factors, the planning staff (*WSDOT*) conducted technical analyses of a list of potential airport sites. Staff also consulted the Washington Environmental Health Disparity map and provided Commission members with a summary review of the factors for each site. Using these site selection factors, the planning staff conducted scoring and recommended a short list of airports to Commission members which was adopted (*October 2020*). This was reported to the Legislature in December 2020. This list has not changed. Throughout 2021 the Commission focused its attention on guiding principles and public outreach. Today, this recap is to have a formal vote on the six sites.

Rob shared Commission member feedback on the initial six sites as well as member feedback on additional sites which could possibly provide added capacity. Six sites were initially considered for their ability to provide commercial service but due to technical analyses and lack of sponsor support some of the six sites are best suited only for general aviation. Only one airport on the list is identified for commercial air passenger service. Two of the six have potential to provide additional air cargo capacity. The strategic approach the Commission adopted was to expand existing airports while we pursue a greenfield site for a new airport. The recent public open house results indicated strong support for expanding existing airports. There is currently no greenfield site on the list. However, that is still part of the strategy.

We recognize the Commission’s recommendation to the legislature will likely supply the six airports previously reported. This recommendation will also need to mention that other sites may be needed whether they are existing airports or new greenfield sites.

The consultant will first examine unmet passenger and air cargo demand in Puget Sound communities and consider the likelihood of air carrier support for providing service to those communities. This will need to be accomplished before considering a site for expansion or development.

This is the list of sites submitted to the Legislature (*December 2020*). Based on Commission member and airport sponsor input it now includes the anticipated roles for each airport (*in parenthesis*).

- Arlington Municipal Airport (potential for additional general aviation capacity),
- Bremerton National Airport (potential for air cargo and general aviation capacity),
- Paine Field (potential for additional commercial passenger service and air cargo capacity),
- Sanderson Field (potential for additional general aviation capacity),
- South Lewis County Airport (potential for additional general aviation capacity), and
• Tacoma Narrows Airport (potential for additional general aviation capacity).

As the consultant conducts technical analyses, we recognize there may be a need for additional options to be provided to the Commission. This is based on two factors, first the Paine Field forecast through 2040 is for 4.3 million passengers or roughly half, 2.15 million enplanements. Second, compared to the anticipated demand developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council Aviation Baseline Study of approximately 21 million or more enplanements it appears that Paine Field is unable to meet this level of demand. In addition, we have not found or evaluated a greenfield site and we don’t know what size site we may be able to find and how much additional capacity it could provide.

Discussion:
Senator Keiser shared that our Commission charge is to find capacity for commercial aviation so we might as well remove those that are only available for general aviation off our current consideration list. She would like to add Grant County International Airport, Moses Lake because it is a huge facility with incredible capacity. It may not be in the right place at the right time, but it deserves to be on the list just because of its physical capacity.

Representative Dent commented that Grant County International has great capacity, but he is not sure the capacity includes commercial passenger service. It definitely has capacity for air cargo, manufacturing, and things like that. But to alleviate air passenger congestion on the west side of the state, it is really not in a position to do that.

Stroud Kunkle, Commissioner from the Port of Moses Lake, agrees with Representative Dent. They are working towards more cargo activity, but passenger service would be a little difficult because of the transportation in and out.

Senator Keiser agrees with Representative Dent and Stroud. Because cargo takes up time and space at Sea-Tac that could be used for passenger service, Grant County International Airport could be part of the overall picture.

David stated we could ensure the consultant give that a solid look. We did spend a considerable amount of time during the joint air cargo study talking about how we could transfer cargo from different locations around the state. There are some things Grant County is pursuing as result of that. Rob mentioned that although this is the current list of six, there are other airports that are going to contribute to capacity and Grant County is one of those airports. They don’t have to be on the list, they can contribute to capacity in other ways.

Rob mentioned that we typically talk about passenger service in this forum, but we recognize air cargo. As an update regarding the Puget Sound Regional Council Study there is an estimated 800,000 metric ton shortfall capacity by 2050. So even though we talk primarily about passenger service, WSDOT Aviation is tracking this and our consultant will look at air cargo as well.

Representative Orwall asked about the Olympia Airport as she doesn’t see it on the list.

David commented that there was no sponsor support from the Port of Olympia to have Olympia Airport on the list. When we went through the initial filtering of the airports it was removed because of that. The Port could, at some point in the future, change their mind and decide they want to pursue commercial service.
Rudy commented that the previous Port Commission sent a letter and went on record and that is reflected in the results you see. The newly seated Port Commission has yet to be briefed in entirety on the work and role of the CACC. We anticipate in the next week or two there will be an opportunity to do that. Rudy does not intend to speak on behalf of the Port Commission on where this will go.

David added that many of us look at Olympia as an opportunity for Washington to be a leader in some of the emerging aircraft technology that is coming online. There could be some things that Olympia could consider in regards to advanced air mobility. It would not solve a big portion of the capacity problem, but it is an opportunity for the state to establish an airport that is going to employ a lot of this emerging technology.

Steve commented that in April we created a white paper setting out the things we would do in phase two. The first of the three things stated is we wanted to know to what extent the six airports on the list would meet the projected demand. Then he asked if our job is to find 400,000 annual operations, where are we? If we said yes to all of the airports on the list, how many annual operations would that get us?

David stated that the preponderance of the issue is commercial air passenger service and air cargo operations. The legislative intent is for us to also address general aviation capacity, but it is not as big of an issue as commercial air passenger service and air cargo. With what is on the list today, if you just want to hear shear numbers, I think Rob has already said that, but Rob can say that again.

Rob shared that the PSRC Regional Aviation Baseline Study projected between 21-25 million commercial passenger enplanements needed by 2050. This Commission is to solve for commercial passenger enplanements by 2040 but we recognize with the lag time it could be closer to 2050. There is also 800,000 metric tons of air cargo needed. After speaking with the air cargo industry partners, this is primarily a Seattle metropolitan area requirement. It has to do with travel time to the airport and the distribution centers to the customers. General aviation is part of the legislative direction, much smaller, but still an important part of the whole aviation system. Based on the current FAA approved forecast, roughly 2.15 million commercial passenger enplanements at Paine Field is anticipated. This leaves a big gap when trying to solve for 21-25 million enplanements.

David added that the strategy the Commission adopted is directly in line with what the public asked us to do; expand existing airports first before we move to a greenfield site. What is being presented today is along that strategy and we know it does not meet all of the forecasted demand. It is along the line of our strategy and in line with what people have asked us to do while we employ the consultant to fill in the gaps of what else can be done to meet the need.

Representative Dent responded if we can increase general aviation capacity away from some of the commercial airports it can take some of the load off those commercial airports not only in aircraft numbers but by moving people in other ways. General aviation is a large part of our transportation system, and it does have potential to grow in the future. If we have public money put into an airport in the Olympia/Tumwater area and they don’t want to use this airport for some limited commercial passenger service, he is concerned. This is the capital city of our state and Washington is a major player in aerospace in the world. To have some commercial passenger service into our capital city is important. It could be listed maybe as limited commercial passenger service or something like that, but it is important that we keep it on the table and look at it. As our aircraft evolve, they become quieter, safer,
and particulates and pollution will get better. Aviation is a big picture, and we need to continue to look at the big picture.

Steve is hearing that we perceive the public is demanding increased capacity at our existing airports, but he does not conclude that from the survey. We have approximately 55 percent saying do not expand or just continue to operate at existing airports. We had 45 percent response saying go ahead and expand. We should take caution and drill into the survey responses to make sure we are accurate. Also, if these six are the airports, we need to be clear on any documentation that if five of these six sites are not on the table right now, for what the public will see as the new “Sea-Tac”, we need to make this very clear that these five are not. The general public may not know the difference between general aviation, commercial passenger service, and air cargo. We should be super careful about how we report this out.

**Legislative Report**

David proposed that we have a motion that supports the list of six airports, as currently presented, with the additional caveat that we could add additional airports and/or greenfield site could be added at a later date based on future information from our Aviation consultant. He then asked for a motion from a voting member.

- Arlington Municipal Airport (potential for additional general aviation capacity),
- Bremerton National Airport (potential for air cargo and general aviation capacity),
- Paine Field (potential for additional commercial passenger service and air cargo capacity),
- Sanderson Field (potential for additional general aviation capacity),
- South Lewis County Airport (potential for additional general aviation capacity), and
- Tacoma Narrows Airport (potential for additional general aviation capacity).

Robin Toth so moved; Stroud Kunkle seconded.

**Discussion:**

Steve commented that phrasing the motion as we might add another site when the math shows we must add another site does not meet the legislative mandate.

David then suggested we amend the motion to say, we vote to approve the six airports on the list with the language provided and we will add additional airports and/or greenfield site with the recommendation as presented by our Aviation consultant.

Robin Toth moved to amend the motion; Stroud Kunkle seconded. (As the amendment was moved and seconded by the same members, the original motion was so changed, and a formal vote can be done on the original motion as amended.)

David proceeded with a roll-call vote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Braham</td>
<td>Mark Englizian</td>
<td>David Fleckenstein</td>
<td>Shane Jones</td>
<td>Stroud Kunkle</td>
<td>David Edmiston</td>
<td>Andrea Goodpasture</td>
<td>Bryce Yadon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charter – Guiding Principles

David spoke about the discussion which was previously tabled regarding the guiding principles which was on environmental responsibility. There have been several discussions during the meetings, and members were provided additional information on studies that were conducted across the United States and other parts of the world regarding the environment and the effects of aviation. Since this is a subsequent meeting to it being tabled, David asked if anyone on the Commission would like to make a motion to bring this back for further discussion.

Rob Hodgman so moved; Senator Keiser seconded.

David then asked for a voice call vote: Ayes (verbal responses heard); Opposed (no response heard). Ayes have it, motion carries.

Senator Keiser suggested we add direct language from the HEAL Act into this guiding principle. After the last word, “needs”, we would add, “and to reduce environmental and health disparities in Washington state to improve the health of all Washington state residents.” This incorporates the issues we brought forward earlier about impacts on communities that are within the boundaries of airport communities.

Senator Keiser moved to add that language; Representative Orwell seconded.

Shane asked how this works within the charter itself. His understanding is that the commercial passenger aviation aspect of the HEAL Act has an exemption due to commercial services overseen by Federal law. If that exemption doesn’t belong in here and/or needed in some way, we need to reflect that fact.

David agrees, his understanding is that there are certain exclusions within the HEAL Act. These are guiding principles, not binding, but are things the Commission should consider when making their recommendations. He has no concerns with having the language in the guiding principles.

Lorin inquired, understanding this is guiding principles, as to inserting language regarding the practicality of actions or decision making. This is strictly related to accomplishing an environmental goal versus the appearance of accomplishing an environmental goal. Is there an ability to add a consideration of practical application to maximize results with practical application instead of visuals?

Representative Dent commented we are trying to come up with a solution to alleviate the expansion of Sea-Tac Airport, either expand out to other airports or a greenfield site but are we going to load ourselves down to the point we never achieve our goals? Are we putting more of a load on this Commission to achieve its goals of identifying a greenfield site or how we alleviate those issues? We need to stay in focus, if we overload ourselves with thoughts, ideas, and desires we may never get to where we want to be.

Mark suggested that the language, as given by Senator Keiser, includes the word, “reduce” which makes it sound like it is the guiding principle of the Commission to reduce something that exists in its current state. He does not believe that is part of what we are trying to solve for. He does agree that it would be helpful to add to the guiding principle to not create any further environmental and health disparities. The action word “reduce” does not seem appropriate for this Commission.
Warren sees the additional language not charging the Commission to do something but that we are embracing the practice of environmental sustainability helping to ensure today’s population’s needs are met and helps to reduce environmental and health disparities. He thinks this is something the Commission should embrace, and he does not see this as something we are being charged with as a direct responsibility.

David asked if Senator Keiser wanted to amend the motion before he calls for a vote. Senator Keiser called for the question on her original motion.

David called for a roll-call vote.

Joseph Braham - Yes  Mark Englizian – Abstain  Shane Jones – Abstain
Jeffrey Brown - Abstain  David Fleckenstein – Yes  Stroud Kunkle – Abstain
Lorin Carr – Abstain  Arif Ghouse – Abstain  Jim Kuntz – Abstain
Steve Edmiston - Yes  Andrea Goodpasture - Abstain  Robin Toth – Yes
Robert Rodriguez – Yes  Jason Thibedeau – Abstain  Kerri Woehler - Yes

Motion carries with 12 in favor and 9 abstentions.

Wrap Up

- PRR, Aviation’s consultant, would like to hold a webinar February 16 to discuss the results of the online open house. Commission members have received the results and they will be posted to the website.
- There will be a spring update from the Aviation System Plan consultant.
- The next CACC formal meeting will tentatively be June 2022.
- Commission member comments:
  - Rob commented that this is a normal Aviation System Plan. However, much of what is in the Federal Aviation Administration’s circular aligns very well with the interest of the CACC. The FAA has agreed to fund an added level of effort in order to do a site feasibility study, that is where the greenfield site selection comes in. This will happen over a period of three years with three separate FAA grants. So, part of the reason the next meeting being in June is because we only have a small amount of funding to get started and in the near term, we are focusing primarily on the most important topics to the CACC. We will not be able to do a deep dive until after that.
  - David added we front-loaded many things with the consultant that we thought was important work to the Commission.
  - Warren commented that as we commence 2022 and we look ahead one year from now where we will be making final decisions and as a result of today’s meeting and thorough discussion, he had two thoughts. First and foremost, the herculean nature of the task before us. This is a huge task to be able to ensure the economic lifeblood of the state and to meet future capacity at multiple levels. Certainly, the critical thinking and thought that goes into this is huge. The second piece, he is reminded again from the comments and discussion today that we definitely have the right people at the table. Everybody brings thoughts and perspectives that are valuable to the process and valued by each of us. He wanted to congratulate ourselves for our participation, continuing presence, and the work that remains ahead of us.
  - David stated the staff owes the Commission a couple things. We need to go back and modify the charter based on what was approved today and get that back out to the Commission members.
as well as posting it on the website. We owe the Commission a draft of the report that will go to the Legislators in February. We will gather your comments and try and fold it into the report.

Adjourned

Approximately 10:40 a.m.