

Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission

Meeting Summary

Location: TEAMS Meeting

Date: September 23, 2022

Time: 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Attendees: David Fleckenstein, Tony Bean, Jeffrey Brown, Lorin Carr, Rep. Tom Dent, Steve Edmiston, Tom Embleton, Mark Englizian, Arif Ghouse, Warren Hendrickson, Robert Hodgman, Senator Jim Honeyford, Shane Jones, Sen. Karen Keiser, Larry Krauter, Stroud Kunkle, Jim Kuntz, Rep. Tina Orwall, Robert Rodriguez, Rudy Rudolph, Jason Thibedeau, Robin Toth, Bryce Yadon, Kerri Woehler and guests

Absent: Lois Bollenback and Andrea Goodpasture

Welcome

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

Public Comment Period

Nora Kammer with the Skagit River System Cooperative, representing the environmental interests of Sauk-Suiattle Tribe located in Darrington and the Swinomish Tribe located in La Conner, shared information on the areas of salmon and steelhead habitat. She stated that protection of the Skagit populations and the habitats that sustain it are essential to recovery of salmon in the Puget Sound region wide. They learned about this proposal in the newspaper. The state failed to do any outreach to Tribal governments regarding these proposals, that if implemented will permanently transform incredible sections of the Skagit delta into an impervious industrial zone. Before any ranking or site selection is made on these greenfield sites, they request that WSDOT engage directly in a government-to-government consultation with these affected tribes. Floodplain development is regulated by various agencies including FEMA. They believe it is not possible, while considering the scope and scale of anticipated impacts; direct, indirect, and cumulative, to achieve ‘not likely to adversely affect the character and function of the Skagit and Sammamish Basins’. They strongly advocate that the CACC remove Skagit County Southwest and Skagit County Northwest sites from the list of potential new greenfield airport sites in Western Washington. Before any further consideration of either Skagit County site moves forward, the CACC must engage with both the Swinomish Tribe and Sauk-Suiattle Tribe about specific concerns with these proposals.

Timothy O’Brien, representing the Enumclaw Plateau Community Association, commented that they are also concerned about the environmental aspects. The airport site in South King County is also not supposed to be considered because of the law that created the Commission. The rivers would be directly adjacent to this airport and those are some of our most productive salmon bearing/producing waterways in our region. The environmental impacts would be great and quick. They also want to mention the geography, that includes the two gorges, would make it very difficult and expensive to build transportation to an airport in that location. There would

have to be many bridges built and some of them would be a billion dollars apiece and a mile long to span the gorges. Even though it is very close in proximity to a major population; to travel there in a car or train would be difficult and lengthy. They are asking to have alternative locations that would better serve future needs of the growing population that is to the south and north of the Seattle/Tacoma area to offset some of the capacity constraints, particularly with what they have in the Portland area, with only two runways. They also believe unconstrained demand does not seem realistic considering people are now being turned off by air travel in general. They would like unconstrained demand to be considered in a more realistic way.

Ursula Euler wanted to second some of what the previous people stated. She also commented that in Thurston County, the outreach to local jurisdictions and local community groups has been non-existent. She feels the Commission's voting members are heavily dominated by for-profit/commercial interests and it needs a democratic approach that brings in environmental impacts and public health considerations to the decision table not just during the two-minute public comment period.

Amy Cruver, Representative for the 3rd Council District, Pierce County, is also raising high caution for these greenfield proposals. Two of them are in her council district and in a location with no access for the projected population to be traveling there. Also, the environment is very wet. None of her constituents, who are aware of this, want the airport in her district. She understands that this is a 20-year project, but the 3rd Council District is not a place for an airport.

Presentation Considerations

David Fleckenstein reviewed the following.

- The technical update is from the Aviation System Plan consultant group
- The Aviation System Plan work is independent of the CACC's work
- Any sites recommended to move forward require further analysis
- Additional technical analysis includes but is not limited to airspace, infrastructure requirements, air cargo, public engagement, environmental showstoppers, airport sponsorship, and cost estimates
- The Commission is considering the technical analysis and the CACC's guiding principles
- Researching a variety of options is part of the process

Public Engagement Update

Lynsey Burgess shared the information gathered from the open house and two virtual public meeting activities in August-September. There were approximately 20,000 users in 23 statewide counties for the open house and 304 attendees of the virtual public meetings. Generally, people who participate in an online open house or public meeting tend to have a stronger opinion about a topic than the general public. Response themes seem to be more personal for this public engagement activity from last time.

Most participants were in one of two categories with their greenfield site responses; a personal connection to one or more of the sites and often opposed to the site due to the impact to them, and those responding from a high-level noting things such as population served, available land, economic opportunities, and existing infrastructure.

Input on the questions for existing airports saw a high level of support for increasing capacity at Paine Field. The most common reason was that it already exists and providing commercial capacity, so it seems the most logical and simplest option. The question was also asked that if Paine Field were to provide additional passenger and/or air cargo service, are there things the airport should consider when planning for expansion. Many responses noted environmental mitigation and also made suggestions for specific improvements such as terminal improvements and more parking options.

There was also an opportunity at the end of the online open house for leaving a general comment. Many were a continuation of comments left regarding greenfield locations. The next most common was a preference to use existing facilities as much as possible. Many commenters noted that they recognized that whatever airport exists in a given area, it may need to be torn down and rebuilt but at least that site is already disturbed and generating aircraft noise. That was followed by concerns with environmental impacts and opposition to expanding commercial aviation capacity in general and participants sharing a preference for a location not presented as an option. The most common location participants wrote in was Olympia Regional Airport. Many participants commented it would be beneficial to have an airport near the state capital and that it would serve a large number of people.

In comparing the participation in the virtual public meetings with the online open house, there are many more people attending the online open house. Relatively few people took the survey after the virtual public meetings. Out of 304 attendees, 63 people took the post meeting survey compared to more than 12,000 comments received from the online open house and 60,000 multiple choice question responses.

Most people who attended the virtual public meeting did so because of concern about the King County Southeast site. There were also a lot of questions and confusion about airport sponsors and the whole CACC process.

Discussion:

Steve E. commented that the public has done an excellent job of informing the Commission about the work needed to be done to demonstrate that decisions going forward as sites are narrowed, complying with the guiding principles and the decisions to be made reflect the best alternatives from a public health and environmental health standpoint against alternatives that remain available.

Jeffrey B. asked, given the language in the bill that states the site cannot be in a county of two million or more, which essentially means King County, should that site ever be put forward to the CACC for consideration? Should the CACC be voting on that site?

David F. stated that later in the presentation it is shown that there is not a recommendation to move the King County Southeast site forward because of what was in the legislation. It was brought to the table because we need to look at all of the options being accomplished through the Aviation System Plan.

WSDOT System Plan/ Recap of Greenfield Analysis

David Williams shared the following regarding the work done in support of the Aviation System Plan project. He recapped the work done for potential greenfield sites; looking for sites in the

general geographic limits of approximately 100 miles of Seattle, west of the Cascade mountains, took into consideration other planning studies, wanted to ensure multiple counties in the region were evaluated, then made some selections based on information gathered during that process. Ten sites were picked, six counties, and to be broad in the System Planning work but as noted, King County Southeast will not be included in the options for the CACC. David W. reviewed the preliminary evaluation elements presented at the previous CACC meeting. The next steps will be additional technical analysis on the shortlisted sites to include airspace review – with assistance from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), air cargo analysis, environmental factors, transportation/access analysis, infrastructure analysis, and Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) cost estimates.

Considerations of a “No Action” Option

Laura Holthus commented that a ‘no action’ scenario has several implications that we want to be aware of as we move forward. To revisit the market analysis offered in June, 67 million annual passengers (MAP) was identified at the time as the planned capacity in the region. The exact timing of when demand exceeds capacity will vary depending on when traffic materializes, how the market will respond in a constrained environment, and how quickly additional capacity is built per the plans. Another nuance with airport planning is facility constraints are based on peak periods, not annual MAP levels. As facilities become constrained, it is likely airlines will find other ways to squeeze in a few more passengers without necessarily affecting those constrained peaks. What roughly remains is that 27 million annual passengers will need to be accommodated at either existing airports or a greenfield site, or both by 2050.

Laura H. stated they are not advocating for an outcome, one way or the other, they just want to make sure that all implications are considered including those of no action. They want to provide some evidence of what those implications could be. Some of those general impacts could include economic impacts, slot control/demand management techniques, increase in ticket prices, overall airfield restrictions, decreased passenger level of service, and increased pressure on existing small commercial service airports. Laura H. shared how some of these implications impacted other state and country airports. [*The FAA’s link to information regarding slot control*

https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/systemops/perf_analysis/slot_administration/slot_administration_schedule_facilitation.]

Narrowing the Sites

Rob Hodgman reviewed the capacity forecast. He talked about two possible strategies moving forward. One is the incremental increases in capacity; in order for the region to incrementally meet the anticipated need for air travelers, that level of capacity for those additional passengers would need to be in place by the year designated. This strategy implies that there are airports in the region that have the potential to accommodate that increased capacity. Based on the analysis so far, there are a few airports to help meet the capacity but not as many as was hoped for. That is why the greenfield site has become an interest to the Commission. The second strategy is broken out into three scenarios. Scenario 1, is ‘no action’ which provides for a few years before the region experiences some of the adverse impacts from being over capacity. Scenario 2, with a single-runway greenfield site in addition to the SeaTac masterplan being fully executed and the Paine Field masterplan being fully executed, gives the region until approximately 2044 before experiencing some of the adverse impacts from being over capacity.

Scenario 3, uses a two-runway greenfield site in addition to the SeaTac and Paine Field masterplans being fully executed, which should potentially cover capacity needs through 2050.

Rob H. then discussed the greenfield sites and why the sites are either not going to be considered or why some are still being considered to provide future capacity. He also stated there is a lot of analysis yet to be done on any sites still to be considered.

- King County Southeast – No, off the table, legislation prohibits King County
- Skagit County Northwest – No, too far north
- Skagit County Southwest – No, too far north
- Snohomish County Northwest – No, same region as Paine Field with possible increased capacity
- Snohomish County Southeast – No, same region as Paine Field with possible increased capacity
- Thurston County South – No, too far south
- Lewis County – No, too far south
- Pierce County East – Possible, needs more analysis done (20.8 MAP)
- Pierce County Central – Possible, needs more analysis done (19 MAP)
- Thurston County Central – Possible, could be part of a solution, needs more analysis done (7.9 MAP)

Rob H. shared two items of legislative guidance as a refresher; 1) [Sec. 1] The legislature seeks to identify a location for a new primary commercial aviation facility in Washington, taking into consideration the data and conclusions of appropriate air traffic studies, community representatives, and industry experts, and 2) [Sec. 3 (1)] ... Research for each potential site must include the feasibility of constructing a commercial aviation facility in that location and its potential environmental, community, and economic impacts. He then talked about aligning the legislative guidance with the CACC's guiding principles.

Considering the Guiding Principles

The guiding principles, from the charter are:

1. **Public benefit:** defined as benefiting the greater good, or the broader public, over an individual entity or group.
2. **Economic feasibility:** defined as the degree to which the economic advantages of something to be made, done, or achieved are greater than the economic costs: Can we fund it?
3. **Environmental responsibility:** defined as the responsible interaction with the environment to avoid depletion or degradation of natural resources and allow for long-term environmental quality. The practice of environmental sustainability helps to ensure that the needs of today's population are met without jeopardizing the ability of future generations to meet their needs and to reduce environmental and health disparities in Washington State to improve the health of all Washington State residents.
4. **Social equity:** defined as fair access to opportunity, livelihood, and the full participation in the political and cultural life of a community.

Rob H. shared possible/proposed methodology to integrate measurement of the guiding principles into Commission discussions.

Discussion:

Steve E. asked if under the environmental responsibility, where has the WASP assessed a location as it pertains to public health.

Rob H. stated that is not part of the regular Washington Aviation System Plan (WASP) process so the Commission will need to look at that. It speaks to the population density and the traffic patterns. The FAA is helping WSDOT with the airspace analysis. Until we do more analysis on each of the possible sites and until we have more information from the FAA on potential flight paths, it might be early to do an assessment of what the impacts are for emissions and noise. He will take a note of this and see how emissions and noise impacts can be added to the environmental responsibility proposed methodology.

Representative Orwall asked if what is partly guiding us, is looking at technologies to make this a greener and more environmentally friendly airport? Also, the original legislation talked about community impacts. As part of our guidance there are different things we can do to mitigate, should this be part of this dialogue?

David F. thinks that is a terrific question and will lead us into the options to be discussed right after the break. Inside of the recommendation, upfront and foremost, is that we advocate for addressing some of these things up front as we look at a greenfield site or other options and that we develop solutions that need to be developed to reduce emissions such as sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) that will create the foundation for the airport of the future.

Mark E. asked about the sequencing of the Commission voting on a recommendation and when the guiding principles get applied to that recommendation. He understood it to be the vote first, then apply the guiding principles.

Rob H. replied that there isn't enough information to apply the guiding principles right now. We are trying to reduce the list of potential sites to those that have the best possible potential to provide additional capacity. At the point the data is available and if these proposed methodologies are supported by the Commission, we will do it then.

Bryce Y. asked about economic feasibility. When we rough out the magnitude of cost for expanding or developing, does this include things such as the cost for expanded highways, extension of services, and other items?

David F. said, yes. With all of the ten sites that were previously on the list, the planners have already started talking to regional planners to get their input in regards to what it would take to build road networks, etc. So, this information will be included in the rough magnitude of cost.

Bryce Y. then asked, with the environmental responsibility, while it takes into account a number of different things such as incompatible land use, does that include laws that would potentially prohibit the ability for siting an airport on a greenfield site which does not abide by state law? He wants to make sure we are not only dealing with the air pollution of the airplanes but to keep in account the localized air pollution for the increased vehicle miles travelled to build these. Also, there is a state law that sets goals, and we hope to meet those, in reduction of vehicle miles travelled per capita basis. Are these taken into account if we are talking about the expansion of these areas?

Rob H. stated that some of these items may be taken into account. Transportation is very expansive and the planners are reaching out to the other modes within WSDOT to see what capabilities we have. There are boundaries that fit in to the System Plan and Site Suitability Study, and the planners will have to go back and look at that in greater detail.

David F. added that it is also important to think about the future because we are talking about building a new airport, that is 20 plus years into the future. By that time, we may be driving different vehicles which could include all electric or hydrogen propelled. He agrees with what Bryce Y. is saying and it needs to be factored in, but it is hard to say specifically what the impacts are going to be.

Rob H. and David F. both commented that recommendations to the legislators can include impacts which need to be considered because we cannot solve them at the CACC level.

Upon returning from the break, David took roll call to ensure a quorum of voting members were in attendance.

Jeffrey Brown	Lorin Carr	Steve Edmiston	Tom Embleton	Mark Englezian
Arif Ghouse	Shane Jones	Larry Krauter	Stroud Kunkle	Jim Kuntz
Robin Toth	Bryce Yadon	David Fleckenstein		

The roll call confirmed there was a quorum.

Options for Meeting the 2050 Demand

David F. stated that with the information shared this morning and all the work that has been completed to date, these are what the planning team believes are the options for the CACC to consider.

1. Take no action
2. Add capacity to Paine Field according to its Airport Master Plan (with potential for additional capacity) and assume SEA executes its Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP)
3. Add capacity to Paine Field according to its Airport Master Plan (with potential for additional capacity), assume SEA executes its SAMP, and continue to develop a greenfield site option with a one (1) runway configuration (requires minimal land acquisition)
4. Add capacity to Paine Field according to its Airport Master Plan (with potential for additional capacity), assume SEA executes its SAMP, and continue to develop a greenfield site option with a two (2) runway configuration
5. Add capacity to Paine Field according to its Airport Master Plan (with potential for additional capacity), assume SEA executes its SAMP, assist other airports interested in pursuing regional commercial service (distributed air service supported by emerging technology), and continue to develop a greenfield site option with a two (2) runway configuration

Discussion:

Steve E. wondered if SeaTac is unable to execute its SAMP, for whatever reason, does it make any difference to these options? His assumption is it doesn't.

David F. agreed that it does not change these options but there are options within options. So, if something does not come to fruition, such as Sea-Tac not executing its SAMP, there is the capability to rely on one portion of the recommended option as opposed to another one. There is some built in capacity to the recommendation that will be made, though it is finite.

Senator Keiser asked with the one-runway layout with option 3, how many acres is 'minimal land acquisition'? Putting it in context, SeaTac has 2,500 acres and three runways.

David F. said the land acquisition area adds buffer areas to help alleviate the noise and particulate issues. He asked David Williams to confirm the acreage.

David W. confirmed the one-runway configuration was approximately 2,400 acres and agreed this includes land for the airfield system, terminal, and buffer areas.

Rob H. added that Sea-Tac is constrained from having simultaneous Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) operations and air cargo also has issues there.

Senator Keiser then asked what the two-runway configuration is expected to need.

David W. did not have the numbers readily available. It was confirmed to be 3,100 acres.

David F. believes Senator Keiser was raising the issue that we could fit something, in regards to a one-runway configuration, in something smaller than what the consultant has provided.

Senator Keiser commented that it may not need to be done all at once, but we do need to plan ahead.

David F. said that gets to the strategy of building the capacity as it is needed over time given the fact that things can change. We do not know what could happen by 2050, we may not need a two-runway configuration by then.

Jeffrey B. cautions using Sea-Tac as a standard for acreage. Sea-Tac doesn't meet the FAA standards and if a runway is going to be built, the FAA will ensure the standards are met. There are many non-compliant airfields especially in runway to taxiway separation. If you build it within the 2,500 feet, it is possible to get waivers, but this will constrain the airport from being as efficient as possible.

David W. and Rob H. confirmed that the FAA was consulted with the runway configurations. David W. explained there was a new advisory circular released in 2022. So, these one, two, and three-runway templates were made to meet the current FAA requirements, provide allowances for growth, and also provide allowances to do the simultaneous operations in IFR (Instrument Flight Rules) conditions.

Lorin C. had concerns with a commercial site that can only handle one runway, which creates a single point of failure. If there is an aircraft incident or failure of pavement, the airport can go from full capacity to zero capacity very easily. It may be desirable to not build a second runway right away, but at least having the capacity to have a second runway is important in that it will help mitigate risk of having an airport out of commission for some period of time.

Robin T. wondered, seeing that Sea-Tac has a sustainable aviation master plan, what about the idea of vertiports and things like that. Will those be incorporated later in the plan or is that something to be thought about sooner rather than later.

David F. mentioned Option 5 has that type of technology imbedded into it. There has been more discussion on the distributed air service because it would probably be more impactful based on the fact that the aircraft currently in development today, 12-15 seat electric/hybrid, or all electric aircraft could make a dent in moving people but the vertiports would facilitate moving lesser numbers of people. They would be included in the airport of the future concept.

Chair/Vice-Chair/Planning Group Recommendations

David Fleckenstein - Chair, Warren Hendrickson – Vice Chair, and the planning group recommend the best option to pursue is Option 5.

5. Add capacity to Paine Field according to its Airport Master Plan (with potential for additional capacity), assume SEA executes its SAMP, assist other airports interested in pursuing regional commercial service (distributed air service supported by emerging technology), and continue to develop a greenfield site option with a two (2) runway configuration.
 - Most resilient strategy focusing on a system solution
 - Provides options within options
 - Continues the analysis on the greenfield options of Pierce County East, Pierce County Central and Thurston County Central
 - “Airport of the Future” addresses harmful emissions and noise

Based on everything talked about and heard, this is the best option because it suits the needs of adding capacity over time and incorporating sustainable aviation technology as available today and what is currently in the works. It also contains layered options making it more resilient to change, narrowing circumstances that could prevent a portion of it from not being doable. In lieu of narrowing the option down to one greenfield option at this time, they believe additional analysis needs to be conducted on the three sites (Pierce County East, Pierce County Central, and Thurston County Central). More information is needed to see if these are viable options. The feedback received to date; people want us to lead with environmental sustainability before committing to a new airport. They agree but believe the state can do both simultaneously. A new airport could be up to 20 years or more down the road. With that in mind, we absolutely should pursue the airport of the future concept that utilizes things such as sustainable aviation fuel, electric ground support equipment, electric vehicle and public transportation charging, the use of alternate propulsion systems such as electric or hydrogen, and more as it becomes available.

Member Discussion/Questions/Vote

Warren H. explained the process moving forward. Comments may be made by all Commission members. Voting will be done by the voting members only. There are 13 voting members present and a quorum has been met. The requirement (included in founding legislation) for a decision is 60 percent of the 15 voting members, which means 9 affirmative votes for a motion to be passed.

Discussion/Questions:

Senator Keiser would like to have an in-depth discussion of distributed air service supported by emerging technologies. The conversations she has had with air carriers has not been very encouraging. She isn't sure how we would pursue that if we do not have industry support.

Tony B. commented that they just finished the realignment in Pullman and it is a hard process. He believes this recommendation is good, because there are things that are measurable that can be done. It is a long process and someone has to shoulder that burden. The process includes finding a sponsor, going through the NEPA process, and a lot of the concerns people have raised, as we have gone through this process in the last two years, will be addressed, it is just in different pieces. Looking back on Pullman's experience, the more land you can get the better. The FAA can put in different things. The forward thinking this Commission has done with the consultants and WSDOT is appreciated. What happens here affects the entire state. If an airport loses their air service capability to get to Sea-Tac the community is lost to the aviation system. This is very important to the smaller airports in Washington State and it is a significant accessibility issue and can affect the economies and quality of life of the communities impacted.

Bryce Y. wants to ensure we are addressing the limitations of land use law in Washington on the impact to potential sites, especially greenfield sites. This includes things such as loss of agricultural resources and other things. In the comments to the legislature, we need to address and understand there are existing conflicts which need to be resolved. One of those is a long-standing state legislation that dictates how we do our land use planning and protects our farms, forests, and water rights.

Larry K. is opposed to hanging a number of caveats onto a motion. The motion needs to be as clean and straight forward as possible. It goes without saying, the process that will be followed to develop any of the recommendations will follow all applicable laws and regulations.

David F. asked Bryce Y. for clarification.

Bryce Y. explained that whatever is submitted to the legislature needs to include information that there might be conflicts that need to be resolved. One of them is the growth management act.

Representative Dent commented that the recommendation the Commission comes up with is just the beginning of a process, it does not lock anything in. When the legislation was created, they knew identifying a greenfield site was going to be a real challenge, as well as identifying another airport to take some of the pressure off Sea-Tac being a challenge.

Warren H. commented this is a collaborative and regional approach and we cannot meet capacity without a greenfield site. The decision to be made today is for the demand in 2050. However, we must be mindful of what the demand will look like after 2050 also. We must focus on resilience, options, locations, and take advantage of future technology. Recommendation #5 includes all of those elements. With regard to the greenfield site locations, it is a matter of looking at the population density and what the industry is looking for. What we have is a north site for commercial service with Paine Field, a central region site with Sea-Tac, and the industry and population density demographics then dictate the south sound be served. The three sites being discussed today would do that. Each six-mile circle is not written in stone, they can adjust

and move around. Ultimately, somewhere within that circle an airport could be sited for future demand.

Voting:

David Fleckenstein opened the floor for a motion on the recommendation offered, if there is one.

Lorin Carr moved to accept recommendation #5 as written on slide 44 of today's presentation.

Add capacity to Paine Field according to its Airport Master Plan (with potential for additional capacity), assume SEA executes its SAMP, assist other airports interested in pursuing regional commercial service (distributed air service supported by emerging technology), and continue to develop a greenfield site option with a two (2) runway configuration.

- *Most resilient strategy focusing on a system solution*
- *Provides options within options*
- *Continue the analysis on the greenfield options of Pierce County East, Pierce County Central and Thurston County Central*
- *"Airport of the Future" addresses harmful emissions and noise*

Robin Toth seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Steve E. commented that based on the statements made during the presentation today and the Commission's expression today to an ongoing commitment to applying the environmental guiding principles to the decisions we will be making, which he believes include assessments of community public health impacts relating to noise and pollution, this is the right option.

Bryce Y. wants to make sure, as we work through the process, that we do not forget, or think we can override, the large regulatory issues in these areas.

Vote:

David Fleckenstein then called for the vote. Due to this being a Teams meeting, a 'yes' vote is in support of the motion, and a 'no' vote does not support the motion.

Jeffrey Brown – Yes	Lorin Carr – Yes	Steve Edmiston – Yes
Tom Embleton – Yes (via chat)	Mark Englisian – Yes	David Fleckenstein – Yes
Shane Jones – Yes	Larry Krauter – Yes	Stroud Kunkle – Yes
Jim Kuntz – Yes	Robin Toth – Yes	Bryce Yadon - Yes
Arif Ghouse – abstain	Andrea Goodpasture (absent)	

The motion passes with 12 - yes, and 1 - abstain.

Comment from Arif G. – Paine Field is currently in the process of going through their master plan and it has not been adopted yet. They have not completed their public outreach and the plan has to be adopted by the elected officials. Since the motion included an assumption that Paine Field will be adopting the airport master plan, growth plan, etcetera, and that is not a certainty in any way at this point, that is why he decided to abstain.

Next Steps

David F. talked briefly about the next steps:

- October CACC report due to the Legislators
- Additional analysis needs to be conducted on potential sites
- Community engagement continues
- Commission provides final recommendations by June 2023
- Future CACC meeting to be determined

Adjourned

David F. adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:36 a.m.