## Snohomish County Airport

### Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne &amp; George Darrow</td>
<td>1073 Goat Trail, Lynnwood</td>
<td>425-348-0163</td>
<td>1-21-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

We don't want any more air traffic at Paine Field.

Comments to:

Barnard Dunkelberg  
Company
BridgeNet International  
Synergy Consultants  
Gibson Traffic Consultants

Dave Waggoner  
Director  
Snohomish County Airport  
3220 100th Street Southwest  
Everett, Washington 98204  
Email: airserviceeacommments@snoco.org

Cayla Morgan  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
Seattle Airports District Office  
Federal Aviation Administration  
1601 Lind Avenue, SW  
Renton, Washington 98057-3356  
Email: Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov

Thank You!
Response to Comment

Dear Jeanne and George Dalton:

Thank you for your comments to Paine Field Airport; they have been noted.
---- Original Message ----
From: Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov [mailto:Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2010 5:40 PM
To: Waggoner, Dave; Dolan, Bill; Ryk Dunkelberg; Ryan Hayes
Cc: Patricia.Deem@faa.gov; Caroline.CTR.Poyurs@faa.gov;
Roland.J.McKee@faa.gov
Subject: Fw: Paine Field review

Cayla Morgan
Environmental Protection Specialist
Seattle Airports District Office
Federal Aviation Administration
425-227-2653

----- Forwarded by Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA on 01/20/2010 04:38 PM -----
|------ -------- |
| From: Stephen Dana <danalane@msn.com> |
| |
| To: Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA@FAA |
| Date: 10/20/2010 03:22 PM |
| Subject: Paine Field review |

D.3
January 19, 2010

Cayla Morgan
Environmental Protection Specialist
Seattle Airport District Office, FAA
1601 Lind Ave SW
Renton, WA 98057

Ms. Morgan,

The matter of commercial air service at Paine field is up for environmental review before your office in the coming weeks. There has already been considerable debate and data gathered regarding this subject, but collecting that data, considering issues and different points of view contribute to the decision making process at this regulatory level of government. I support the process completely.

For me and my neighbors in and around Snohomish, the possibilities for commercial service at Paine Field are exciting and encouraging. Even though we have no illusion that service at Paine Field will be anything like Sea-Tac, the ability to have local service is encouraging.

From a purely selfish point of view, being able to avoid the trip to Sea-Tac would be very desirable. My family currently uses commercial air transport a dozen or more times per year. In the scheme of things, that is not too much, but each time we have to make that journey we waste valuable time and resources.

From an economic development point of view, commercial air service offers better marketability for our county and the businesses that have already made the commitment to locate here. Adding new businesses anywhere in the county improves the tax base and leverages the investment we already have made. Building on that foundation produces benefits for many.

If only we were able measure lost opportunities.

If this discussion were about whether we should be building a new airport on that same site in today’s world with today’s other conditions, we might be arguing for other locations as being more suitable. The fact is there is a world class publicly owned facility in place already. It was improved to accommodate jet aircraft of any size with public funds. This facility already has all the components we would require if we built a new airport on a different site.

There is no doubt that encouraging the use of the airport for any purpose will create impacts. Adding business of any kind to the airport will require analysis to consider impacts to existing uses. Regardless of the specific business, off site impacts like traffic and noise will come to the area and the same process will apply when determining proper mitigation. When Snohomish County built the Solid Waste Transfer Station at Paine Field they created a stream of traffic and associated environmental impacts that may be more detrimental to the study area that increased air traffic. That project sailed through the review process without a problem.
For surrounding residents, increased air traffic will certainly create some level of impact both in the air and on the ground. I don’t want to minimize their concerns. I would only suggest that when the Growth Management Act was adopted, it made provision for siting essential public facilities. The process of siting an essential public facility takes into consideration mitigation for impacts. Even though the airport already exists, the process of making it available for commercial air service may require consideration of specific measures to address impacts.

As a former elected official from Snohomish, I understand the difficult position you find yourself in when you have to make the right decision for all of us taxpayers perhaps at the expense of those closest to the airport. I know you will consider all the input very carefully and make the right decision. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard.

Sincerely,

Stephen Dana
Response to Comment

Dear Stephen Dana:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

General Response 1-5: Mitigation
General Response 6-1: Significance of Project Effects
-----Original Message-----
From: Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov [mailto:Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 1:12 PM
To: Waggoner, Dave; Dolan, Bill; Ryk Dunkelberg; Ryan Hayes
Cc: Patricia.Deem@faa.gov; Caroline.CTR.Poyurs@faa.gov;
    Roland.J.McKee@faa.gov
Subject: Fw: No additional flights at Paine

Cayla Morgan
Environmental Protection Specialist
Seattle Airports District Office
Federal Aviation Administration
425-227-2653
----- Forwarded by Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA on 01/06/2010 12:11 PM -----

"Robert Darrow" <robert@haozous.com> wrote on 01/06/2010 09:01:39 AM:

> [image removed]
> No additional flights at Paine
> Robert Darrow
> to:
> Cayla Morgan
> 01/06/2010 09:02 AM
>
> There seem to be some serious flaws in the EA, and the FAA seems to
> be serving the developer's lobbyist. The thousands of residents who
> bought homes in the area based on no airport growth are going to be
> very upset with the way this developer profit opportunity is being
> handled.
>
> Robert Darrow
> Mukilteo
Response to Comment

Dear Robert Darrow:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

**General Response 1-3:** An independent investigation is needed because the FAA pushed the County to approve the terminal

**General Response 1-11:** Flawed/inadequate/biased EA
From: Waggoner, Dave [mailto:Dave.Waggoner@co.snohomish.wa.us]
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2009 11:26 AM
To: Air Service Comments
Subject: FW: Public Comment period on draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Air Service at Paine Field extended to 1-29-10

From: chipandjoan@aol.com [mailto:chipandjoan@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2009 10:15 AM
To: Waggoner, Dave
Subject: Re: Public Comment period on draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Air Service at Paine Field extended to 1-29-10

I believe that the prospect of scheduled air service will enhance the utilization of the airport facility and I support air service to begin as soon as possible
244th Ave SE, Woodinville
Clifford W Davidson

-----Original Message-----
From: Waggoner, Dave <Dave.Waggoner@co.snohomish.wa.us>
Sent: Mon, Dec 21, 2009 3:07 pm
Subject: FW: Public Comment period on draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Air Service at Paine Field extended to 1-29-10

Attached find a notice of the extension of the public comment period on the draft EA for Air Service at Paine Field. Written comments will now be accepted until January 29, 2010.

Dave
Waggoner, Dave
Airport Director
Snohomish County Airport--Paine Field
425-388-5100 Direct
425-508-7286 Mobile
dave.waggoner@co.snohomish.wa.us
www.painefield.com
Response to Comment

Dear Clifford Davidson:

Thank you for your comments to Paine Field Airport; they have been noted.
----- Original Message ----- 
From: Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov [mailto:Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 3:19 PM  
To: Waggoner, Dave; Dolan, Bill; Ryan Hayes; Ryk Dunkelberg  
Cc: Patricia.Deem@faa.gov; Caroline.CTR.Poyurs@faa.gov; Roland.J.McKee@faa.gov  
Subject: Fw: Paine Field air service

Cayla Morgan  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
Seattle Airports District Office  
Federal Aviation Administration  
425-227-2653

----- Forwarded by Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA on 01/05/2010 02:17 PM ----- 

JDayRoch@aol.com wrote on 01/05/2010 07:25:22 AM:

> [image removed]
> Paine Field air service
> JDayRoch
> to:
> Cayla Morgan
> 01/05/2010 07:20 AM
> I support service at Paine Field. I live in Mill Creek and aircraft
> from Paine Field fly over our neighborhood regularly. I do not
> believe the addition of commercial flights will damage our area. In
> fact, it will likely benefit the community.
> John Day
> 2506 161st St Se
> Mill Creek, WA
Dear John Day:
Thank you for your comments to the FAA; they have been noted.
Nimmy Dayalu

to:
Cayla Morgan

02/05/2010 04:18 PM

Show Details

Pulikeshi Dayalu
5223 169th PL SW
Lynnwood WA 98037
425 787 9579
nimmycai@hotmail.com

February 5, 2010

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident of Lynnwood WA, I oppose the conversion of Painefield airport to a commercial status.

I am not interested in environmental reports that highlight the safety aspects.

We simply do not want to live near a commercial airport. No, not in my backyard. As simple as that.

I oppose the plan one hundred percent.

Thanks.

Pulikeshi Dayalu

Your E-mail and More On-the-Go. Get Windows Live Hotmail Free. Sign up now.
Dear Pulikeshi Dayalu:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA; they have been noted.
-----Original Message-----
From: Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov [mailto:Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 12:26 PM
To: Waggoner, Dave; Dolan, Bill; Ryk Dunkelberg; Ryan Hayes
Cc: Patricia.Deem@faa.gov; Roland.J.McKee@faa.gov; Caroline.CTR.Poyurs@faa.gov
Subject: Fw: Paine Field

Cayla Morgan
Environmental Protection Specialist
Seattle Airports District Office
Federal Aviation Administration
425-227-2653

----- Forwarded by Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA on 01/06/2010 11:25 AM -----

deardebebcomcast.net wrote on 01/05/2010 11:02:58 AM:

> [image removed]
> Paine Field
> deardeb
to:
> Cayla Morgan
> 01/05/2010 11:03 AM
> To whom this may concern:
> 
> As a property owner in Mukilteo since the early 1980's I stand for
> no commercial service at Paine Field.
> 
> A deal is a deal.
> 
> I grew up starting in the fifth grade in a little town called
> Bensenville, just on the south and west border of O'Hare Airport
> serving Chicago and Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, and
> Indiana, etc.
> 
> I watched school after school being shut down. There was nothing
> that could stop the noise, nor the oil slick that covers everything
> outdoors. Most of my family and friends have cancer.
> 
> A deal is a deal.
> 
> I would have never moved to this town if a commercial airport had
> been adjacent, raised my children, volunteered in the classroom, or
> generally being a good neighbor if I had known we would have to fight
> to save our sacred right to quiet enjoyment.
> 
> A deal is a deal.
> No commercial service

> Deb Dearie

> P.S. Frank Waggonner is a pompous fool. Please replace him.

> "Common sense in an uncommon degree is what the world calls wisdom"

> Samuel Taylor Coleridge
Response to Comment

Dear Deb Dearie:
Thank you for your comments to the FAA; they have been noted.
Dear Mr. Reardon,

When I moved to Mukilteo in 1985, I found a wonderful community, great schools for my children and a safe place to live. All good stuff. You see I migrated here from a village in Illinois called Bensenville. If you do not know the village, it borders the south and west side of Chicago’s O’Hare Airport. I went to school there from fifth grade through high school.

The quality of life was compromised by the air traffic noise from O’Hare, even though the towers used radiating landing and takeoff directions, it was not constant noise, but could wake us up from a dead sleep when the radis was overhead.

You could not hear the minister in church if the planes were going overhead. We had to stop our lessons because the planes were flying over in school, or quickly revert to silent reading time. The oily discharge? About once a month you had to clean black oily soot off of any yard furniture. But the worst effects? People get used to listening without hearing. Very bad for personal interactions. When you spend so much time where you cannot hear, you simply
get used to it. Most of my family and friends who have lived in Bensenville, succumb to cancer or emphysema. What does that tell you?

Now O'Hare has condemned most of the town. It is a miserable place to live, no pleasant restaurants any more, the schools I went to have closed, and to see the town half boarded up is very eerie.

Mr. Waggoner used to work at O'Hare. I approached him when there were hearings about a development under the North runway for Paine Field here in Mukilteo. I was deeply concerned that taking out acres of large trees would negatively impact my home just one block away. Mr. Waggoner assured me that the trees did nothing for the noise. He is so wrong about this. We lost our battle and the planes are much louder now. I stand for removing Mr. Waggoner from his position and for keeping the mediated agreement for the development of the City of Mukilteo.

You are a father, Mr. Reardon, and you have the ability to keep your word that you will stand with us. I do not think you would want to raise your children under an airport, especially one who promised to be mostly small planes.

We are barely an hour away from Seatac. Let us pull together and get the public transportation working for everyone.

Please stand with me and say, "A deal is a deal"

Sincerely,

Debora Dearie
808 10th St.
Mukilteo, WA 98275

425-710-0260

Now here
"Common sense in an uncommon degree is what the world calls wisdom"
Samuel Taylor Coleridge
Dear Debora Dearie:

Thank you for your comments to Snohomish County; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

**General Response 2-1:** MRD document  
**General Response 4-1:** Alternative airports should be used  
**General Response 6-4:** What are the quality of life impacts?
Dear Mr. Reardon,

Tonight I was at the last public hearing held at Kamiak HS. Over 600 people attended.

It appears that the study was conducted by a firm who has advised Paine Field in the past.

Also did you hear that one neighbor has taken pictures of the spotted owl nest in his backyard?

Please demand that there is a educational funded study that address the environmental impact.

Sincerely,

Deb Dearie

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "County Executive" <county.executive@co.snohomish.wa.us> 
To: deardebg@comcast.net 
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2010 8:13:47 PM GMT -08:00 US/Canada Pacific 
Subject: RE: Paine Field proposed expansion
Dear Ms. Deane:

Thank you for contacting me regarding discussions concerning commercial air service at Paine Field.

Let me make myself very clear: I am, and have always been, opposed to commercial air flights from Paine Field.

Under the directions of the Council, County staff has been in discussions with Allegiant Air since May of 2008, when the airline announced its intention to begin commercial flights at Paine Field. In June, the Federal Aviation Administration advised the County that a failure to negotiate in good faith may subject the County to an enforcement action. The same rules apply for Horizon Air to begin future flights from Paine Field.

Currently, the FAA is receiving public comment on the recently released draft environmental assessment under that National Environmental Protection Act.

We have forwarded your comment for consideration and inclusion when finalizing the assessment for the FAA to make an environmental determination.

Future comments can be forwarded directly by email either to airserviceeacommments@snoco.org or cayla.morgan@faa.gov. Mailed comments may be sent to: Dave Waggoner, Director, Snohomish County Airport, 3220 100th St. SW Suite A, Everett, WA 98204 or to Cayla Morgan, Environmental Protection Specialist, Seattle Airports District Office, FAA, 1601 Lind Ave. SW, Renton, WA 98057-3356. The public comment period runs until February 5, 2010.

Thank you again for sharing your concern.

Sincerely,

Aaron Reardon

County Executive

---

From: deardeb@comcast.net [mailto:deardeb@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2010 11:02 AM
To: County Executive
Subject: Paine Field proposed expansion

Dear Mr. Reardon,

When I moved to Mukilteo in 1985, I found a wonderful community, great schools for my children and a safe place to live. All good stuff. You see I migrated here from a village in Illinois called Bensenville. If you do not know the village, it borders the south and west side of Chicago's O'Hare Airport. I went to school there from fifth grade through high school.

The quality of life was compromised by the air traffic noise from O'Hare, even though the towers used radiating landing and takeoff directions, it was not constant noise, but
could wake us up from a dead sleep when the radis was overhead.

You could not hear the minister in church if the planes were going overhead. We had to stop our lessons because the planes were flying over in school, or quickly revert to silent reading time.
The oily discharge? About once a month you had to clean black oily soot off of any yard furniture.
But the worst effects? People get used to listening without hearing. Very bad for personal interactions. When you spend so much time where you cannot hear, you simply get used to it. Most of my family and friends who have lived in Bensenville, succumb to cancer or emphysema. What does that tell you?

Now O'Hare has condemned most of the town. It is a miserable place to live, no pleasant restaurants any more, the schools I went to have closed, and to see the town half boarded up is very eerie.

Mr. Waggoner used to work at O'Hare. I approached him when there were hearings about a development under the North runway for Paine Field here in Mukilteo. I was deeply concerned that taking out acres of large trees would negatively impact my home just one block away. Mr. Waggoner assured me that the trees did nothing for the noise. He is so wrong about this. We lost our battle and the planes are much louder now. I stand for removing Mr. Waggoner from his position and for keeping the mediated agreement for the development of the City of Mukilteo.

You are a father, Mr. Reardon, and you have the ability to keep your word that you will stand with us. I do not think you would want to raise your children under an airport, especially one who promised to be mostly small planes.

We are barely an hour away from Seattle. Let us pull together and get the public transportation working for everyone.

Please stand with me and say, "A deal is a deal"

Sincerely,

Debora Dearie
808 10th St.
Mukilteo, WA 98275

425-710-0260

Now here
"Common sense in an uncommon degree is what the world calls wisdom"
Samuel Taylor Coleridge
Dear Deb Dearie:

Thank you for your comments to Snohomish County; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

**General Response 1-9**: Roles of consultant and their qualifications
**General Response 1-13**: Additional study should be conducted
**General Response 11-1**: What is the impact on wildlife?
The study appears flawed due to measuring only minimum impact possibilities. Tax many schools speculate a deal is a deal.
Response to Comment

Dear Deb Dearie:

Thank you for your comments to Paine Field Airport; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

General Response 1-10: Scope of the EA analysis for future operations and passengers
General Response 1-11: Flawed/inadequate/biased EA
General Response 2-1: MRD document
General Response 7-7: Noise impacts on schools
I have been a resident of Snohomish County for all of my 58 years and have lived in Mukilteo for 22 years. My children went through Mukilteo public schools and I have been an employee in this county for over 35 years. I am supportive of commercial flights from Paine Field. I appreciate that other Mukilteo residents have their opinions about environmental impacts from expanded aviation use at Snohomish County Airport, but after reviewing the Draft Environment Assessment (DEA), I respectfully disagree with them.

Many public comments appear to be overstating potential impacts on air quality, traffic and pollution that the DEA has adequately addressed. Ongoing commentary regarding property values dropping due to commercial aviation is being made without basis.

Additionally, I will be a customer. I currently drive to Bellingham from Mukilteo to fly Allegiant Airlines to Southern California and to avoid the unpredictable trek to Sea-Tac. Coincidentally, Bellingham has a modest terminal and two airlines—Allegiant and Horizon Air serving residents of Whatcom, Skagit and Snohomish Counties as well as British Columbia.

I encourage you to recommend moving forward with a decision to open Paine Field to commercial air service for the benefit of all of Snohomish County's residents, the owners of this considerable asset.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Deller
Response to Comment

Dear Michael Deller:

Thank you for your comments to Paine Field Airport; they have been noted.
Hello,

I am a Snohomish County resident, living under the flight path of commercial aircraft turning south to land at Paine Field and I am writing in support of commercial flights from Paine. I see and hear Paine-bound jets every day and they are never intrusive.

The convenience of catching commuter flights locally would be very valuable to me.

Thanks
Dave De Marco
12432 14 Ave NE
Tulalip, WA 98271
Response to Comment

Dear Dave DeMarco:
Thank you for your comments to Paine Field Airport; they have been noted.
To whom it may concern:

In response to the Draft Environmental Assessment to allow scheduled flights at, and change the status of Paine Field, I wish to comment.

The EA makes its premise of little to no impact based on few flights by Horizon and Allegiant with limited increases over the next few years. As it has been testified to by many concerned citizens, and I will concur, if the status of Paine Field is changed from a Category 4 to a Category 1 airport allowing scheduled passenger flights it WILL, by law, open the door to any and all comers to begin scheduled flights at Paine Field as well. Southwest Airlines would be a logical and probable comer to remove themselves from the clutter and high gate leases of Sea Tac.

But getting back to the applications at present, Horizon already flies out of Sea Tac and Bellingham, and Allegiant already flies out of Bellingham. For individuals wishing to fly to Portland, Spokane or Las Vegas who live in the North Sound area, commute time from Everett north to Bellingham International is similar to travel time through downtown Seattle to Sea Tac. Parking and security clearance time would be advantageous at Bellingham. For those complaining about how much time they need to lead their flights to Portland, well, there's not much credence to their arguments that scheduled flights out of Paine Field are really necessary. The time to travel to any/either of the airports in question, parking or being dropped off, checking baggage, clearing security, waiting to board, waiting for the rest of your planemates to board, taxi time, waiting for your turn for your aircraft to take the active runway, flight time, taxi in, waiting for everyone to deplane, retrieving baggage, arranging any kind of transportation, clearing the airport environment...... you might as well drive to Portland yourself and have your own transportation at your own convenience! As far as flying to Spokane, either of the existing scheduled flight airports, are within equal driving and wait times. Arguments about having to drive through downtown Seattle don't hold merit as north sounders can, and should use Bellingham.

But wait, flights to Spokane from Bellingham stop at Sea Tac anyway! Why fly out of Everett to Spokane if flights will just go down to Sea Tac before continuing on to Spokane? Why? To fill the planes! Demand doesn't merit non stop flights from/to Bellingham, why will non stop flights from Everett be much different unless flights at Bellingham are eliminated to create greater demand at Paine. The scenario just doesn't make sense, so the initial proposal doesn't hold merit as it is obviously not the intended end result. Therefore, the Environmental Assessment is not assessing the potential for what could be real-world actualities. As far as Allegiant is concerned, again, those
travelers north of Seattle who don't want to wait at Sea Tac or travel through Everett and Seattle to fly to Las Vegas can and should go to Bellingham. For those flyers who complain about the time to get to Sea Tac to fly elsewhere, well, that's not what we're talking about here, we're talking about Portland, Spokane and Las Vegas, right? ...or, are we? Because if we're talking about other flights to other destinations, then the EA is irrellevant and unusable as written as it addresses only flights proposed to Portland, Spokane, and Las Vegas.

Access to Paine Field as a reliever airport and industrial center for freight and the Boeing company should not be altered. Access to BF Goodrich provides many vital community jobs, and the Boeing Company is already the largest employer in the Everett region. If Boeing loses access with an open door to all comers to move scheduled flights to Paine Field they may move completely to South Carolina. The loss of Boeing jobs would FAR out number the few support jobs that will come with scheduled flights. Losing Boeing jobs will not be compensated by passengers coming through the area to the airport to fly out immediately or who fly in and then commute directly through and on their way home or to some appointment.

The point has been tried to be made that Dash 8/Q400 aircraft that Horizon flies are quiet airplanes. Compared to which other airplanes? Q400's have huge six blade propellers and their (take off rating) 4,580 hp turbine engines turn at many hundreds of thousand of revolutions per minute. We live 1.5 miles south of the threshold for 34L at Paine Field. Not too many Dash 8's fly into Paine Field now but when one comes in for work at BF Goodrich on its de-ice boots, you know it! With the props at full pitch and the turbines screaming, a Dash 8/Q400 is NOT a quiet airplane. While Bombardier claims on their company website that the "Q" means quiet, the noise cancelling employed is for the cabin environment for the comfort of the passengers, not the external surface environment for those they fly over. Bombardier's specification sheet for the Q400 also states that take off noise levels are 78.3 db with a sideline level of 84. These planes do climb rather aggressively but they land on a 3 degree glideslope like all airlines and their landing noise level is specified at 94.8 db. Certainly not "quiet"! No one really mentions the MD 82's that Allegiant flies. The engines on an MD 82 are not very new technology engines and therefore are not the new high bypass turbines that can be considered "quiet" jet engines.

At current, the flights over the neighborhood (built on the premise that Paine Field would never have scheduled air service) are few. Many of the smaller propeller planes turn crosswind on departure or base on landing closer to the airport than our neighborhood. The turbine engined small private jets do fly low overhead and the new Boeings fly directly over on test flights. All those flights represent jobs and money to the local community. When the new Boeings fly over it is mostly a sense of awe and at the same time novelty because the flights are relatively rare and almost exclusively during the daytime. I support Boeing jobs and new Boeing test flights into and out of Paine Field as they represent direct jobs to residents who live nearby. I reject the argument that we want Boeing to build the planes but don't want them to fly back into Paine Field! I also support
use of Paine Field as a reliever airport for general aviation and industrial businesses as they also represent uses by and benefits to local residents.

Getting back to the basics about the current EA and how it may affect the decision about changing the status of Paine Field, I believe the EA is flawed, incomplete, and should not be allowed to be used as basis to allow the altering of status of Paine Field. It does not address the inevitable possibility of other airlines than Horizon and Allegiant flying only the flights that are presently being proposed. Any EA that should be considered should include the possibility of Alaska Airlines, Southwest, and other majors also moving flights to Paine Field, the construction of a larger terminal building (beyond the one considered in the current EA), parking for airline passengers (at current, where are they going to park?) and much heavier surface traffic for passengers and others dropping off or picking up passengers on flights not currently accounted for in this incomplete EA.

Further, let's remember that within the recent history of Sea Tac, billions (with a "B") have been spent constructing the third runway, millions have been spent FINALLY building light rail to Sea Tac with expansion already in the works, and millions have been spent updating and expanding the terminal environment at Sea Tac. All the while flights have been reduced due to the global economy and Sea Tac is operating at least 30% below capacity. If Sea Tac were nearing operating capacity and all the infrastructure improvements had not been recently completed, there might be merit to propose scheduled airline passenger service at Paine Field.

I respectfully submit that the Draft Environmental Assessment cannot be considered in its current form.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Steve Demmert
3814 Serene Way
Lynnwood, WA 98087
Dear Steve Demmert:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

**General Response 1-10:** Scope of the EA analysis for future operations and passengers

**General Response 2-2:** Boeing reaction to the Proposed Project and effect of the Project on Boeing

**General Response 3-5:** Why was 2016 selected as the future year?

**General Response 4-2:** What is the relationship of the Proposed Project to WSDOT's Long-Term Air Transportation Study (LATS)

**General Response 4-3:** What is the demand for this proposal and how does it fit with regional planning?

**General Response 4-4:** Relationship between capacity at other airports and Paine Field

**General Response 5-4:** Existing Traffic

**General Response 7-5:** Proposed commercial fleet mix
Dear Mr. Reardon,

Tonight I attended the FAA meeting at Kamiak High School. This packed standing room only crowd was the second of three meetings I was able to attend. The charade of a process before us nauseates me. The sheer condescension the EA study represents is both insulting and maddening. I am particularly distraught that the County Council has repeatedly voiced in public that they were not in favor of the airport expansion yet every move they have made speaks loudly to say otherwise.

The expansion of Paine Field will destroy the fabric of life and economic standard we in the beautiful community enjoy. The fact that the EA study fails to take into account the full impact of the expansion down the road is despicable. I can assure you of one thing. The expansion of the airport will leave a last pox on this community and it's members will have a long and vivid memory of whence it came. Just this past week an equally arrogant politician in Massachusetts failed to recognize the angst of the people and simply assumed she would be elected. I think we all know how that one turned out...

You and your fellow council members serve at our leisure. To forget that and forge ahead with this ill conceived project will very surely leave you out on the streets.

No Broken Promises, No Airport Expansion!

Vicki Derks
13820 Picnic Point Rd
Edmonds WA 98275

425-245-3866
Dear Vicki Derks:

Thank you for your comments to Snohomish County; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

- **General Response 2-1**: MRD document
- **General Response 3-5**: Why was 2016 selected as the future year?
- **General Response 6-4**: What are the quality of life impacts?
-----Original Message-----
From: Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov [mailto:Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2010 1:33 PM
To: Waggoner, Dave; Dolan, Bill; Ryk Dunkelberg; Ryan Hayes
Cc: Patricia.Deem@faa.gov; Caroline.CTR.Poyurs@faa.gov;
Roland.J.McKee@faa.gov
Subject: Fw: painefield service

Cayla Morgan
Environmental Protection Specialist
Seattle Airports District Office
Federal Aviation Administration
425-227-2653

----- Forwarded by Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA on 01/25/2010 12:32 PM -----
| ------------------>
| From: |
|-------->

>---------------------------------------------------------------|
|Matt or Karen Dillon <dingojoe@yahoo.com>
|
| |
|>---------------------------------------------------------------|

>---------------------------------------------------------------|
|To: |
|-------->

>---------------------------------------------------------------|
|Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA@FAA|
|
>---------------------------------------------------------------|
|Date: |
|-------->

>---------------------------------------------------------------|
|01/21/2010 08:28 AM|
|
>---------------------------------------------------------------|
|Subject: |
|-------->

>---------------------------------------------------------------|
|paine field service|
|
>---------------------------------------------------------------|
I am writing in support of commercial airline service at Paine Field. I live in Monroe and going to SeaTac is a huge hassle and wastes fuel and time to get there. I could take 2 hours off a plane trip if Paine Field was in service. I would support commercial service in Monroe itself, if that was available. Today's planes are much more quite than days past. My In-laws live in Redondo Beach which is right in the incoming and outbound flights from SeaTac and it isn't noisy at all. In fact, I like looking at the various planes. Please count me and my family in favor of flights from Paine Field. Thank You. Karen Dillon 21729 Woods Creek Rd Monroe
Response to Comment

Dear Matt & Karen Dillon:
Thank you for your comments to the FAA; they have been noted.
Hello,

I am unable to attend a public hearing, but am delighted to hear that commercial air flights are being considered for Paine Field.

I live in Mill Creek and travel regularly for business. Due to my hectic schedule - two young children needing transportation daily, an older parent occasionally needing support, and full-time employment requiring more than a 40-hour workweek on my part and my husband's, I usually end up driving myself to the airport. It saves time, hassle, and stress. I don't have the option to not travel with my job so flights are inevitable for me. Occasionally I take a cab. The last time I took a cab (December 14th of 2009), the fare was over $100, not including a tip. The trip takes me about an hour, is about 34 miles one-way, with a fuel cost of about $9 round trip. My concern, however, is not the expense, as my company covers my costs generally.

My concern is all the single driver trips to the airport from populous Snohomish county - and other less populated counties north of Snohomish. It is ridiculous to funnel so many drivers through such a populated and highly congested freeway system as we have with I-5 and I-405 when Paine field is so conveniently located and easy-to-access for the many Puget Sound residents living north of the King County line.

- For those residents of Mukilteo who are concerned about air traffic, may I ask why they are living near an airport in the first place?
- Why is it okay to add flights out of Seatac further adding to air pollution there but not to take some of our share in Snohomish county?
- Airlines are cancelling flights as I know from personal experience (eg. service between Seattle and Chicago was cut by American Airlines), so concern that flights out of Paine Field would escalate suddenly and exponentially seem out-of touch with reality. Also, I don't believe any international flights are being requested, and SeaTac ranks higher on the list of domestic airports for international boards then it does for domestic boards on a recent list I saw on wikipedia.

I travel often to locations with smaller airports such as Oakland and San Jose in the Bay Area and Burbank and John Wayne in LA. It is so much easier to leverage such airports.
While having high speed rail service from near my home to the airport available would be terrific, even if it was approved and funded tomorrow, it most likely wouldn't be in service for another eight years +/- . Commercial flights could be in place from Paine Field - I assume - in around one year or less once approvals were in place.

Regards,
Dia Dissmore
diaglynn@yahoo.com
425.486.0252
Mill Creek, WA 98012
Response to Comment

Dear Dia Dissmore:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted.

Please also refer to the following individual response.

Project Timeline:

In response to comments regarding the project timeline, assuming environmental approval in 2012 and construction in early 2013, it is possible that commercial service could be available at Paine Field as early as summer of 2013.
-----Original Message-----
From: Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov [mailto:Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 3:21 PM
To: Waggoner, Dave; Dolan, Bill; Ryk Dunkelberg; Ryan Hayes
Cc: Patricia.Deem@faa.gov; Caroline.CTR.Poyurs@faa.gov;
Roland.J.McKee@faa.gov
Subject: Fw: Paine Field Everett, WA service

Cayla Morgan
Environmental Protection Specialist
Seattle Airports District Office
Federal Aviation Administration
425-227-2653
----- Forwarded by Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA on 01/05/2010 02:18 PM ------

RichardVDodds@aol.com wrote on 01/05/2010 07:22:53 AM:

> [image removed]
> Paine Field Everett, WA service
> RichardVDodds
> to:
> Cayla Morgan
> 01/05/2010 07:23 AM
> I eagerly await commercial air service at Paine Field, Everett, Washington.
> I believe that commercial air service at Paine Field, as proposed by both Horizon and Allegiant, will be a benefit for all in the area just North of Seattle.
> Don't bend to the narrow views of some people and small towns that want to stay in the dark ages with no commercial service.
> Please also remember that Paine Field supported commercial flights from West Coast Airlines for some time in the early 1950's, and also from several small commuter operators until very recently. Therefore, commercial service is not new to Paine Field.
> Commercial service at Paine Field will never become a second Sea-Tac, nor will it evolve to be an equal to the John Wayne airport of Orange County California. Even if commercial service grew to 15 flights daily, that would still be a small fraction of the total yearly operations at the former air force base.
> Rick Dodds
> Las Vegas, NV
Response to Comment

Dear Rick Dodds:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA; they have been noted.
Those involved with the responsibility for the operation, maintenance, and future development of this unique resource must prepare themselves for the negative response that has resisted the orderly growth and utilization of a facility that is without equal in the entire Evergreen State. I encourage you to begin immediately with a campaign that will stress the potential benefits to Snohomish County citizens, especially those who bear the burden of property taxes. Showcase the projects immediate and future benefits. Describe the light rail extension to a terminal facility that will capture the best design concepts of the century. Highlight the flight patterns that will take advantage of the proximity to Puget Sound and their zero impact on current and future urban areas. Snohomish, Whatcom, Island, and Skagit counties are the cornerstone of future development in Western WA state. What an opportunity for elected officials, appointed community activists and talented professionals to be involved in a concept that holds the promise of major benefit for generations to come. If those who are satisfied with preservation of status quo, and are dedicated to obstruction of growth are allowed to successfully promote their ideology— Then shame on you all! You have the ability- you have the talent- The goal is worthy! Now — Get Going!

John J. Donoghue
Kalispell, MT

Former Snohomish County resident
Dear John Donoghue:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted.
From: Bill Doran [mailto:bill@doransales.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 8:00 PM
To: Air Service Comments
Cc: cayla.morgan@
Subject: Paine Field Commercial Service

I support and highly encourage commercial service at Paine Field in Everett, WA. Commercial service would make the greater Everett area more attractive to Northwest regional businesses and as a long term impact would increase our employment opportunities which will increase our property values.

Please do everything possible to allow commercial flights into Paine Field and move us into the 21st century.

Bill Doran
DORAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
Manufacturer’s Representative
Office (425) 488-1200
Cell (206) 819-2001
www.doransales.com
Dear Bill Doran, on behalf of Doran Associates:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted.
From: County Executive [mailto:county.executive@co.snohomish.wa.us]
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2010 12:18 PM
To: Waggoner, Dave; Air Service Comments
Subject: FW: Psaine Field (again)

Amy Ockerlander
Executive Analyst
Snohomish County Executive Office
3000 Rockefeller, M/S 407
Everett, WA 98201-4046
Dir. Phone: 425-388-3090
Main Phone: 425-388-3480
Fax: 425-388-3434
Email: amy.ockerlander@snoco.org
www.snoco.org

From: Don Doran [mailto:cando411@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2010 9:48 PM
To: County Executive
Cc: Camp, Peter
Subject: Psaine Field (again)

Sorry for the redundancy but I thought it might be helpful to include the attachments that I referred to in the first email.

Don

Good Morning County Executive Reardon-

As you undoubtedly know, the scheduled commercial service issue is at a critical stage. The FAA has funded an environmental assessment in an attempt to comply with NEPA but the study uses an artificially small number of flights to evaluate the impacts. This is wrong and does not comply with the spirit nor the letter of the law in our view. We urge you to read the 2 letters attached and to formulate your own response to the FAA. It would be advisable to attend the last FAA hearing being held this Thursday evening at 6:30 pm at Kamiak High School in Mukilteo.

We urge you to engage on the flawed Draft Environmental Assessment, to withdraw the County request for a terminal subsidy and to respond to the 6 south County Mayor letter on good faith negotiations sent November 2008.

Don’t hesitate to contact me with any questions and visit our website at socnw.org for lots of additional information.

Respectfully-
Don Doran
President
Save Our Communities
president@socnw.org
(425) 210-6893
January 15, 2010

Snohomish County Council  
Chair Dave Gossett  
Vice-Chair Dave Somers  
Councilmember John Koster  
Councilmember Brian Sullivan  
Councilmember Mike Cooper  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Council Members,

On behalf of our communities and members, I am compelled to write this letter to you regarding Paine Field. We have two requests: the first involves the Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) and the second involves the terminal-funding request presumably put forward by the County.

First, the Draft Environmental Assessment is out for comment. Two public hearings have been held and the final one is scheduled for January 21st. A number of legitimate and thoughtful concerns have been expressed but one stands out and demands engagement from our elected leaders — the scope of the DEA is absolutely insufficient.

As each of you know, the FAA provides grant funds and has rules requiring airports receiving grant funds to engage in good faith negotiations with interested air carriers. If that process gets far enough then the FAA funds consultants to produce Environmental Assessments or Environmental Impact Statements. In the case of Paine Field, the FAA funded consultant is using minimal flight activity levels provided by Horizon and Allegiant rather than independently assessing higher potential activity levels which would obviously produce greater impacts. In addition, the draft EA only looks out to 2016, further minimizing the downstream impact analysis. This limited scope skews the entire assessment including but not limited to impacts from air emissions, noise, traffic, parking, water runoff and impacts to children required by Presidential Executive Order.

We request that the County Council formally express their concern regarding the scope. The public and our region deserve a fair, transparent and honest decision making process, particularly when the decision involves an irreversible regional game changer. We must collectively work to ensure that the FAA rejects a flawed minimal assessment that concludes there are no significant impacts in changing the role of Paine Field airport. The assessment should not be based on a few flights but on the full potential impacts both short term and long
term. To stand on the sideline during this already flawed process would be a complete abdication of responsibility and duty to the public — duty we know you all take seriously.

We urge you to formally convey concerns to your airport director and the FAA regarding the scope of the assessment, specifically calling for the scope to address foreseeable potential activity levels resulting from a change in the airport operating certificate to allow commercial service. We note that there are now two proposed terminals and both should be considered. The system should not be allowed to foster incremental “approvals” that, by design, circumvent requirements to mitigate impacts beyond certain thresholds.

Secondly, we urge you to rescind the County request for FAA terminal construction funds that in effect subsidize Horizon and Allegiant. The County position of discouraging commercial service within FAA’s legal requirements does not include actively seeking taxpayer funds to subsidize start up service. The air carriers should pay their own way and terminal costs should be retired using air carrier revenue, not taxpayer funds (and FAA funds come from taxpayers).

We look forward to your timely actions on these requests reflective of your commitment to public service and commensurate with your responsibilities and duties as duly elected Snohomish County Council members. The public trust is at stake.

Sincerely,

Don Doran, President
Save Our Communities
president@socnw.org

cc:
Senator Patty Murray
Senator Maria Cantwell
Representative Jay Inslee
Representative Rick Larsen
State Senator Paul Shinn
State Representative Marko Liias
State Representative Mary Helen Roberts
Snohomish County Executive Aaron Reardon
Mayor Joe Marine, City of Mukilteo
Mayor Gary Haakenson, City of Edmonds
Mayor Don Gough, City of Lynnwood
Mayor Carla Nichols, City of Woodway
Mayor Mike Todd, City of Mill Creek
Mayor Jerry Smith, City of Mountlake Terrace
Mayor Bob Colinas, City of Brier
Everett Herald
Seattle Times
Puget Sound Business Journal
Seattle Magazine
Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce
Seattle Post-Intelligencer
Mukilteo Beacon
KIRO TV 7 (CBS)
KOMO TV 4 (NEW)
KIRO TV 7 (ABC)
KIRO AM 950
KOMO TV 4 (ABC)
KPS TV 45
KPTK AM 1090
KSTW TV 11 (CW)
KTTH AM 770 (ABC)
KUOW FM 94.9 (NPR)
KVI AM 570 (Fox)
NorthWest Cable News

The Honorable Aaron Reardon  
Snohomish County Executive  
3000 Rockefeller  
M/S 407  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Executive Reardon,

On behalf of our communities and members, I am compelled to write this letter to you regarding Paine Field. We have three requests: the first involves the Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA), the second relates to the terminal-funding request reportedly put forward by the County and the third concerns your response to a letter written by several Snohomish County city mayors regarding good faith negotiations.

First, the Draft Environmental Assessment is out for comment. Two public hearings have been held and the final one is scheduled for January 21st. A number of legitimate and thoughtful concerns have been expressed but one stands out and demands engagement from our elected leaders—the scope of the DEA is absolutely insufficient.

As you know, the FAA provides grant funds and has rules requiring airports receiving grant funds to engage in good faith negotiations with interested air carriers. If that process gets far enough then the FAA funds consultants to produce Environmental Assessments or Environmental Impact Statements. In the case of Paine Field, the FAA funded consultant is using minimal flight activity levels provided by Horizon and Allegiant rather than independently assessing higher potential activity levels which would obviously produce greater impacts. In addition, the draft EA only looks out to 2016 further minimizing the downstream impact analysis. This limited scope skews the entire assessment including but not limited to impacts from air emissions, noise, traffic, parking, water runoff and impacts to children required by Presidential Executive Order.

We request you formally convey concerns to your airport director and the FAA regarding the limited scope of the environmental assessment and specifically call for the scope to address foreseeable potential activity levels resulting from a change in the airport operating certificate to allow commercial service. The public and our region deserve a fair, transparent and honest decision making process, particularly when the decision involves an irreversible regional game changer.

Urge the FAA to reject a flawed minimal assessment that concludes there are no significant impacts in changing the role of Paine Field. The system should not be allowed to foster incremental "approvals" that, by design, circumvent requirements to mitigate impacts beyond certain thresholds. The assessment should not be based on a few flights but on the full potential impacts both short term and long term. We note that there are now two proposed terminals and both should be considered since both proposals are connected to FAA rules and expectations.
Your personal position opposing scheduled service at Paine Field, the documented County position of discouraging scheduled service and the duty to ensure public rights are not circumvented provide three compelling reasons supporting our request. We know you are interested in forging, developing and implementing a vision for Snohomish County. We have a shared vision in believing that Paine Field's best role is to serve as an Aerospace Center of National Significance. We should not allow a flawed process to change that role. We urge you to take action while you can.

Secondly, we urge you to rescind the County request for FAA terminal construction funds that in effect subsidize Horizon and Allegiant. The County position of discouraging commercial service within FAA's legal requirements does not include actively seeking taxpayer funds to subsidize start up service. The air carriers should pay their own way and terminal costs should be retired using air carrier revenue, not taxpayer funds (and FAA funds come from taxpayers). Your airport director and staff should be reminded of their duty to support you and the County position on these matters.

Thirdly, we ask that you provide an answer to, or copy of your reply to, the November, 2008 letter regarding how to reconcile the County position of discouraging scheduled commercial service while still engaging in good faith negotiations required by FAA. The letter was signed by mayors from Mukilteo, Lynnwood, Edmonds, Woodway, Mountlake Terrace and Brier. A copy can be found at http://socnw.org/pdf/Open%20ltr%20to%20Reardon%20by%20mayors%20Nov%202008.pdf.

We look forward to your timely actions on these requests reflective of your commitment to public service and commensurate with your responsibilities and duties as Snohomish County Executive. The public trust is at stake.

Sincerely,

Don Doran, President
Save Our Communities
president@socnw.org

cc:
Senator Patty Murray
Senator Maria Cantwell
Representative Jay Inslee
Representative Rick Larsen
State Senator Paul Shinn
State Representative Marko Liias
State Representative Mary Helen Roberts
Mayor Joe Marine, City of Mukilteo
Mayor Gary Hakstenson, City of Edmonds
Mayor Don Gough, City of Lynnwood
Mayor Carla Nichols, City of Woodway
Mayor Mike Todd, City of Mill Creek
Mayor Jerry Smith, City of Mountlake Terrace
Mayor Bob Collins, City of Brier
Everett Herald
Seattle Times
Puget Sound Business Journal
Seattle Magazine
Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce
Seattle Post-Intelligencer
Mukilteo Beacon
Edmonds Beacon
KCPQ TV 13 (Fox)
KCTS TV 9 (PBS)
KEKP FM 90.3
KHJO AM 850
KING FM 98.1
KING TV 5 (NBC)
KIRO AM 710 (ESPN)
KIRO TV 7 (CBS)
KJR AM 950
KMYQ TV 22 (MyTV)
KOMO AM 1000 (ABC)
KOMO TV 4 (ABC)
KPST TV 45
KPTK AM 1090
KSTW TV 11 (CW)
KTTH AM 770 (ABC)
KUOW FM 94.9 (NPR)
KV1 AM 570 (Fox)
NorthWest Cable News
Dear Don Doran, on behalf of Save our communities:

Thank you for your comments to Snohomish County and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

**General Response 1-1:** Why can't the County limit or restrict operations?

**General Response 1-6:** What are the FAA and County roles in this EA and has a decision been made to move forward?

**General Response 1-10:** Scope of the EA analysis for future operations and passengers

**General Response 1-16:** How will the proposal be funded?

**General Response 3-1:** What is the purpose and need for the action or project?

**General Response 3-5:** Why was 2016 selected as the future year?

**General Response 3-11:** What is the capacity of the terminal?

**General Response 3-12:** What is the relationship of the two terminals?

**General Response 3-14:** What actions will require additional environmental review?

**General Response 6-1:** Significance of Project Effects
To Whom It May Concern-

In response to the request for comments on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Snohomish County (Paine Field) airport, please find our comments and requests enclosed. Save Our Communities believes that we have cogently illustrated a number of area's in the DEA where the FAA simply ignored their own regulations, orders and the law. We ask for a detailed response to our comments and questions posed.

Respectfully-

Don Doran
President
Save Our Communities
(425) 210-6893
February 5, 2010

Ms. Cayla Morgan  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
Seattle Airports District Office, Federal Aviation Administration  
1601 Lind Avenue S.W.  
Renton, WA 98057-3356

Dear Ms. Morgan:

In response to the request for comments on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Snohomish County (Paine Field) airport, please find our comments and requests enclosed. We ask for a detailed response to questions posed and to our requests for additional action.

Executive Summary
Our comments focus on three major issues based not only on the EA, but also on the process used to begin the EA.

First, the FAA engaged in coercion of Snohomish County to sway a vote by the County Council in favor of terminal construction. The FAA pre-empted its own rules and, by forcing that vote, created the basis to start the EA. Details that demonstrate such coercion are provided herein. Although internal FAA communications demonstrate restraint and a commitment to a more fair process by most, there are others in the FAA seemingly committed to getting airlines into Paine Field no matter what the cost to the public.

Given the documentation we have, we will be recommending an independent agency, such as the GAO and/or Washington State’s Auditor, initiate an investigation immediately into the overall process and conduct of all involved officials at the FAA, Paine Field airport or third-party contractor to determine compliance with applicable rules, policies and existing laws. Upon completion, the investigating agency needs to refer findings to the Department of Justice or other appropriate law enforcement agency.
The FAA's overzealous drive includes the failure to hire a truly independent third-party contractor and the failure to direct that contractor to pursue a fair, unbiased and comprehensive analysis that genuinely meets the intent and purpose of NEPA. We ask that a new, qualified contractor be identified based on a proper bidding process.

In view of these findings, the EA should be negated in favor of a properly scoped Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The County Council's vote was coerced, so the entire process leading up to such coercion should be reviewed with the Council having the opportunity to reconsider its vote.

We are copying the Snohomish County Council and County Executive on this letter. As stated in our letter of January 15, 2010 to the County, we urge the County to rescind its request for FAA terminal construction funds that effectively subsidize Horizon and Allegiant. The County's position of discouraging commercial service within FAA's legal requirements includes the County's stated policy to "insist that an airline pay its own way and mitigate its impacts." (MRD Report May 16, 2007.)

In support of the County's freedom to act without coercion, we specifically request that the FAA demonstrate clearly to the County that discretionary funds are, in fact, not jeopardized by any action that the County takes, or does not take, with respect to funding a terminal, and that the County fully complies with FAA rules whether or not the County chooses to subsidize terminal construction. The FAA must take whatever other steps necessary to reverse the poisonous atmosphere it created by its coercive actions.

Secondly, we believe the EA is fatally flawed based on its scope. Full details are provided herein. We ask that if actions proceed to change Paine Field from a Class IV to a Class I airport that an EIS is conducted with a scope based on full capacity of the airport and full impacts and mitigation accounted for. The FAA rules on economic non-discrimination do not allow for local restrictions other than those that are safety related. That means no restrictions on the number and frequency of flights or the time of day they occur. The potential activity levels associated with changing the role of the airport are akin to looking at the maximum activity of a new commercial airport or new runway at SeaTac. The limited scope of the draft EA based on airline intentions hardly gets at this larger picture. Sea-Tac's 3rd runway analysis was not based on a few daily flights so it is reasonable to expect opening another "new" scheduled service runway/airport in the region would get no less of an analysis. Additional specific requests for the EIS are included in the "Conclusions" section of our comments.

Finally, we provide comments outlining a number of substantial environmental concerns that the draft EA failed to address adequately due to the modest scope and/or flawed assessment methodology. We would expect that an EIS would address these substantial environmental concerns by outlining a plan to analyze, mitigate, and assess payment for them to the airlines at Paine Field. A failure to do this represents an unacceptable
social, economic, and environmental liability to the taxpayers and municipalities of Snohomish County.

Sincerely,

Save Our Communities (SOC)
President, Officers, Board
On behalf of SOC members

Cc:
Snohomish County Council
Snohomish County Executive
Senator Patty Murray
Senator Maria Cantwell
Congressman Jay Inslee
Congressman Rick Larsen
Governor Christine Gregoire
Senator Paul Shinn

Representative Marko Liias
Representative Mary Helen Roberts
Mayor Joe Marine (Mukilteo)
Mayor Gary Haakenson (Edmonds)
Mayor Don Gough (Lynnwood)
Mayor Carla Nichols (Woodway)
Mayor Jerry Smith (Mountlake Terrace)
Mayor Bob Colinas (Brier)
Secretary Paula Hammond (DOT)
Table of Contents

Process Flaws and Violations of Law/Policy/Precedence.................................5
Part I: FAA Threats Forced Snohomish County to Pass Terminal Resolution ..........6
FOIA Obtained Documents; Flawed EA Consultant Selection .............................6
Part II: EA Scoping is Improper, Creates Fatal Flaw: Does Not Comply with NEPA ....13
  Sole Source Consultant Selection a Conflict of Interest Violation – EA Invalidated........21
Part III Comments on impacts that the EA failed to address............................24
  Compatible Land Use: Significant Land Use Compatability Issues exist..................28
SOC’s Overall Conclusions .................................................................................47
Process Flaws and Violations of Law/Policy/Precedence

These comments point out flaws and violations of law, rules, orders and policies involved throughout this entire EA process. We have acquired documents and communications through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and will reference only a portion of those in our comments, reserving the ability to use them in different actions in the future. As a result, these comments are not intended to convey an exhaustive listing or description of all the flaws, violations and concerns. Given the possibility of formal complaints and/or legal actions we reserve the right to add to or modify this list in the future. In addition, since these comments are provided in response to NEPA and not in response to a SEPA hearing, (which has not occurred yet), we reserve the right to provide additional information pertinent to SEPA at a later date. For ease of reference the following list summarizes the major issues discussed in this document.

Part I  FAA threats forced Snohomish County to pass terminal resolution
          FOIA obtained documents; Flawed EA consultant selection
Part II  EA scoping is improper, creates fatal flaw: does not comply with NEPA
Part III Comments on impacts that the EA failed to address
Part I: FAA Threats Forced Snohomish County to Pass Terminal Resolution

FOIA Obtained Documents; Flawed EA Consultant Selection

Without a resolution would there have been an EA?

Summary. The FAA coerced Snohomish County into authorizing the construction and payment of a terminal against both the County’s wishes and against FAA’s own rules. Its actions poisoned the atmosphere for negotiations and for unbiased consideration, creating bad faith and forcing a decision by the County Council that may not have happened in a less threatening environment. The FAA should acknowledge that such threats were improper and the County Council should have the opportunity to reconsider its decision to pay for a terminal, or have the prospective airline applicants pay for a terminal, in an environment devoid of threats from the FAA. The FAA, and specifically Carol Suomi, Manager, Seattle Airports District Office, has taken positions that seem to pervert the discretionary grant program by misuse of the grant assurances in an effort to compel and direct the County to do what she wants. Under such circumstances, this entire EA should be invalidated since it is premised on wrongful actions and on a terminal that have significant design changes if airline applicants pay for its construction. Support for this argument is provided below.

In a legal memorandum written by Kaplan Kirsch Rockwell on 7 Jan 2009 for the County about its obligations with respect to scheduled air service, the law firm writes:

“In summary, the FAA has opined that, when it receives a proposal to initiate commercial service, an airport sponsor like Snohomish County:

- Is not required to construct facilities to accommodate the carrier if such facilities do not already exist.”

This finding is consistent with a letter from the FAA to Save Our Communities dated 12 Dec 2005 (enclosed), where the FAA stated the following:

SOC: “Does the FAA actively force a change in the role of any airports from general aviation to commercial air passenger or air cargo?”

FAA: “While the FAA provides expertise and guidance on growth planning, and compliance with grant assurances to airport sponsors, we do not force an airport to change its role from general aviation to commercial air passenger or air cargo.”

---

1 Memo from Kaplan Kirsch Rockwell to Snohomish County, “Obligations to accommodate commercial Air Service”, 7 Jan 2009, p. 4
SOC: “If a commercial carrier asks the FAA to enforce grant assurances, would the FAA require the airport operator (such as Snohomish County) to pay for upgraded facilities, terminals, baggage, parking, road and traffic improvements, and other direct or indirect costs necessary for an air carrier to operate?”

FAA: “The prime obligation of the airport sponsor is to operate the airport for the use and benefit of the public. While the owner is not required to construct or upgrade facilities, it has the obligation to make available suitable areas or space on reasonable terms to those who are willing and otherwise qualified to offer flight services to the public (i.e. air carrier, air taxi, charter, flight training, crop dusting, etc.) The airport sponsor has a duty to negotiate in good faith for the lease of such premises as may be available for the conduct of aeronautical services.”

Finally note: The County only has an obligation to “negotiate in good faith” with prospective air carriers. The County’s own attorney states:

“... federal law and FAA regulations do not require that negotiations with a prospective carrier be successful.”

Summary: The County is not required to fund a terminal, negotiations in good faith need not be successful, and the FAA does not force a role change. A reasonable “arms length” negotiation between the County and prospective air carriers should take place.

However, in February of 2009, the County Council is suddenly considering a motion to pay for funding a terminal. According to the January legal memo:

“FAA staff has explained that, if the County is unwilling to make the minimal investment to build a terminal for these carriers, FAA will reconsider its historical level of funding for Paine Field. More seriously, as explained above in footnote 3, the County could jeopardize over $70 million in discretionary funding under the proposed federal economic stimulus package. The FAA is watching the actions of the County closely; the agency has a long track record of using discretionary grants to convince an airport proprietor to act in a manner consistent with the FAA’s policies.”

“If the FAA were to withhold discretionary grants, the County would risk losing funding for projects that directly support Boeing’s operations and provide an incentive for Boeing to remain at Paine Field.”

On January 7, 2009, Carol Suomi wrote:

“.... I believe it is time to push them harder to move towards commercial service. There is a County Council Meeting next Monday, and I would really like to have this out by Friday of this week.”

And in another quote:

---

2 Ibid 1, p. 7
3 KKR memo p. 11
"... In conclusion, the bottom line is that county must provide concrete evidence, such as a signed contract, that they will meet their grant obligations before we would award discretionary funds towards any requested projects."4

Apparently, the FAA has created a basis for funding a terminal or ... risk losing Boeing.

The FAA has provided discretionary grants to Paine Field for 45 years. It then threatens to withhold those grants unless the County builds a terminal for private commercial carriers. This is very troubling because the FAA is essentially blackmailing the taxpayers of Snohomish County. This also violates the FAA’s Airport Improvement Handbook (FAA Order 5100.38C) that states in part 25 (g):

“(1) Projects funded with any discretionary funds should be based on the national priority system in Paragraph 320.”

In other words, the FAA should manage discretionary funds according to its objective rules, not according to subjective desires of its local administrators.

Please respond:

1. Why did the FAA claim that $70 million of discretionary funding from the stimulus package was at risk?

2. How did the FAA know this on January 7, 2009 before the new President was inaugurated and before Congress passed the stimulus bill?

3. Are Boeing activities considered high in the national priority system?

4. How much of the discretionary funding given to Paine Field was for projects necessary to ensure Paine was in serviceable condition for Boeing and related activities?

5. Is the FAA intending to circumvent its own AIP Handbook to fund a terminal beyond the limit of $200,000 per year?

6. Did the FAA successfully suggest using entitlement funding from other airports to help fund the terminal? Did any airports that gave up their entitlement funding of $150,000 receive "any" discretionary funding after transferring their funds to Paine Field for terminal construction?

As of February 4, 2009, no stimulus bill had passed, yet these fictional dollars are at risk.5 This denies them any credibility. They have created fact out of fiction to sway the County Council and the public.

---

4 E-mail from Carol Suomi (FAA) to Donna P. Taylor (FAA) dated 02/03/2009
5 The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, abbreviated ARRA (Pub.L. 111-5), is an economic stimulus package signed into law by President Obama on February 17, 2009
The FAA’s threat to remove discretionary funding at Paine Field, when they KNEW it could negatively affect Boeing, was a pre-emptive move to force a role change. This violates FAA’s own policy. As shown by documents obtained by SOC from a Freedom of Information Act Request, the FAA gets involved in discussions with an airport proprietor only AFTER a carrier has filed a formal complaint AND the airport proprietor has failed to resolve that complaint. The quote from an FAA memorandum shows this:

Enforcement — “If Snohomish County declines Allegiant Air’s proposal Allegiant may pursue a formal complaint under 14 CFR Part 16, Rules of Practice for Federally Assisted Airport Enforcement Proceedings, against PAE. 14 CFR Section 1623(a). Allegiant must “initiate and engage in good faith efforts to resolve the disputed matter” with PAE prior to filing a Part 16 complaint. 14 CFR Section 16.21(a). If the FAA determines under Part 16, that PAE is in violation of its grant assurances, the agency may issue a compliance order terminating eligibility for future grants or suspend payment of grant funds.”

The airlines had not formally complained yet the FAA, under Carol Suomi’s direction, persisted. Even internal FAA memoranda confirm that Ms. Suomi was over-stepping her authority. See below. (Emphasis added)

“Carol,

I have numerous concerns with this letter and do not believe it is wise for us to send it. While I agree that we need to ensure that the airport does not deny access to either Horizon or Allegiant, I believe we need to be careful not to enter into the political fray. The following are my initial concerns with the letter:

1. Have we received correspondence directly from Horizon or Allegiant claiming that the County has not been negotiating with them or has been denying them access? If we haven’t, we really don’t have much to go on in alluding to the idea that the County is not negotiating in good faith or is denying them access.

2. We mention Horizon’s goal to initiate service on April 1, 2009 and stress that it’s important to complete negotiations and move forward. Since this is Horizon’s timeframe goal and not an FAA goal I do not believe we should have a role in pressing for or encouraging the timeframe. These are private sector negotiations that we should not take a position on.

3. We refer to any delay or lack of negotiations could be perceived as action contrary to your grant obligations. Do we have any information from Horizon or Allegiant on how the County is delaying or not negotiating? This is a pretty general statement and not tied to denying access.

4. The 2nd paragraph is a bit unclear as it discusses the stimulus package (which I don’t think we have confirmation of yet) being discretionary funds. This is true, however, one could read the paragraph to mean that we would withhold any discretionary funds. In order to withhold discretionary funds we need to have found: (1) formal non-compliance under Part 16, (2) Land Use violations on the report to congress, (3) that the airport clearly remains in

---

6 FAA Memorandum To Associate Administrator for Airports From Donna Taylor, ANM-600 Prepared by: Joelle Brigss, ANM-626, 425-227-2626 Friday, May 23, 2008
non-compliance despite FAA requests for corrective action or (4) the violation must be so egregious as to preclude additional Federal financial assistance until the issue is resolved. I don’t think we’ve reached these points yet at Paine Field. Especially, if we haven’t received any request for assistance from Horizon or Allegiant.

5. In the 3rd paragraph, I do think it is fine to provide guidance to the airport on aspects that should be in the ground lease if they choose that route. Our bullets in this paragraph are good and could be conveyed to the County as something that they should seriously consider if they structure a ground lease.

6. Finally, our statement that a failure to negotiate in good faith may subject them to enforcement action is a bit general and strong. Instead, it is the denial of access that results from a refusal or failure to negotiate that would be the basis of a complaint. We would not take the enforcement action, unless a complaint was filed. The first sentence sounds like we would take the enforcement action.”

At SOC’s request, Congressman Jay Inslee called Ms. Suomi on February 5, 2009 to discuss concerns raised by the FAA’s heavy-handedness the day AFTER the County Council voted for the terminal. Representative Inslee memorialized his conversation with Ms. Suomi in a letter dated February 6, copy enclosed. This confirms further that the FAA had received no complaints from the airline applicants and that Snohomish County was negotiating in good faith.

These documents also confirm that the FAA was acting pre-emptively against Snohomish County to force a role change of Paine Field. They enforced this threat with the potential loss of discretionary funds. The following email further supports this:

From FAA Seattle Airports District Manager (emphasis added): 8

“I was discussing the issues with Paine Field with Roman, and he explained to me that there is another tactic that we could take (and is one that the Denver ADO has found to be very effective). To me, it’s even a harder line... but maybe it works better for you all.

The suggestion is to just tell them that we will hold back from giving them any additional discretionary funds until they have successfully negotiated leases with both Allegiant and Horizon Air. Simple as that – and put the burden back on the County.”

A Snohomish County EDC e-mail confirms the threat as follows:

“Today, I caught wind that the FAA has moved beyond ‘will or may’ suspend federal discretionary dollars to they “have suspended” those dollars. So I called Carol Suomi, Manager of the Seattle district office of the FAA, who manages the grants for the northwest. She confirmed with me that the FAA had indeed suspended discretionary grants..... and that until there is a deal struck with

7 Joelle Briggs/ANM/FAA memo to Carol Suomi and cc to others in the FAA 01/08/2009
8 Carol Suomi/ANM/FAA email to Roman Pinon, Stan Allison, Tim Shaw, Cayla Morgan, Bill Watson all FAA on 01/08/2009
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Horizon for a lease and an adequate terminal that those dollars and any stimulus dollars will not be issued."9

The FAA’s heavy-handed tactics worked. In a 4-0 vote of the County Council on February 4, 2009 the Council voted to build a terminal.

As reported in the Everett Herald (2/5/09)

"The Snohomish County Council had no realistic choice Wednesday when it gave the county executive directions for negotiating a deal to bring commercial passenger service to Paine Field. It had to follow the law, and by a 4-0 vote, it did.

Dave Gossett, ever the practical voice of the council, put it best when he said, ‘I’m not willing to play a high-risk game of chicken with the FAA that could result in a loss of airport grant money and help push the Boeing Co.’s widebody manufacturing to another state.’

Later, in a written statement -- notable for its conciliatory tone toward the council -- Executive Aaron Reardon pointed out that the Federal Aviation Administration ‘has strongly warned that Snohomish County cannot stand in the way of commercial flights, or it risks losing tens of millions of dollars in federal grants’ for airport improvements, funding that’s critical to Boeing’s long-term success here.’

Please respond:

1. Why did the FAA violate the public trust, its own rules and possibly Federal law, while creating a high stakes, high-risk game involving the nation’s largest aerospace manufacturer?

2. Why is the FAA advocating so aggressively for Horizon & Allegiant airlines?

3. Why did the FAA break its own stated rules in the AIP Handbook and its stated position to SOC in its letter of Dec 5, 2005 letter that it does not force a role change?

4. Why did the FAA act pre-emptively when it had received no complaint by any airline?

5. In view of these findings, why should the EA not be negated? Alternatively, why should an EIS not be done?

6. Has the County now received $70 million of stimulus funding that the FAA allegedly held in abeyance pending the County’s vote? What is the status of the $70 million of stimulus funding that the FAA said was in jeopardy?

The County Council’s vote was coerced, so the entire process leading up to such coercion should be reviewed with the Council having the opportunity to reconsider its

---

9 Mike Deller, Bank of Everett e-mail to Snohomish County EDC February 02, 2009 4:53 PM obtained via FOIA request as Airport Director Waggoner forwarded to FAA
vote. The Council should be able to consider giving the airline applicants the opportunity to pay for the terminal and other improvements at Paine Field without taxpayer subsidies. Following such decisions by the County, only then can an EIS be considered, possibly based on a terminal paid by the airlines themselves.

We specifically request that the FAA apologize for such coercion, that the FAA demonstrate clearly to the County that discretionary funds are, in fact, not jeopardized by any action that the County takes, or does not take, with respect to funding a terminal, and that the County is in full compliance with FAA rules whether or not the County chooses to subsidize terminal construction. The FAA must take all necessary steps available to clear the poisonous atmosphere it created by its coercive actions.
Part II: EA Scoping is Improper, Creates Fatal Flaw: Does Not Comply with NEPA

Public Considered the Opposition
After forcing a County Terminal Resolution, the FAA turned towards addressing NEPA barriers and dealing with the “opposition”, a term Ms. Carol Suomi used in internal communications. Apparently, the very public being protected by NEPA is considered the “opposition” by the senior FAA official responsible for threatening the County and influencing the scoping of the NEPA process – a process that minimized the public’s role.

Please respond:
1. Is Ms. Suomi the official responsible for making the final decision on the EA disposition (FONSI or EIS)?
2. What are the criteria and procedures for requesting that an official be recused from a decision if they are found to be compromised in their ability to make an unbiased and objective decision?

FAA Denies Wanting Airlines in Paine Field
The FAA spokesperson following the third EA hearing was quoted in the Everett Herald stating that the FAA was not taking a position on whether airlines should be at Paine Field but was following the law – apparently, this spokesperson had not checked with the FAA Seattle Airports Manager, Ms. Suomi, who built a record through multiple internal and external FAA communications demonstrating a focus on getting airlines into Paine Field. This is just one thread of communications that reveal a mindset and focus on a predetermined outcome. The preponderance of documented communications creates the inescapable conclusion that this same mindset and focus influenced the approach to NEPA and the limited, flawed design and scope of the EA.

FAA Seeks Least Resistance NEPA Compliance Path
FAA considered no EA at all: FAA internal discussions demonstrate an inconsistent understanding of NEPA requirements. This conclusion is based on FOIA obtained internal FAA discussions that initially focused on using a Categorical Exclusion determination. A Categorical Exclusion approach would have allowed the FAA to avoid having to do an Environmental Assessment (EA) or a more comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) altogether.

---

10 Numerous e-mails obtained via a FOIA request provided by the FAA to SOC
Eventually, FAA internal discussions led to a sharing of documents pointing out that the FAA had to at least conduct an EA if not an EIS for all the federal actions being considered. Once the FAA accepted this reality internally, the focus turned to scoping, consultant selection and funding. Approaches to all of these were flawed as shown below. The FAA still pursued their streamlined and simplified approach to drive towards a predetermined outcome – see the following quote:

“That said, it looks like an EA can be prepared that would document that there are no significant impacts without a lot of time and expense. A 30 day comment period will be needed, but that certainly doesn’t stop a project, it just means that we will likely have to provide responses to comments in the final EA” (emphasis added)¹¹

Please respond:

1. If the outcome is predetermined and public comments don’t matter because the project will continue in any event, then please answer how the intent, spirit and requirements of NEPA have been met?

2. Does the FAA intend to assess and incorporate public comment or disregard the public entirely and issue a pre-determined FONSI?

Scope is Flawed, Limited and Designed to Support a FONSI

FONSI was the goal before the EA started: There was internal acknowledgement that the scope would be the key to the EA’s outcome: a narrowly defined scope would produce the desired outcome of having the EA result in a Finding Of No Significant Impact (FONSI). Furthermore, EA draft timetables dated as early as January 29, 2009 listed the conclusion as a FONSI even before the scope was finalized and consultants selected. Clearly, once the Categorical Exclusion option was ruled out, the FAA pursued the next least onerous outcome by conducting an Environmental Assessment that results in a FONSI with virtually no consideration of the possibility that an EA could result in significant impacts requiring an EIS. The FAA’s confidence may be rooted in the fact that they set the rules, direct the scope, “approve” the forecasts, hire the third-party contractor and then they determine if the work they choreographed was adequate to support a FONSI. There appears to be no real checks and balances in this approach outside of political pressure or legal action.

Please respond:

1. Why did all the timelines schedules starting with the January 29, 2009 timeline end in a final step FONSI (Finding Of No Significant Impact)?

2. Is it true that an EA can result in moving to an EIS?

¹¹ Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA e-mail to Carol Suomi/ANM/FAA dated 01/29/2009
3. Does the absence of the EIS option in the timelines as a possible result indicate a bias and predetermined thought process by those involved? If not, then why wasn’t the potential of an EIS option considered?

Minimal forecasts not sufficient for acceptable EA: Internal FAA communications and interaction with Paine Field staff on scoping included whether to use or modify Terminal Area Forecast numbers and whether to use Allegiant and Horizon forecast flight and passenger forecasts.

Forecasted numbers do not account for “potential” activity levels over a long timeframe. Allegiant forecasts a 400% increase in 5 years in the number of cities that they will serve out of Paine Field and a 500% increase in the number of flights. Even this minimal forecast shows a significant growth rate pointing to continued rapid expansion beyond 5 years. Even the FAA states that “The purpose of an EA is to determine whether a proposed action or its alternatives has the potential to significantly affect the environment.”

12 Potential does not mean minimal or limited. Therefore the FAA requires itself to assess potential capacity and the associated potential impacts of changes precipitated by federal actions including changing the operating certificate of the airport to allow for unconstrained commercial flight activity. The EA limited scope provides a prima facie case of a failure to comply with this clear and logical requirement.

Horizon does not commit to own forecast: In a letter to Paine Field airport staff from Horizon, the airline states “This information may not accurately reflect the actual number of operations, aircraft types, number of passengers carried, etc. at any given time and also does not constitute an offer, proposal, agreement or commitment of any kind by Horizon Air.”

13 Even with this qualification by Horizon, the FAA and Airport staff accepted it as good enough to assess environmental and public impacts. We find this unacceptable. Horizon has no accountability to the FAA or to the community should they choose to expand operations well beyond these initial estimates. Relying upon a forecast the airline itself does not “accept” cannot be defended as a legitimate assessment of the reasonably foreseeable potential activity encouraged by these federal actions.

Please respond:

1. Why was the EA based on minimal flight activity and passenger levels provided by Horizon and Allegiant? What were their forecasts based on?

2. If Horizon won’t commit to their own forecast then why should the County and the FAA?

---

12 FAA Order 1050.1E CHG1 Section 201b and in multiple other sections as well

13 Horizon Air Letter to William Dolan dated March 15, 2009
3. Under what federal law or rule would Horizon, Allegiant, the County or the FAA be bound by these forecasts? What is the penalty for creating impacts beyond these minimal forecasts?

4. Why didn’t the FAA comply with FAA Order 1050.1E CHG 1 requiring assessment to determine if the proposed action or its alternatives have the potential to significantly affect the environment?

5. Why does the FAA and this EA fail to identify mitigation actions associated with the potential to significantly affect the environment?

6. What is the FAA’s definition of “potential”?

7. Does the FAA intend to enforce economic non-discrimination requirements to ensure unconstrained scheduled commercial air service if the Operating Certificate is changed from Class IV to a Class I Certificate?

   a. If Allegiant and Horizon initiate commercial air service at Paine Field, will the FAA allow the County to limit their activity to 10 flights a day for Horizon and 10 flights a week for Allegiant?

   b. Will the FAA allow the County to place any limit on Allegiant and Horizon flights and passenger throughput so long as such activity complies with safety and security operations?

   c. If the FAA does not allow restrictions, then how does the FAA reconcile using a limited scope of assessment?

8. Boeing has announced a three to five hour flight next week and the aircraft is not certified and therefore considered by FAA to be an experimental plane. If Horizon and Allegiant were operating scheduled commercial air service at Paine Field would the FAA allow the Boeing flight and airfield closure to take priority over scheduled Horizon and Allegiant flights? If not, then why aren’t potential impacts to Boeing assessed?

9. Why wasn’t the EA based on independently assessing higher potential activity levels that would obviously produce greater impacts?

10. Why didn’t the FAA start with an EIS?

**FAA sought to facilitate start up by minimizing mitigation and other costs to airlines:** The airlines and the FAA understood that lower activity levels would result in lower impact assessments needed to support a FONSI. A FONSI would result in no mitigation actions resulting from the EA and thus no mitigation costs. The County would therefore not be able to use EA-identified mitigation costs as part of the negotiations in making the airport available on reasonable terms — terms the FAA itself stated could include direct
and indirect costs. An artificially reduced scope was just another step in fulfilling start-up requirements of low cost airlines. In addition, the FAA is seeking ways to fund the terminal to take the cost pressure off the County and the airlines – lowering the barriers to entry and subsidizing the start up. Together these actions dramatically reduce direct/indirect costs thereby guaranteeing a lower cost negotiation between the County and the airlines – apparently, this is exactly what Ms. Suomi was seeking as evidenced by the following internal FAA communications:

Joelle Briggs/ANM/FAA 02/04/2009 09:57 AM to Carol Suomi (copy to others in FAA)
"... As you and I discussed, satisfactorily concluding negotiations does not mean that it must be a conclusion that has the airlines using Paine Field. It is possible for whatever reasons that the airlines decide during negotiations that this is not in their best interest."

Carol Suomi response to Joelle Briggs 02/04/2009 10:12 AM
"Yes, Joelle, you are absolutely right, and I have had this conversation with the County. But, this is what the opposition is hoping, and would love for us to say (which is why I like not saying it). The opposition wants it to be so difficult and onerous that the airlines will give up."

Please respond:
1. Why is the FAA assisting the airlines at Paine Field so aggressively that the FAA has engaged in coercion, conflicts of interest, manipulating federal subsidies, and irresponsibly minimizing the scope of the EA?
2. How does this internal conflict measure up to the objectivity expected and required by FAA policy, FAA orders and NEPA?
3. How could any reasonable person including elected officials, senior FAA or DOT officials or a judge not conclude that this process and predetermined outcome focus summarily fails the required objectivity I’mus test?
4. What is the FAA’s plan to correct these issues?

Distorted market not acceptable as basis for the EA scope: Following a public hearing on the EA, the Paine Field airport director responded to calls to assess potential activity levels and impacts by stating that “market demand” will determine the level of activity. This approach does not address overall potential activity. Market demand cannot be part of the forecast and scope discussion without recognizing the influence of the distorted market that subsidies create. A subsidized market would increase activity levels including the diversion of market share from existing airports. The only way to truly account for foreseeable potential activity and meet the public protection requirements of NEPA is to assess the maximum capacity of the proposed federal actions.

---

14 December 2005 FAA ltr to SOC, enclosed
The EA timeframe should not be limited to five years: A short timeline of 2015 or 2016 was discussed in FAA communications with the only rationale being a reference to air quality conformity requirements for the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP requirements do not dictate the length of an EA as confirmed by discussions with an air emissions regulatory authority. Furthermore, the FAA itself requires longer-term forecasts and master plan updates but when it comes to this EA, the FAA suddenly chose to discard those longer-term forecasts. The FAA has repeated that they are only following the law. However, no law requires this EA to set a record for the shortest timeline ever studied under NEPA for a federal action that in effect has the potential to change a region forever. On the contrary, NEPA requires an objective assessment of the impacts of a federal action.

The FAA instead determined this limited scoping design with input exclusively from Paine Field staff, the third-party contractor and the applicant airlines. Did they consider the public protection required in NEPA when providing input on the scope and forecasts? We do not see any documented evidence that the intent, spirit and compliance with NEPA were the basis of their input.

Please respond:

1. Why shouldn’t an EIS be based on the maximum potential capacity of Paine Field after being certified as a Class I airport?
2. Internal FAA communications regarding scope initially included assessment of the full capacity of the terminal(s), so why was the assessment criteria removed from the scope?
3. Why shouldn’t a new EIS be based on a 20-year forecast? A 30-year forecast?
4. Why was this EA referenced to an air emissions conformity report with only a 5-year forecast?
5. What is the legal or rule based precedent requiring the EA scope to match timelines with an air emissions conformity report? If this was a project in 2014, would the timeline be matched to the SIP air emission conformity report of a scant one-year later?

This approach has produced an EA with a minimized and non-compliant scope that defies logic given the requirement to assess impacts of proposed federal actions. The FAA trick of looking at “foreseeable” activity levels where they define foreseeable is full of conflict of interest issues and avoids the requirement of assessing and mitigating potential impacts as required under NEPA.

FAA in Conflict: Minimal EA Scope incompatible with FAA Rules: If the FAA takes federal actions, including changing the Part 139 Operating Certificate of Paine Field to allow schedule service at Paine Field, then by FAA rules the airport may not constrain
additional flights from the initial air carriers or discriminate against other carriers that want in. On the one hand, the FAA wants to assess/mitigate the impacts of this role change on a relatively low level of activity while on the other hand their regulations require that the airport accept any and all activity literally 24/7. This reality demonstrates the conflict FAA has in promoting a minimal EA.

**Please respond:**

1. How does the FAA respond to this conflict?
2. Shouldn’t the FAA address this conflict with a properly scoped EIS based on the maximum capacity of the airport? If not, why not?

The EA document is fatally flawed due to a minimal, inadequate and non-compliant scope. The EA is required because of planned federal actions. One of the federal actions is to change the Paine Field Operating Certificate from a Class IV to a Class I. Such a change opens the door to virtually unconstrained scheduled commercial service up to the safe capacity of the airport.

**Please respond:**

1. If the FAA allows for a “role change” for Paine Field then why not consider the impacts from “unconstrained activity” which FAA regulations require?
2. Why does FAA’s Carol Suomi state that this is not a role change for the airport?
3. How is the use of short-term minimal activity levels as the scope of activity for the EA compatible within the purpose, spirit and intent of NEPA?

A minimal scope is duplicitous and seeks to avoid accountability and responsibility for the true potential impacts of federal actions. It adds insult to injury for the Airport and FAA staff to promote the low initial, estimated airline activity numbers from the applicants, knowing that FAA rules do not allow constraint of their activity levels once they start. The obvious incentive for the FAA, the airlines and the airport was to use the lowest numbers possible in order to ensure a FONSI by the FAA and thereby facilitate a quick low cost startup.

**Please respond:**

1. Please comment on the above referenced items. Shouldn’t the FAA order an EIS based on full potential impacts?
2. Why is the FAA promoting an EA based on the airline applicant’s activity levels, when the FAA knows those levels will easily be exceeded over a relatively short time?
3. Was there any effort to design the scope in this EA to create conclusions that have de minimus impacts?
The EA should be discarded and an EIS with a proper scope should be initiated: the new scope must be designed to account for all the potential activity levels and impacts of each of the following distinct federal actions:

- Part 139 Operating Certificate changing the role of the airport
- Allegiant operating certificate for aircraft and cities proposed
- Horizon operating certificate for aircraft and cities proposed
- FAA funding (or partial funding) of a terminal (they call it an expansion of the existing terminal)

**EA Preparation and Scoping Was Not a Public Process**

FAA rules allow the agency to involve the public during the scoping process including government and non-government organizations. In fact, FAA encourages and supports a public EA scoping process for situations like Paine Field (emphasis added):

"Although scoping is not required for EAs, scoping could enhance EA preparation and content. This is especially so when the proposed action is highly controversial or involves special purpose laws or other environmental concerns...

a. Conducting EA scoping. .... Instead, the airport sponsor should use the local media or mail to notify the public that it is planning to conduct scoping for an EA."

**Please respond:**

1. Why didn’t the FAA invite interested governmental and non-governmental agencies to participate in the scoping process for this EA?

2. Why didn’t the FAA and County Airport share documents and rationale related to making scope decisions?

Doing so would have helped to ensure that all concerns were heard early in the process so they could have been accounted for in the scope and design of the study. The FAA actually has guidance promoting involvement of the affected community as follows (emphasis added):

*EA PREPARATION COORDINATION.* Text at 40 CFR 1501.4(b) states:

"The [Federal] agency shall involve environmental agencies, applicants, and the public, to the extent practicable, in preparing assessments ..."

---

15 See FAA Order 1501.7
16 FAA ORDER 5050.4B Part 705 Dated April 2006
17 FAA ORDER 5050.4B Part 704 Dated April 2006
**February 5, 2010**

**Save Our Communities**

---

**a. Public input.** EA preparers should coordinate with resource agencies, industry groups, and the affected community as practicable and necessary to ensure the EA addresses those issues of greatest public concern.\(^a\)

The FAA and Paine Field staff chose instead to minimize community involvement and public process to implement a “de-minimus” path towards a FONSI — a path they apparently felt was defensible. This approach fails on several levels including a failure to comply with the intent, spirit and purpose of NEPA.

**Please respond:**

1. Why did the FAA disregard FAA Order 5050.4B with regard to involving the public in EA preparation?

2. How did the FAA conclude it could ensure the EA addressed those issues of greatest public concern without fully involving the public?

---

**Sole Source Consultant and a Conflict of Interest Violation — EA Invalidated**

The NEPA process requires a selection process that produces a truly independent, qualified consultant devoid of conflict of interest and free from bias related to past or future financial gain. However, the consultant, Barnard Dunkelberg & Company, was targeted for selection early on based on past performance at Paine Field as demonstrated in this e-mail from Paine Field staff to the FAA:

> "I understand that calling a cat is not an option and we need to get a consultant underway to develop an EA. We selected Barnard Dunkelberg in 2007 for a multiyear on call planning contract.... I would like to give RYK a call today if possible to get him underway."\(^{18}\)

There is no documentation that a competitive bid process was used. Given the fact that this consultant was working with the FAA shortly after this communication, the only conclusion is that this was a sole source selection. Since Paine Field has used this consultant for no less than the last 15 years, it is reasonable to assume that future work may be more likely if the EA met expectations of the funding source (FAA) and the airport staff. The sole source hiring not only used taxpayer dollars but was also made at the expense of the public’s need for an independent, objective and unbiased analysis. In addition, after the hiring there was an all too cozy relationship between the consultant and the FAA as depicted in the following FOIA obtained email excerpt below:

---

**Ryk Dunkelberg (Consultant) to Cayla Morgan (FAA) 3/11/2009**

Top of the morning, sweet Cayla and a Happy Wednesday! Welcome back from vacation, hope all was well and you had a wonderful time. ....

As always, have a great and groovy day and call with questions!!

PS I DO have tickets to see Bruce Springsteen in three weeks!

---

\(^{18}\) Bill Dolan (Paine Field) to Cayla Morgan (FAA) 2/6/2009
Please respond:

1. Did the FAA and/or Snohomish County perform a competitive bidding process to identify the consultant? If so, please provide documentation that demonstrates a fair, objective process was used. If not, why not?

2. Why was the consultant chosen on a sole-source basis?

3. Please show how the procurement process for the EA’s consultant followed the FAA’s Acquisition Management Policy.19

4. Has the Responsible Official prepared a disclosure statement specifying that the contractor has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project? (40 CFR 1506.5(c)), (FAA 1050.1E section 204b[1])

5. Why has the FAA and/or Snohomish County used the same consultant repeatedly for projects involving the airport over the past several years?

6. Doesn’t this present a conflict of interest since the consultant has clearly lost their objectivity?

**FAA Uses Funding of EA to Demand County Terminal Resolution**

The FAA told the Airport Director they would not fund an EA unless the County agreed to build a terminal:

*Feb 9, 2009 Carol Suomi to Dave Waggoner: “There will only be funding of an EA IF the County agrees to build a terminal....”*

**Draft EA/Hearings Timing Demonstrates Low Regard for Public Input**

The FAA decision on the timing of the release the Draft EA over the holidays and scheduling hearings in the first two work evenings after the holiday reflects a disregard for public comment – a de-minimus approach to use a term from the EA. Under pressure, the FAA extended the comment period and scheduled a third hearing at a location closer to the airport. However, the scheduling decisions reflect another example of the mindset and approach prevalent throughout the process – one that has served to undermine the public trust. Furthermore, the FAA failed to ensure public involvement as described in the following FAA Order 1050.1E CHG1:

“208. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

208a. NEPA and the CEQ regulations, in describing the public involvement process, require Federal agencies to: consider environmental information in their decision making process; obtain information from the public regarding environmental concerns surrounding an agency’s proposed action; fully assess and disclose potential

---

19 See FAA Order 1050-1E section 204b
environmental impacts resulting from the proposed action and alternatives; and provide the public with this information and allow it to comment on these findings."  

Please respond:

1. How does the FAA reconcile public involvement with the release of the EA just prior to the Christmas holiday season?

2. Why were EA hearings scheduled for the first two working days in the New Year? How does this represent good faith efforts to obtain public input?

3. Demonstrate how the EA process complied with public involvement policy and rules as set forth in FAA Order 1050.1E CHG 1, NEPA and CEQ?

20 FAA ORDER 1050.1E CHG 1 Section 208
Part III Comments on impacts that the EA failed to address

We note some specific comments here on several issues. However, all environmental issues enumerated in the original EA must be reassessed in an EIS after a new scope is developed based on full impacts of the airport changing from a Class IV to a Class I airport, with two terminals at full capacity.

EA Assumptions and Methodologies not Transparent

The Draft EA fails to provide full transparency regarding assumptions, scope and analysis in a number of areas.

Please respond:

1. What are the qualifications of the company producing the Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA)?
2. Will those qualifications and the standards and methodology they apply be made public?
3. In particular, where have the employed methodology and standards been previously applied and how successful were they in accurately predicting the environmental impacts that resulted?
4. Given the current lack of information about the EA’s process, why shouldn’t this EA be invalidated in favor of an EIS? If we cannot assess the assumptions and methodology, then we cannot assess the output. For this reason alone, the EA fails and an EIS should be done.

In addition, outside of construction activities, the various items assessed (traffic, schools, pollution, etc.) are all based on a scaled back number of flights. The EA therefore minimizes the overall impacts in virtually all areas.

Please respond:

1. Doesn’t the public deserve, and doesn’t NEPA demand, an assessment of the reasonable worst case associated with all the involved federal actions including changing the airport role to allow for scheduled service?
2. Based on the flaws identified in the EA, shouldn’t an Environmental Impact Statement be conducted that properly addresses the full impacts, items that must be mitigated, and costs to mitigate?
**Failure to Adequately Assess Alternatives as required by NEPA**

According to the EPA, “EPA's regulations implementing NEPA require evaluation of the no-action alternative, which provides the baseline for comparison of the action alternatives.”

The “baseline” needs to be established as an environmental reference and comparisons made to future direct, indirect and cumulative effects from the proposed alternative. Our comments below show a general failure to assess or analyze a baseline properly for such items as air pollution, traffic, impact on children, etc.

Further, once a baseline has been properly established, the comparison to the “action alternatives” must be based on the full capacity of a two terminal airport, as stated repeatedly throughout this document.

Finally, an objective analysis would reveal that in many cases, the “no action alternative” would likely be the preferred alternative. The “no action alternative” would provide the least environmental impact on air pollution, land use compatibility, noise, children, etc.

**Please respond:**

1. Why hasn’t more analysis and assessment been done to properly develop a baseline for air, ground, water, traffic and other environmental impacts?
2. Wouldn’t the “no action” alternative be the more likely alternative if baseline comparisons were properly compared to the action alternatives, especially when compared against unconstrained flight activity with two-terminal capacity at Paine Field?
3. Why is purpose and need not defined? How can the consultant use undefined purpose and need as a basis for eliminating alternatives?

**Environmental Consequences / Environmental Health and Safety Risks**

The EA fails to adequately or responsibly identify the known potential impacts. The EA’s limited projection period of only five-years does not adequately address the known health risks associated with residing in close proximity to commercial airports. The 25 TPY of Carbon Monoxide (CO) that would put PAE above de minimis standards would require approximately a 25% increase in the estimate of total operations. Once the commercial certificate is issued, the commercial flights are likely to jump beyond the deceptively low estimate of 20 operations a day to a much higher number, as happened in Bellingham (BLI) for example. Additionally, the estimate that technology will become cleaner is also liberal. The GA flights, with leaded particulates, and the jet flights with...
the even more hazardous addition of ultrafine particles, create a lethal combination for the air quality in the residential zones surrounding Paine Field.

In a 2009 article, 'Aircraft Emission Impacts in a Neighborhood Adjacent to a General Aviation Airport in Southern California', University of California researchers discovered highly elevated ultrafine particle (UFP) concentrations downwind of the Santa Monica Airport (SMA). The author, Dr. Suzann Paulson, recently confirmed that we would expect to see an increased level of UFP's given commercial flights at Paine Field, considering that meteorological conditions would increase the accumulation and concentrations at ground levels due to the lower night and winter temperatures compared to southern California daytime temperatures and SMA nighttime flight restrictions. Additionally, the South Coast Air Quality Management District made measurements of PM$_{2.5}$, total suspended particles (TSP), lead, and ultrafine particle concentrations in the areas around SMA, and nearby Van Nuys Airport. They found highly elevated total suspended particulate lead, by up to a factor of 25 immediately adjacent to the takeoff area and a factor of 7x higher than background in the residential area. They also observed spikes in ultrafine particle number concentrations associated with aircraft departures. A study of London Heathrow Airport$^{22}$, reported aircraft NO$_x$ at least 2.6 km from the airport. VOC, NO$_x$, CO, and CO$_2$ were measured around the Zurich Airport.

Surrounding Paine Field are five schools, a community park, an intensively used 4-field little league complex and a YMCA summer camp within 1 km of the airstrip. There are more than 15 schools within a 3 km radius. The FAA, Airport manager Dave Waggoner and the EA ignore the very serious and devastating impacts commercial flights at Paine Field will have on the community and the air quality at public and private schools and daycare facilities.

It is unconscionable to change the classification of Paine Field considering the fact that the surrounding communities were built on the assumption that Paine Field would continue to be an airport used for general aviation and the Boeing Company. Indeed, if the airport is expanded, we will have an ideal human case study on the epidemiological impacts on children raised within the vicinity of a commercial airport. The 37,000 + children who live in this community and attend elementary school, middle school, high school, day care and preschools deserve to breathe the cleanest air possible, not to be subjects of a misguided experiment in human health risks. To better understand the effects of air pollution on children's health, please see the studies published in *Pediatrics* (2004).

---


$^{22}$ Schramm, G.; Schfer, K.; Jahn, C.; Hoffmann, H.; Bauerfeind, M.; Reuti, E.; Rappenglück, B. The impact of NO$_x$, CO and VOC emissions on the air quality of Zurich airport Atmos. Environ. 2007, 41, 103–118
Air Quality

There is insufficient data in the Draft EA to address total air emissions impacts due to the foreseeable potential activity levels associated with the federal actions being considered.

SOC requests studies similar to those published in May 2009, in Environmental Health by Zhou and Ley, "Between-airport heterogeneity in air toxics emissions associated with individual cancer risk thresholds and population risks." Their findings indicated that site characteristics can be used to accurately predict maximum individual risk and total population cancer risk at a given level of emissions. Including airports with the meteorological inversions characteristic to those observed in Paine Field may elucidate future work expanding the data collected at 32 airports across the US.23

Please respond:

1. Why doesn't the EA include the option of the maximum activity levels to fully account for all air emissions?

2. Why did the EA skip over air toxins described by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?

3. There needs to be a rigorous analysis of PM 2.5 since the county is on the brink of falling out of attainment on this priority pollutant. Will a new EIS be done to include such rigorous analysis?

4. Why did the EA not include a rigorous assessment of CO2 emissions given EPA's recent announcement and pending rules and legislation at the state level?

5. How does the EA assess health impacts without an acceptable air emissions analysis to establish a baseline?

6. Given the foreseeable expansion of activity based on the proposed federal actions including the desired and expressed growth of the two applicant airlines how can an air emissions assessment be accepted for a few flights looking no more than five years out?

7. Why do other EA's and EIS's on major projects or proposals have to look out farther than five years? For example, a 2008 Mead & Hunt EA, conducted prior to the construction of an Air Traffic Control Tower for University Park Airport in State College, PA included a 20 year table that looked back 4 years (to 2004) and projected out to 2020. The Puget Sound Regional Council is finalizing a 2040

---

23 This study was sponsored by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) through the Partnership for Air Transportation Noise and Emissions Reduction (PARTNER) under Cooperative Agreement No. 03-C-NE-MIT-026, Subcontract Agreement No. 5710002069.
plan, the FAA produces 20-year forecasts, and NEPA compliance efforts around the country including airport projects provide precedent for comprehensive scopes based on potential impacts rather than minimal assessments.

8. What rules prevent looking out 20 years at the potential activity level of the proposed federal actions in order to comply with NEPA by identifying potential significant impacts and associated mitigation?

9. How does the limited scope and timeline compare with other air emissions assessments of major proposed projects or federal actions requiring NEPA compliance?

10. With an expanded scope, why would the FAA oppose a more thorough air National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) assessment and EIS?

Based on this issue alone and pursuant to the requirements of FAA Order 1050-1E, an EIS should be conducted.

Compatible Land Use: Significant Land Use Compatibility Issues exist

Changing Paine Field from a Class IV to a Class I airport with full capacity creates significant land use compatibility issues for cities throughout south Snohomish County. Based on a deliberate plan for managed growth that started 33 years ago, Paine Field is essentially surrounded by residential communities on all sides.

Background. Cities voiced concern about the potential development of Paine Field in the 1970’s when the federal government deregulated airline travel. Residents then had the same concerns as residents now—they didn’t want to live next to a major airport. As a result of such concerns, Snohomish County brought in arbitrators with the community and crafted a Mediated Role Determination (MRD) agreement of 1977/78, copy enclosed. The MRD stated that the County would “strongly discourage” development of Paine Field for air passenger and air cargo use. It created a three-legged balanced approach: the County would support aerospace activities (i.e. Boeing and its suppliers), support the community with limited activity from Paine Field, and support general aviation activity at Paine Field. The MRD’s adoption by Snohomish County induced residential development; cities changed their land-use planning to zone from light and heavy industrial to residential. Such residential development has taken place for the past 33 years up to today, practically up to the borders of Paine Field.
The MRD has been reviewed six times in the past thirty years. Each time, Snohomish County has reaffirmed it, as recently as 2007.\textsuperscript{24} The panel had the following final conclusions:

"The efforts of the community panel identified three primary, fundamental factors influencing the future role of the Snohomish County Airport (Paine Field):

1. Current federal law does not allow the County to prohibit or limit scheduled passenger air service.

2. Current federal law does not require the County to encourage or subsidize scheduled passenger air service.

3. The County can and should insist that an airline pay its own way and mitigate its impacts. (Emphasis added.)"

The MRD has been found to be a legally valid document despite relatively recent federal laws, such as the 1990 Airport Noise and Capacity Act that now restrict limitations on airline travel by local authorities.\textsuperscript{25}

The MRD induced 33 years of residential development around Paine Field, specifically with the promise of minimal flight activity from Paine Field. Federal laws might preempt the contemplated restrictions on Paine Field, but they cannot reverse the fact that every foundation of every home in the area is based on the MRD’s promise of limited use of Paine Field. As a result, the proposed action under the EA creates significant land use compatibility issues with the residential communities.

Indeed, the communities of Brier, Edmonds, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Mukilteo and Woodway have recognized the compatibility issues. Each of these six cities’ councils has issued resolutions opposing airline activity at Paine Field. Their mayors have agreed. \textit{(See enclosed letter.)} Further, those cities have memorialized such understanding into their Municipal Planning Policies (MPP’s) while Snohomish County has memorialized such an understanding into its County Planning Policies, as required under the State’s Growth Management Act.

\textbf{Growth Management Act creates significant land use compatibility issues.} Under the Growth Management Act, counties are required to adopt Comprehensive Plans that guide development in the County. Snohomish County’s Comprehensive Plan

\textsuperscript{24} "Report on Mediated Role Determination for Paine Field," Peter Camp, Executive Director, Office of Snohomish County Executive Aaron Reardon, May 16, 2007

\textsuperscript{25} KKR Memorandum to Sno. Cty did 12 Oct 06
incorporates by reference the airport’s “adopted role.” In the Capital Facilities chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, two separate policies make this incorporation:

“The County shall plan for Capital Facilities that support the best use of the airport’s remaining undeveloped and underutilized areas for airport-related uses that fit within the airport’s adopted role.”

Capital Facilities Policy 7.A.1 (emphasis supplied).

“The County shall identify land acquisition priorities related to airport safety, future airport development, and land use compatibility in accordance with the airport’s adopted role.”


Explanatory text in the Comprehensive Plan that just precedes these policies makes clear that the “adopted role” refers to the role adopted in 1978. That explanatory text states, among other things, that “in 1973 the County initiated a planning study of the airport that generated significant public debate and eventually culminated in County adoption in 1978 of a general aviation role for Paine Field.” The explanatory text discusses other plans that were adopted in 1981 and 1983 and then states that “[t]hese documents chartered a future for both the airport and the surrounding community that was predicated on a defined role for the airport that features continuation of Boeing’s operations and expanding operations for general aviation.” Thus, consistent with this text and the policies quoted above, the Comprehensive Plan’s Capital Facilities Goal 7 states: “Develop investment strategies for Paine Field to support and enhance its role as a general aviation and industrial commercial facility consistent with the Airport Master Plan.” (Emphasis supplied.)

The foregoing should establish that the MRD’s General Aviation role for Paine Field has been incorporated by reference into the County’s Comprehensive Plan.

In sum, while the MRD is not a legal “contract,” the role it specifies for Paine Field has effectively been carried over into the County’s Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan clearly specifies that the role of Paine Field is to be for "general aviation.” No reference is made to scheduled commercial operations.

In 1993, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) adopted Resolution A-93-03 amending the 1988 Interim Regional Airport System Plan (RASP). Resolution A-93-03 conditionally authorized construction of the third runway at Sea-Tac International Airport. That resolution also indicated that a "major supplemental airport should be located in the
four-county area within a reasonable travel time from significant markets in the region.” The resolution also states, "Eliminate small supplemental airports, including Paine Field, as a preferred alternative." Based on Resolution A-93-03 alone, we find continued incentives and inducements by municipalities to promote residential development in the areas immediately surrounding Paine Field and in those communities under the flight paths.

Therefore, the MRD in combination with PSRC’s Resolution A-93-03 have created significant land use compatibility issues. These issues should be studied under an EIS with complete analysis as to the costs associated with substantial mitigation efforts that will be needed throughout the affected communities in south Snohomish County.

Countywide Planning Policies
The Growth Management Act requires Snohomish County and its cities to develop the CPPs and requires that Snohomish County’s Comprehensive Plan (and the Comprehensive Plans of all the cities within Snohomish County) be consistent with the CPPs. RCW 36.70A.210(1). The CPPs are adopted by an amalgamation of Snohomish County and the cities within the Snohomish County. These various local government entities developed the document through the “Snohomish County Tomorrow” body.

The CPPs specifically address Paine Field and state that “land uses and zoning of Paine Field continue to be governed by the Snohomish County Airport Paine Field Master Plan and Snohomish County Zoning Code consistent with federal aviation policies and grant obligations.” CPP Policy ED-3c. As discussed above, the Paine Field Master Plan arguably limits Paine Field to a “General Aviation” role.

Consistency with Comprehensive Plans of adjacent jurisdictions
Snohomish County’s Comprehensive Plan must also be consistent with the Comprehensive Plans of adjacent jurisdictions. RCW 36.70A.100. Snohomish County cannot ignore the land use planning and development that has occurred in neighboring communities based on their good faith reliance on Snohomish County’s earlier decision to limit Paine Field’s role to General Aviation.

Mukilteo’s Comprehensive Plan calls for a significant amount of residential development in areas bordering Paine Field. It also includes the following transportation policy: "The City of Mukilteo opposes physical and operational expansion of Paine Field General Aviation Airport to accommodate commercial aviation.” TR 31. Also, "the City of Mukilteo shall actively participate in airport planning to decrease current noise levels, limit flight paths, limit evening and nighttime landings, and limit the number of incoming and outgoing aircraft at the Paine Field General Aviation Airport.” TR 32.
Finally, as noted above, Snohomish County Executive Aaron Reardon formed an MRD Review panel in 2005. When it completed its work nearly 2 years later, the panel reaffirmed the MRD. The FAA (represented by Ms. Carol Suomi) participated in these panel meetings as an observer, and was well aware of the controversial aspect of the discussions.

Summary: Between the land use policies calling for significant residential development in areas surrounding Paine Field and these transportation policies that are directly on point, there is incontrovertible evidence that significant land use compatibility issues exist that must be addressed in an EIS and mitigated.

Conclusion: FAA Order requires full EIS

Pursuant to FAA Order 1050-1E:

"202a. The responsible FAA official should initially review whether the proposed action:

(1) Could significantly affect the quality of the human environment, for example, with respect to noise, land, air, water, wildlife, energy supply and natural resources, or cultural, historic or archeological resources;

(2) Would be located in wetlands, floodplains, coastal zones, prime or important farmlands, habitat of Federally listed endangered, threatened, or other protected species, wild and scenic river areas, areas protected under section 4(f) of the DOT Act, or in or adjacent to minority or low income populations; or

(3) Would be highly controversial on environmental grounds (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4))."

The FAA knew, through its ongoing observations at the MRD review meetings in 2005-2006, of the significant effects of scheduled air service on the human environment and that this action would be highly controversial on environmental grounds.

"201d. If the EA indicates the proposed action's impacts would meet or exceed a significance threshold(s) for the affected resource(s), or that mitigation would not reduce the significant impact(s) below the applicable threshold(s), FAA must prepare an EIS."

Please respond:

1. Why did the consultant fail to address the MRD and subsequent 33 years of residential development surrounding Paine Field?

2. The scope of the EA fails to address the proposed new airline activity out of Paine Field. How would airline activity, based on Paine Field's full capacity as allowed under federal law, be compatible with the land use policies of Snohomish County and its surrounding cities over the past 33 years?

3. What impacts would this have?
4. How would such impacts be mitigated for the home-owners, schools, churches, hospitals and other related facilities that both surround Paine Field and are under the proposed flight paths of the airport at full capacity?

5. How does the FAA plan to pay for the substantial mitigation costs needed for the affected communities throughout Snohomish County?

**Noise and Compatible Land Use**

The Draft EA does not include the maximum amount of flight activity and therefore fails to fully assess the noise impacts. Furthermore, the 65 DNL threshold has a number of flaws, as the FAA is well aware.

Noise is a huge concern and the FAA should be required to assess the maximum activity level associated with a change in the airport's role from a Class IV to a Class I airport with scheduled airline activity.

Please respond:

1. How would the 65 DNL noise contours change based on unconstrained maximum capacity at Paine Field?
2. How would they change based on frequent nighttime flights?
3. How would such noise be mitigated?
4. How will the FAA, the County or the airlines pay for such mitigation?

**Socioeconomic Environment, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks**

Studies show the impact on airports affect the learning environment. One significant study stated, "Our findings indicate that a chronic environmental stressor-aircraft noise-could impair cognitive development in children, specifically reading comprehension. Schools exposed to high levels of aircraft noise are not healthy educational environments."

Another study states, "The constant roar from jet aircraft can seriously affect the health and psychological well-being of children, according to a new Cornell University study. The health problems resulting from chronic airport noise, including higher blood
pressure and boosted levels of stress hormones, the researchers say, may have lifelong effects.\textsuperscript{27}

The limited scope of the draft EA underestimates the impacts to the socioeconomic environment. A proper scope, based on full capacity of Paine Field, is needed to conduct this analysis.

Social impacts to surrounding communities have not been adequately addressed and subsequently provide further proof that an EIS is warranted. Among these concerns, are airport impacts that will adversely affect those residing in close proximity to increased airport operations, such as residents in a nearby mental health facility, Snohomish County Evaluation/Treatment Facility on the Mukilteo Speedway. Residents there are most vulnerable and unable to relocate due to the nature of the facility. Moreover, the EA fails to consider impacts on local residents most vulnerable to noise and pollution - the elderly, immuno-suppressed persons with cardiovascular and pulmonary health issues who may not be physically able to relocate. While increases in social service costs are difficult to measure, sadly health risks are measurable such as increased hypertension, cardiovascular disease, cancer and leukemia.

Please respond:

1. How did the EA address these important impacts?
2. Why does the FAA find disregarding these impacts to be compliant with the intent, spirit and purpose of NEPA?

**Impacts on Schools Must Include All Scheduled Service Activity Impacts**

The statement in the Draft EA that no residences or schools are within the project area indicates a thought process and approach that misses the point. This is not just about the construction of a terminal. The FAA, the County and Airport Officials and the airlines are well aware that the major concerns are about the activities associated with starting up and expanding scheduled service. Impact to schools, children, playgrounds, hospitals, residents and the communities at large are not restricted to the construction and existence of a terminal building since they are also exposed to the over-flights (flight paths) of inbound and outbound flights. Listing a technical school and one grade school in the entire Draft EA is absolutely inadequate and unacceptable. Impacts are not

restricted to the terminal construction or the day/night noise line that “averages” noise over a 24-hour period.

Please respond:

1. What are the impacts to schools from noise, pollution, and impacts to the learning environment, based on full operational capacity of the airport (with two terminals)?
2. Is the FAA aware of the number of schools near Paine Field and/or those schools likely impacted by over-flights (those in the flight path)? See map, below.

Failure to comply with E.O. 13045 to assess all impacts to children

Requirements to fully consider all impacts to children alone should have driven a rigorous analysis of this issue and not of just a few flights but the maximum level.

Please respond:

1. Shouldn’t a rigorous analysis based on a role change of the airport from Class IV to Class I at full capacity, include more than just noise but also air emissions, traffic, disruptions to learning, health impacts to children and so on?
2. Why isn’t the Executive Order 13045 referenced in the Draft EA adhered to and not dismissed because schools are not in the “project area”? What about schools located under the flight paths, subject to noise, pollution and other environmental impacts due to the change of Paine Field from a Class IV to a Class I airport? Schools that are not in the project area are still subject to analysis, since the proposal includes a change in the role of an airport to a Class I status.
SCHOOLS IMPACTED BY SCHEDULED SERVICE AT PAINE FIELD

There are more than 130 public and private schools in the flight path.
Impacts on the Human Environment – Downward Spiral

Lower property values lead to less tax revenue and less service and safety with more crime and downward spiral for impacted communities. The EA does not provide documentation for property value reduction. Conservative estimates suggest a low figure of 10% and in a 1997 professional analysis to the Orange County Board of Supervisors, Randall Bell, MAI, Certified General Real Estate Professional and Instructor for the Appraisal Institute indicated that homes with higher valuations experienced higher diminutions, up to 27% surrounding Orange County Airport. These results translate to lower tax bases for county, cities, hospital and school districts and a downward spiral.

Please respond:

1. Why didn’t the EA include an assessment of impacts on the entire human environment?

Surface Transportation

The scope of the traffic analysis in the draft EA is extremely limited, estimating a maximum of 23 daily flights in the year 2016. However, Horizon and Allegiant will not be limited to the flights analyzed but rather by the capacity of the terminal(s), runway, aircraft and service routes. The draft EA suggests that no additional studies or mitigation will be required for these airlines to expand the services in their proposal. We note that although the EA uses Horizon’s estimate of flight and passenger levels, the consultant could not agree with the Horizon estimate of passengers per car that would have reduced estimated car trips by 66%.

The traffic analysis in the EA as sent to Lorena Eng, WSDOT NW Regional administrator, presupposes that the maximum impact of allowing unlimited commercial air service by Horizon and Allegiant will only be 956 daily vehicle trips assuming 1.5 to 2.4 people per vehicle all based on a limited number of flights. Using these minimal volumes, of the 15 intersections Ms. Eng requested Snohomish County analyze, only 7 intersections realized 10 or more peak-hour trips. The other 8 did not receive more that 10 peak hour trips and thus were not analyzed. In addition, several critical intersections and interchanges that lead from I-5 to the airport such as I-5/I-405/SR 525 Swamp Creek Interchange, SR 525 and Lincoln Way, the SR 525 arterial were not studied because the analysis shows they would not receive more than 10 peak hour trips. These potentially significantly under-estimated volumes will also underestimate the severity of impacts to I-5, SR 525, the I-5 / 128th Street interchange and 128th Street (SR 96) from I-5 to Paine
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Field Airport and the SR 99/128th Street signal which already operates at Level of Service F (worst rating possible.)

Alaska/Horizon Airlines currently operates 60% of the departures from the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Although we believe there are many flaws with Paine Field’s 2004 Mead & Hunt Report titled Passenger Core Market Analysis, airport officials and others refer to it as it provides one perspective regarding potential passenger activity levels at Paine Field as follows:

- “Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field catchment area contains approximately 28.6 percent (1,118,315) of the total population of the current Seattle-Tacoma International Airport catchment area (3,911,660). Accordingly, the Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field catchment area could garner a comparable share of the area’s air travel market.” (p.19)

- “With retention of 30.0 percent of the Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field market, 1,512,463 origin and destination passengers would be generated annually.” (p. 21)

The analysis purports limited trips but the proposal, once accepted, requires a change in the operating certificate of Paine Field to allow unconstrained scheduled air service with no limitations on type of aircraft, number/frequency of flights or time of day. The traffic analysis and resultant impacts need to consider the full capacity of the airport and the market before making this irreversible change to the airport and region. A capacity analysis would reveal many millions of annual passengers depending on the assumptions used regarding aircraft, load factors and so on. Using the Mead & Hunt study’s estimate of 1,512,463 origin and destination passengers described above, one finds vehicle trips several fold above those described in the EA. If this number of passengers was used even at above average carpooling standards with typical drop-off and pick-up trips we arrive at an estimated one million additional vehicle trips annually. That means 2,740 new daily vehicle trips or nearly 3X more than the 956 daily trips analyzed in the Environmental Assessment.

Please respond:

1. Please justify why the allowable impacts have not been analyzed.
2. Why was the consultant off in their traffic trip estimates by a factor of 3x?
3. If Horizon or Allegiant Air increases the number of operations proposed or increases the passenger capacity of the airplanes proposed, what areas of impact would require a new study? What specifically would trigger a new study? Please cite applicable law or regulations that support this idea.
4. The EA states that impacts were correlated with trips generated at Bellingham International Airport. Please provide a table showing the flights analyzed for the proposal to allow commercial air out of Bellingham and the
actual number of flights since commercial air service has started at Bellingham International Airport (BLI).

5. Gibson's Proposed Commercial Service at Paine Field Traffic Impact Analysis states: "The project may change some travel patterns in the Puget Sound region since it is anticipated that the project may divert some vehicle trips to Paine Field from Sea-Tac International Airport and Bellingham International Airport. This change in regional travel patterns could reduce the number of vehicles at the intersections and along the arterials analyzed in this report."²⁹ Please provide data showing the number supporting the above claim showing which intersections and arterials will see reduced vehicle volumes and the number of vehicles reduced. Also, explain which arterials and intersections the vehicles will be relocating to use.

6. The EA Traffic Analysis states, "Scoping discussions were held with staff at Snohomish County, The Washington State Department of Transportation, the City of Mukilteo, and the City of Everett." Please provide letters from Jim Bloodgood, Snohomish County Traffic Engineer, Lorena Eng WSDOT NW Region Administrator, Dong Ho Chang City of Everett Traffic Engineer, and Larry Waters City of Mukilteo Public Works Director stating that they have reviewed Gibson’s traffic analysis and they concur that the project description, assumptions, and analysis accurately represent the traffic impacts that are likely to be seen by allowing unlimited commercial air service at Paine Field. Please review and provide comments that the mitigation fees proposed in the EA are sufficient to cover any and all roadway impacts as a result of Horizon and Allegiant being allowed unlimited commercial flights out of Paine Field Airport.

7. When planners analyze impacts to roadway systems, they use a 20-year horizon. Why was a 20-year horizon not utilized when completing this critical traffic analysis? This represents a significant flaw in the EA that requires a full EIS with at least a 20-year scoping period as discussed throughout this document.

8. Please provide the data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers reference that supports the assumption of 1.5 and 2.4 persons per vehicle used in this analysis.

9. What is the person per vehicle number used for arterials as typically applied by WSDOT?

10. Since commercial airport users will clearly be coming from the interchanges of I-5 and SR 526/SR 527 please explain why this interchange was not included in the traffic analysis?

11. Since commercial airport users will clearly be coming from I-5/ I-405 Swamp Creek Interchange please explain why this interchange was not included in the traffic analysis.

12. The intersection of SR 525 and Lincoln Way is known as a back up point. Explain why this intersection was not included in the traffic analysis.

13. Currently Snohomish County and WSDOT’s SR 96 experience extreme back ups and delays on 128th Street (SR 96) between SR 99 and I-5. Please explain how these impacts will be addressed and mitigated, using a 20-year time frame.

14. The Traffic Analysis states that the intersection of SR 99 and 128th (SR 96) will be at Level Of Service (“LOS”) F in 2016 with or without the project. (LOS F is the worst possible LOS.) The City of Everett has identified that capacity improvements for single-occupancy vehicles to the intersection of SR 99 are not practical due to the existing lane configuration and lack of right-of-way. If this intersection is operating at LOS F how will drivers get to Paine Field Airport if this is one of the main access routes? Please list what roadways and intersections drivers will divert to in efforts to avoid this LOS F intersection.

15. The estimate of 956 vehicle trips per day based on 23 airplane operations per day does not properly assess the impact to roadways since the airlines will not be limited to 23 operations per day. Please include an assessment of the available runway capacity for commercial operations and analyze the maximum roadway impacts that would be seen.

16. The traffic analysis did not assess impacts to the arterial SR 525. Please assess the impacts to SR 525 from the Mukilteo Ferry terminal to I-5 with the assumption as allowed by this project that commercial air service is only limited by the market and runway capacity.

17. The traffic analysis did not assess the impacts during peak summer travel periods. The Washington State Ferry Service operates the largest number of ferry commuters in the State at the Mukilteo terminal. Please analyze the peak summer ferry volumes with anticipated peak summer commercial air service market capacity and determine its affects on the I-5, SR 525, SR 526 and 128th Street (SR 96) arterials and their associated intersections and interchanges.
18. The traffic analysis in the EA as sent to Lorena Eng, WSDOT NW Regional Administrator, analyses the maximum impact of allowing unlimited commercial air service by Horizon and Allegiant as being 956 daily vehicle trips assuming from 1.5 to 2.4 people per vehicle. With these minimal volumes, out of the 15 intersections Ms. Eng requested Snohomish County analyze only 7 realized 10 or more peak-hour trips. The other 8 did not receive more than 10 peak hour trips and were not analyzed. In addition, several critical intersections and interchanges that lead from I-5 to the airport such as I-5/I405/SR 525 Swamp Creek Interchange, SR 525 and Lincoln Way, the SR 525 arterial was not analyzed because the analysis shows it will not receive more than 10 peak hour trips. These under-estimated impacts will have severe impacts to I-5, SR 525, the I-5 / 128th Street interchange and 128th Street (SR 96) from I-5 to Paine Field Airport and the SR 99/128th Street signal, which is already operating at Level Of Service F. If the analysis included over half a million trips as supported by the Paine Field 2004 Mead & Hunter report titled “Passenger Core market Analysis” what would be the impact to the 15 intersection analysis requested by WSDOT’s NW Regional Administrator Lorena Eng?

19. The intersection of SR 526 and Everett Mall Way is not considered in the traffic analysis. Since this is the first intersection from I-5 to the airport from the North this should have been assessed. Please provide the currently LOS at this intersection during the PM peak.

20. The analysis states, “The project will, however, add trips to three intersections that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service, whether or not the proposed project is implemented. These intersections are SR 99 at Airport Road and the I-5 southbound and northbound ramps at 128th Street SW (SR 96). The traffic report only analyzes the southbound on ramp to I-5 at 128th but does not detail any analysis of the I-5 northbound ramps at 128th Street SW. Please add this analysis to the report based on full capacity at Paine Field.

21. If the carriers are not limited to the flights proposed, why are the FAA, Snohomish County, WSDOT, and Everett not demanding mitigation fees for the fully allowable impacts?

22. The traffic report states that, “Based on the trip generation and identified codes the total traffic mitigation fees identified in this report for payment to Snohomish County, WSDOT and the City of Mukilteo for the project is $333,262. The Snohomish County mitigation fees are $206,161.40, the WSDOT mitigation fees are $32,695.20 and the City of Mukilteo mitigation
fees are $94,406.25." Please provide letters from the agency officials stating that they concur with the above mitigation fee for the resultant impact.

23. Please provide comments from the City of Everett traffic engineer stating he agrees with the assessment that Everett will expect no traffic mitigation fees for the impact of commercial air service at Paine Field.

24. The traffic analysis assumption that 2% of the people flying on the commercial airlines will be arriving by bicycle allows Horizon and Allegiant to reduce their mitigation fees by 5%. Please provide your data source for the assumption that 2% of the commercial air travelers arrive by bicycle.

25. Please detail the back up for the assumption that only 34 employees will be needed to support commercial air service at Paine Field.

26. Please provide the compounded annual growth rate, the 5-year growth rate, the lane saturation volume and the flow rate used in this analysis.

27. Airport users will likely travel on Beverly Park Edmonds road west of SR 525. What volume of additional vehicles added by potential commercial air service would require arterial or intersection improvements on this section of Beverly Park road?

28. Page 12 of the traffic analysis states, "ITE's data shows that there would be 6.9 peak-hour trips per light." This is low for planes that carry from 76 to 150 passengers. Please explain.

29. Page 13 of the traffic analysis states "48% of the trips will come from Beverly Park Road, SR 99, SR 525 and I-5, SR 527 and 35th Ave SE." Please analyze the route from these facilities to the airport. Please provide analysis from I-5 to SR 525 through Swamp Creek interchange, SR 99 and Lincoln Way. Please provide analysis of the SR 527/ SR 526/I-5 interchange. This should be done as part of an EIS.

30. Please propose a solution to the LOS F intersection at SR 99 and Airport Road since it will be an impact to Boeing commuters, Boeing suppliers, airport users, local residents and local businesses.

31. Page 47 of the traffic analysis states, "The intersection of SR 525 and Beverly Park Road is programmed to be improved to allow the existing second southbound left-turn and second westbound left-turn lanes to be opened up to traffic." It states that these, not currently completed improvements, have been assumed to be completed in the airport traffic analysis. Please comment on the anticipated impacts to traffic and SR 525 as a result of SR
525 southbound to northbound u-turn movement will be eliminated by the opening of the second left turn lane.

32. Why are the growth rates used for the traffic study inconsistent? Page 16 states that a 2% annually compounded growth rate was used for 2010 turning movements. Page 18 states that where pipeline data was not available, .5% annually compounding growth rate was used along 84th Street. What is the annual growth rate for the ferry traffic using 84th Street? The report also uses growth rates of .53%, .93%, and 1.78%. Please explain these inconsistencies. How does this correlate with the anticipated growth rate of commercial air service at Paine Field over the next 20 years? Note again that Allegiant’s prospective growth rate of flights is 500% in the next 5 years.

33. What is the number of passengers that are reasonably expected to fly out of Paine Field over the next 20 years based on the latest market studies?

34. Does the Airport Master Plan estimate additional trip generators in future years based on its master plan expansion? What are the numbers of trips anticipated each year through 2020?

35. How have the effects of reduced vehicle speeds and increased idling time been accounted for in the noise and air impacts? Has there been an analysis to evaluate the need for noise walls based on increased vehicle volume and the potential need for future roadway improvements?

36. The EA states that trips will be generated from drivers on SR 99. Please evaluate the potential impacts of commercial airport trips at the intersection of SR 99 and 148th.

37. Please provide the date for the installation of the signal at the intersection of Center Road and Beverly Park Road, which was assumed as operational for this analysis.

38. Has the full traffic volumes generated at build-out from Korry Manufacturing been included in the commercial airport traffic analysis?

39. Table 9 has not included the analysis of the 128th Street SW at I-5 Northbound ramps as it purports in the executive summary. Please provide this analysis.

40. The analysis of intersection #4 Beverly Park Road and SR 525 presents a maximum peak hour increase of 4 through vehicles and 9 turning vehicles. The analysis states that the project will generate 212 vehicle trips and 40% of
these trips will take Beverly Park Road. Please explain why the intersection analysis does not show 40% of the peak hour vehicle trips.

41. We are requesting the WSDOT perform an independent traffic analysis to assess the impacts of commercial air service at Paine Field. The analysis bears review as the increase in overall traffic volumes at the intersection of SR 525 and Beverly Park Edmonds Road from 2010 without the project to 2016 with the project only increases turn movements by 1 to 81 and through movements by 18 to 110.

42. On page 41 of the traffic analysis it states that arterial flow rates will be 10.3 mph in 2016 with project conditions. What will the travel time be from I-5? What will the travel time be from 128th Street interchange to Paine Field Airport during the PM peak in 2016 with the project? Also, what will be the reverse travel time from the airport to I-5 during this same time period? Has the increased car volume and idling time been accounted for in the noise and air study?

43. STAYBRIDGE Suites in Mukilteo at the intersection of SR 525 and Paine Field Blvd paid the WSDOT $140,000 in roadway mitigation fees. Please explain how a hotel can be required to pay this amount with commercial airport expansion generating only $32,000 in mitigation fees to WSDOT.

44. Please list the High Accident Location intersections on SR 525, SR 99, SR 96 and Beverly Park Edmonds Road that are included in the 2007 WSDOT publication. Please discuss what level of traffic volume increases would require improvements at these locations.

45. The forecast reports in Appendix G shows aviation growth rates at Paine Field from the 23 daily operations proposed to be a 7.3 % increase in 2010 with a 9.9% increase in 2016. If commercial growth rates are 9.0% how can roadway growth rates be 0.5%?

46. If the airlines have the ability to increase flights and airplane size at any time, how will mitigation for the increase be analyzed and paid?

47. Appendix I contains the Proposed Commercial Service at Paine Field Vehicles Miles Traveled Analysis. Page 4 states that the catchment area has a radius of approximately 30 miles. The traffic analysis in Appendix F is flawed in that it does not analyze the impacts to the catchment area. Please explain why traffic impacts to the catchment area were not analyzed.

48. The Central Puget Sound Region Designated Maintenance Areas are included in Appendix I. Please comment on how air quality due to increased traffic
volumes and increase airplane volumes impact the Catchment area as defined in the Mead & Hunt Passenger Core Market Analysis.

**Parking**

Once again, the analysis failed to include the maximum activity levels instead relying on Horizon and Allegiant Airlines estimates regarding the number of flights and Snohomish County Airport (PAE), the applicant, to provide the parking space counts. Even the consultant disagreed with Horizon’s estimate of passengers per car that would have reduced estimated parking demand by some 66 percent. The DEA states “Based on Snohomish County Code requirements, there is sufficient existing on-airport surface parking available to accommodate the parking requirements of a building this size and thus, no additional parking is required.”

It is not the size of a building but the type of business that drives the need for parking. PAE has less than 300 parking spaces adjacent to the proposed terminal. Using the data from the DEA, assuming between 1.5 – 2.4 passengers/vehicle there would be a daily need for between 187 – 299 parking spaces, not including the 34 new employees. It is not difficult to assert that many of these vehicles would be consuming a space for a couple of days. Consider that constriction within the context that the average daily trips to-and-from the airport could be understated by a factor of 3X and you will quickly conclude that available parking is not sufficient and that the FAA failed to assess the impacts from this obvious deficiency.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The EPA defines “Cumulative Impacts” as follows:

“**Cumulative Impacts** - The impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over time. See 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7.”

Requirements to assess cumulative impacts have not been met. The flawed minimal scope significantly understates the impacts associated with the contemplated federal actions. Cumulative impacts are to be based on reasonably assessing the cumulative impacts of potential and foreseeable actions. The 5-year outlook is not reasonable. Furthermore, it defies credibility to completely dismiss the potential for other airlines coming in once the door is open.

---

30 Draft EA page B.7
31 Draft EA Table 4: Total Daily Trip Generation Summary at 2016 Full Operations, Appendix F page 11
32 Ibid
33 Paine Field 2004 Mead & Hunt Report, Passenger Core Market Analysis, pages 19 & 21
All potential and reasonably foreseeable actions need to be considered when assessing the cumulative impacts. This requirement forces FAA to look beyond the Horizon and Allegiant forecasts of a few flights a day and instead look at the expected and potential growth that is possible. If the FAA, low cost airlines and Paine Field are successful in obtaining significant taxpayer subsidies and in avoiding the legal and public pressures associated with this process then it is completely reasonable to assume that the cost of doing business at Paine Field will be cheaper than alternate airports including SeaTac. That means it is also reasonable to assume that some level of flight demand will shift to Paine Field. Further, it is reasonable to assume that some airlines will move to protect their turf and will demand the same “deal” the first airlines received.

It is therefore reasonably foreseeable to envision the last remaining constraint, other than Boeing complaining, to be the safe capacity of the airport. This will then be the final “cumulative impact” level. Since this final cumulative impact level is tied to the federal actions being assessed in this EA, it is both prudent and reasonable for the public to demand and for NEPA to require the honesty and transparency of a fully comprehensive cumulative impact assessment. This EA has not provided that. A legitimately scoped EIS can provide that and thus we demand a comprehensive EIS with full public involvement.

Please respond:

1. Why are the above cumulative impacts not considered?

2. Does the 5-year timeline limit the cumulative impact assessment? What would cumulative impacts look like over a more reasonable timeframe, such as 20 years? 30 years?

3. Please provide the citation, documentation, rationale and precedence for defining potential, reasonable and foreseeable as they relate to NEPA scope requirements.
SOC’s Overall Conclusions

First, the FAA engaged in coercion of Snohomish County to sway a vote by the County Council in favor of terminal construction. The FAA pre-empted its own rules and, by forcing that vote, created the basis to start the EA. Although internal FAA communications demonstrate restraint and a commitment to a more fair process by most, there are others in the FAA seemingly committed to getting airlines into Paine Field no matter what the cost to the public.

We recommend an independent agency, such as the GAO, immediately initiate an investigation into the overall process and conduct of all involved officials at the FAA or Paine Field airport to determine compliance with applicable rules, policies and existing laws.

The FAA’s overzealous drive includes the failure to hire a truly independent third-party contractor and the failure to direct that contractor to pursue a fair, unbiased and comprehensive analysis that genuinely meets the intent and purpose of NEPA. We ask that a new, qualified contractor be identified based on a proper bidding process.

In view of these findings, the EA should be negated in favor of a properly scoped Environmental Impact Statement. The County Council’s vote was coerced, so the entire process leading up to such coercion should be reviewed with the Council having the opportunity to reconsider its vote.

We are copying the Snohomish County Council and County Executive on this letter. As stated in our letter of January 15, 2010 to the County, we urge the County to rescind its request for FAA terminal construction funds that effectively subsidize Horizon and Allegiant. The County’s position of discouraging commercial service within FAA’s legal requirements includes the County’s stated policy to “insist that an airline pay its own way and mitigate its impacts.” (MRD Report May 16, 2007.)

In support of the County’s freedom to act without coercion, we specifically request that the FAA demonstrate clearly to the County that discretionary funds are, in fact, not jeopardized by any action that the County takes, or does not take, with respect to funding a terminal, and that the County fully complies with FAA rules whether or not the County chooses to subsidize terminal construction. The FAA must take whatever other steps necessary to reverse the poisonous atmosphere it created by its coercive actions.

Secondly, we believe the EA is fatally flawed based on its scope. We ask that if actions proceed to change Paine Field from a Class IV to a Class I airport that an EIS be conducted with a scope based on full capacity of the airport and full impacts and mitigation accounted for. The FAA rules on economic non-discrimination do not allow for local restrictions other than those that are safety related. That means no restrictions...
on the number, frequency or time of day. The potential activity levels associated with changing the role of the airport are akin to looking at the maximum activity of a new commercial airport or new runway at SeaTac. The limited scope of the draft EA based on airline intentions hardly gets at this larger picture. Sea-Tac’s 3rd runway analysis was not based on a few daily flights so it is reasonable to expect opening another “new” scheduled service runway/airport in the region would get no less of an analysis.

We specifically request the following:

1. The FAA should immediately order a new Environmental Impact Statement with the inclusion of both new terminals and their REAL maximum capacity.

2. The FAA should conduct the scoping process properly, inviting all governmental and non-governmental interested parties.

3. The impacts of two large terminals in operation 24 hours a day seven days a week must be studied.

4. Since the draft EA failed to properly scope out the impacts of changing the airport role and operating certificate to allow scheduled service, we ask that the “No Action Alternative” be the default alternative until a comprehensive full-capacity EIS is completed and compared to alternatives.

5. We urge the FAA to reject a flawed minimal assessment that concludes there are no significant impacts in changing the role of Paine Field. The system should not allow incremental “approvals” that, by design, circumvent requirements to mitigate impacts beyond certain thresholds.

6. We request an EIS with a scope that extends out at least 20 years, and preferably, 30 years. The draft EA only looks out to 2016 further minimizing the downstream impact analysis. This limited scope skews the entire assessment including but not limited to impacts from air emissions, noise, traffic, parking, water runoff and impacts to children required by Presidential Executive Order.

7. We request an EIS be conducted with a scope that addresses foreseeable potential activity levels resulting from a change in the airport operating certificate to allow commercial service. The public and our region deserve a fair, transparent and honest decision making process, particularly when the decision involves an irreversible regional game changer.

Finally, we provided comments outlining a number of substantial environmental concerns that the draft EA failed to address adequately due to the modest scope and/or flawed assessment methodology. We would expect that an EIS would address these substantial environmental concerns by outlining a plan to analyze, mitigate, and assess payment for them to the airlines at Paine Field. A failure to do this represents an
unacceptable social, economic, and environmental liability to the taxpayers and municipalities of Snohomish County.

Enclosures
1. FAA letter to SOC dtd Dec 12, 2005
2. Letter from Congressman Jay Inslee to Ms. Carol Suomi
3. Mediated Role Determination, 1978/79
4. Letter from 6 Mayors to County Executive
December 12, 2005

Mr. Gregory W. Hauth
President
Save Our Communities
P. O. Box 482
Mukilteo, WA 98275

Dear Mr. Hauth:

Your November 19, 2005, letter, requesting clarification of the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) role in Snohomish County’s management of its airport, has been forwarded to me for response. My responses to your questions are below. You may find additional information on an airport owner’s obligations in FAA Order 5190.6A, Airport Compliance Requirements, Chapter 4.

1. Does the FAA actively force a change in the role of any airports from general aviation to commercial air passenger or air cargo?

   While the FAA provides expertise and guidance on growth planning, and compliance with grant assurances to airport sponsors, we do not force an airport to change its role from general aviation to commercial air passenger or air cargo. However, the FAA does have a statutory mandate to ensure that airport owners comply with Federal grant assurances under Title 49 USC subtitle VII, as amended, and surplus real property agreements. In order to receive Federal grant funds, an airport sponsor must agree to make the airport available as an airport for public use, on fair and reasonable terms, and without unjust discrimination, to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical activities.

2. Is the FAA a party in community discussions about the future role of a general aviation airport? If not, can Snohomish County proceed to pass ordinances and resolutions without involving the FAA (assuming Snohomish county is aware of grant assurances regarding Paine Field)? If so, would the FAA participate on a voluntary basis or on a required (regulatory) basis?

   During the master planning process, the FAA discusses the future role of the airport with the airport sponsor. At the request of the airport sponsor, the FAA occasionally participates in community discussions about the future role of an airport and may also review and comment on current or proposed ordinances and resolutions. However, our contributions are limited to providing guidance on regulatory requirements surrounding the airport’s compliance with its grant assurances. These grant assurances apply to Snohomish County and as the sponsor of the airport, they should take appropriate action to assure that their rights and powers related to the grant assurances are not limited by other local jurisdictions. Snohomish County or other local governments are not required to
necessarily involve the FAA in developing its ordinances and resolutions, however, Snohomish County could be found in non-compliance if they were to approve of any ordinance or resolution that is contrary to their grant assurances.

3. If a commercial carrier asks the FAA to enforce grant assurances, would the FAA require the airport operator (such as Snohomish County) to pay for upgraded facilities, terminals, baggage, parking, road and traffic improvements, and other direct or indirect costs necessary for an air carrier to operate?

The prime obligation of the airport sponsor is to operate the airport for the use and benefit of the public. While the owner is not required to construct or upgrade facilities, it has the obligation to make available suitable areas or space on reasonable terms to those who are willing and otherwise qualified to offer flight services to the public (i.e., air carrier, air taxi, charter, flight training, crop dusting, etc). The airport sponsor has a duty to negotiate in good faith for the lease of such premises as may be available for the conduct of aeronautical services.

4. Is it possible for the airport operator to allow operations on a non-discriminatory basis only if an interested air carrier(s) pay(s) for all such direct and indirect costs necessary to assess, plan, execute, operate and/or compensate the operator for all expenses and liabilities associated with such operations?

Generally, yes. While an airport sponsor must allow all aeronautical users access to the airport on fair and reasonable terms without unjust discrimination, it may make reasonable distinctions among aeronautical users (such as signatory and non-signatory carriers) and assess higher fees on certain categories of aeronautical users based on those distinctions. The allowable rates and charges must be allocated by a transparent, reasonable, and not unjustly discriminatory cost allocation methodology that is applied consistently.

For costs that are not directly attributable to a specific user group the cost allocation methodology cannot require any aeronautical user or user group to pay costs properly allocable to other users or user groups. Indirect costs can only be included in the fees for aeronautical use if the cost allocation formula is consistently applied to other units or cost centers within the control of the airport sponsor.

There are many factors that may impact whether or not a specific rate or charge is allowable. For more detailed information please see the FAA’s Final Policy Regarding Airport Rates and Charges published June 21, 1996 in 61 Federal Register 31994.

5. If one or more air carriers ask the FAA to enforce grant assurances of an airport, and the airport operator chooses not to comply, what are the potential penalties for such non-compliance? What are the costs to the operator? Does the FAA have any history on imposing grant assurance enforcement penalties and if so, can you describe what those penalties and circumstances have been?
If the FAA determines, after investigation, that an airport is in violation of its grant assurances and the airport sponsor refuses to implement corrective action, the FAA would place the airport in non-compliance and could withhold future federal funding.

Generally, the FAA seeks to obtain voluntary compliance from airport sponsors. However, the FAA has imposed enforcement penalties where the airport sponsor refuses to voluntarily comply with its grant assurances. These cases may be reviewed on the Department of Transportation’s Docket Management System at http://dms.dot.gov/search/searchFormAdvanced.cfm. All formal complaints of compliance can be found by selecting “Advanced Search” and selecting the following information: At “return matching” select “Dockets”; for “agency” select FAA; for “category” select “non-rulemaking”; and for “subcategory” select “formal complaints”. You may limit the search by date.

6. If commercial air service flights commence at Paine Field, for either passenger service or air cargo, can the airport operator impose restrictions on operations, such as type of aircraft that can fly, the frequency of flights or time of day on operations?

Generally, the airport may not impose restrictions on the type of aircraft, the frequency of flights, or the time of day of operations. The exception to this rule is if the restrictions are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the airport. In such cases, the airport must have concurrence from FAA that the restriction is reasonable. In the event that FAA receives a complaint, Flight Standards and Air Traffic representatives will be consulted and appropriate studies (e.g., airspace, ground safety) may be initiated to determine if the restriction is reasonable and related to the safe and efficient operation of the airport.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Carol A. Key
Supervisor, Washington Section

cc:
Paul Johnson, Seattle Airports District Office
Matthew Cavanaugh, Manager, Safety and Standards Branch
Dave Waggoner, Airport Director, Paine Field
Tom Fitzpatrick, Snohomish County
Donald L. Doran, Mayor, City of Mukilteo
Ray Stephanson, Mayor, City of Everett
Ms. Carol Suomi  
Manager, Seattle Airport District Office  
Federal Aviation Administration  
1601 Lind Avenue, S.W., Suite 250  
Renton, Washington 98057

Dear Ms. Suomi:

Thank you for taking the time yesterday to address my concerns regarding the Federal Aviation Administration’s perception of the negotiation process between Snohomish County and commercial air service providers at Paine Field.

Per our conversation, it was my understanding that the FAA had concerns regarding granting compliance and the length of time that the negotiation process has taken thus far. I am happy to hear that the FAA has not received any complaints from either airlines throughout this process and has received regular updates from Snohomish County. Further, it is my understanding that:

1. Snohomish County is currently and has consistently acted in good faith throughout its negotiations for commercial air service at Paine Field. The County was and continues to be compliant with the “good faith” negotiation requirement specified by FAA and statutory regulations.

2. At this time, Snohomish County remains in full compliance with all statutory requirements attached to FAA funding.

3. The current concerns regarding negotiations between Snohomish County and commercial air carriers have been resolved and will not prejudice Paine Field in FAA consideration of future discretionary funding or other potential funding streams.

4. The future of commercial flight activity at Paine Field lies with Snohomish County. However, if statutory requirements and grant assurances are not met at some future date, Snohomish County is aware of the potential consequences that may lead to a denial of future FAA discretionary funds.
While this process is a difficult one and it will take time for the County to reach consensus, I have the utmost confidence in the local elected officials and their intent to reach a timely and appropriate resolution. Thank you for your hard work and diligence on this issue.

Very truly yours,

JAY INSLEE
Member of Congress

JRI/pm
WHEREAS, Findings and Recommendation of the Snohomish County PLANNING COMMISSION have been filed with the Board of Snohomish County Commissioners in the matter of the SELECTION OF AN AIRPORT ROLE FOR PAINE FIELD, and,

WHEREAS, the Board did on the 29th day of March, 1978, set this 11th day of April, 1978, at the hour of 10:00 o'clock a.m., as the time for considering the Findings of fact and the Recommendations of the Planning Commission concerning the role for Paine Field, and,

WHEREAS, at such public meeting held this date, the Board of County Commissioners carefully considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission, the Airport Commission and all written material received thus far, and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, after two public hearings at which several hours of citizen input and testimony were received, recommended to this Board that the Commissioners adopt a role for Paine Field to be entitled "General Aviation" (combination of Revised general Aviation and Do Nothing role), and,

WHEREAS, after having received and considered all documents and testimony submitted to this Board by the Planning Commission, Airport Commission and others, it appears to this Board that the recommendation of the Planning Commission should be followed with two modifications and two additional conditions being made by this Board of Commissioners:

1. There is widespread and well founded public concern in the Paine Field Study Area about the possible expansion of airport operations and/or facilities at Paine Field.

2. The Environmental Analysis Summary, supplemental technical evidence, and statements from the public indicate that any expansion of Paine Field, if not strictly controlled, could impose substantially increased adverse environmental impacts on a large number of existing and future Paine Field area residents.

3. There is a demand for improved and expanded light aircraft general aviation facilities in the Seattle-Tacoma-Everett region.

4. There is no clear justification for providing additional large transport air carrier or air cargo facilities at Paine Field, or at any airport in the region other than SEA-TAC, during the foreseeable future.

5. The Paine Field Study Area has been designated by elected officials of Snohomish County and affected cities as a major urban growth center. Major public and private investment, including development of an extensive system of public utilities and educational facilities, has already occurred to implement this growth policy. Furthermore, urbanization of the study area is continuing.
6. Failure to reduce the adverse impacts of airport operations on the community and control negative residential growth impact on aircraft activities will result in unnecessary social, environmental and economic hardship for the community, while jeopardizing legally and financially the County's substantial investment in airport facilities at Paine Field.

7. Future use and development of Paine Field must recognize and protect the rights of the Boeing Company to use these facilities as provided for in their long-term contract with the County.

8. The needs and interests of the municipalities surrounding Paine Field, including Everett, Mukilteo, Lynnwood and Edmonds, must be given full consideration by the County in determining the future use of this facility.

9. A wide assortment of noise abatement measures are available which can and should be effectively used at Paine Field to substantially reduce the adverse impact of present and future aircraft noise on the surrounding community.

10. Testimony by pilots based at Paine Field and affected residents of the community has raised serious doubt about the accuracy of the airport noise contour forecasts generated for this study and hence supports enactment of a major continuous noise monitoring program at Paine Field.

11. Citizen confidence in the commitment of the Airport staff, Airport Commission, and elected County officials to aggressively pursue programs to make the airport and surrounding community compatible must be created to avoid long-term major confrontations that will poorly serve the airport, County and community.

12. Serious unanswered questions have been raised by professional aviators based at Paine Field regarding location of a proposed new 3,100 foot light aircraft, general aviation, runway on the Bomarc site. Substantial doubts exist concerning:

A. development of a safe flight pattern to avoid a potentially dangerous intersection of aircraft using the new runway and those using runway 11-29;

B. The provision of adequate fixed based operator flight services to aircraft using the Bomarc runway;

C. provision of eventual taxiway access to the Bomarc runway from the main airport;

D. The acceptability of this runway for student pilot training stemming from such factors as

(1) The increased crosswind conditions caused by the 6º Canting of this runway away from the prevailing winds;

(2) The need for a second air traffic control radio frequency; and

(3) ...
In light of these findings and our knowledge gained from many hours of testimony and review of evidence, we recommend that a redefined aviation role for Paine Field be selected which would achieve some of the primary objectives of the Revised general Aviation role, while also protecting the interests of the Paine Field residential community, the airport, and the County by incorporating key elements of the Do Nothing role. We entitle this new role “General Aviation.”

The principal aviation objectives of the General Aviation role would be to retain and enhance light aircraft general aviation as the dominant aeronautical activity at Paine Field. This role would provide for a reasonable amount of airport facility expansion and modernization to accommodate the expected growth of this activity. Future aircraft operations would be keyed to the substantial growth rate projected in the Do Nothing role. This approach would impose strict control on any aviation activity with potential for adverse environmental impact.

In the event further analysis justifies its need, the principal new aviation facility provided under the general Aviation role could be a new light aircraft utility runway 3,100 feet in length. This new runway would be located west of Airport Road, rather than on the Bomarc property. The preferred site would be located approximately 3,300 feet east of the existing main north/south runway 16-34.

Expansion or improvements of other airport facilities primarily for light aircraft general aviation use would also be permitted under this role, subject to adequate mitigation of adverse environmental impacts. New or improved facilities would include new T-hangers, tie-down space, taxiways, navigational aids, and other necessary ground support facilities for light aircraft aviation. This role does not propose extension of the main north/south runway 16-34 or other existing runways.

Other aviation activities which would be encouraged to continue operation and expansion at Paine Field include: aircraft related industries, business and corporate aviation, public service aviation and air taxi service. Reasonable expansion of these activities would be permitted.

Existing aviation activities at Paine Field which would be strongly discouraged from expanding because of their inconsistency with the airport’s primary aviation role, as well as their unavoidable adverse impact on the surrounding community, include supplemental/charter air passenger service, large transport crew training, air cargo aviation, and military aviation.

A vigorous noise abatement program embodying the elements described in the Planning Department’s position statement should be included as an integral part of this redefined general Aviation role. We earnestly recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that steps be taken to begin implementation of this program before the next phase of the study is permitted to begin. It is our firm belief that all affected sectors of the airport community should be directly involved in developing and, as possible, implementing the detailed elements of a noise abatement program. The program should include at least the following:
1. Staffing of an Airport Noise Mitigation Program

A. The county should engage the services of a professional mediator when needed to work directly with the Paine Field Area community to resolve any differences that may arise between the operation of Paine Field and the citizenry.

B. The County should form a permanent Paine Field Advisory Council composed of local residents and airport users to provide advice to the County on important airport related issues.

4. Land Use Controls and Land Acquisitions

[Per the Mediation Panel, the “Land Use Controls and Land Acquisitions” section is to be amended according to the Snohomish County Planning Commission recommendations dated November 14, 1978]

A. All noise impacted land inside Zone C Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) 40+ should be converted to an airport-compatible, non-residential land use either by private development or through purchase by the County with a staged acquisition program following FAA guidelines.

B. Based upon the results of the noise monitoring system, the most severely impacted portions of noise impacted land inside Zone B (NEF 30-40) should be converted to airport-compatible, non-residential land uses whenever consistent with accepted land use planning principles.

C. The County should require or purchase appropriate aviation easements when granting approval of residential property requests inside Zone B (NEF 30-40).

D. The County should require that special noise insulation be added to all new residences constructed inside Zone B (NEF 30-40).

E. The County should pursue efforts to require that disclosure of airport noise impact be included on title reports for all property located in Zone B or Zone C when development or subdivision is proposed.

5. Community Assistance Program

A. Existing Residences located in noise impacted areas with aircraft noise levels of NEF 35-40 should be provided with a guarantee of purchase by the County if so desired by the affected owner.

B. A County sponsored cost sharing program to purchase noise insulation materials should be offered to the owners of all existing residences in Zone B (NEF 30-40).

6. Control of Military Aircraft Activities at Paine Field

[The “Control of Military Aircraft Activities at Paine Field” section is replaced with the Paine Field Noise Abatement Procedures developed by airport users and adopted by the Snohomish County Airport Commission on September 13, 1978]

The County should attempt to renegotiate the lease with the U.S. Army Reserve Helicopter unit dated March 22, 1978 for a period of time shorter than the 20 years specified.
In conclusion, we present our findings, which expressly support the selection of the new redefined General Aviation role:

1. The General Aviation role will permit reasonable airport expansion to continue at Paine Field.

2. The General Aviation role will impose a minimum amount of adverse environmental impact on the Paine Field area community.
3. The General Aviation role will cause the least disruption to existing land use patterns around Paine Field.

4. The General Aviation role will provide the best opportunity to both preserve and expand the existing airport industrial park.

5. The General Aviation role will provide the greatest economic benefits to the County with the least economic and environmental costs.

6. The General Aviation role will best serve the future needs of light aircraft general aviation. The principal aeronautical activity at Paine Field.

7. The General Aviation role will ensure that light aircraft general aviation will remain the dominant aeronautical activity at Paine Field for the foreseeable future.

8. The General Aviation role will limit the expansion of aviation activities at Paine Field which are least compatible with its dominant aviation role and which would impose the most severe adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding community.

9. The General Aviation role will provide the County with the best opportunity to successfully implement an aggressive, long-term noise abatement program at Paine Field.

10. The General Aviation role will protect the rights of the Boeing Company to use the airport facilities at Paine Field as outlined in their long-term contract with Snohomish County.

It is further recommended by the Planning Commission that the Paine Field Annual Air Show and other such community sponsored events continue to be permitted at the Snohomish County Airport at Paine Field.

On a motion duly made, seconded and UNANIMOUSLY approved, the Planning Commission further recommends to the Board of County Commissioners of Snohomish County that should at any future date further study be done relative to the Paine Field Community Plan, the body studying said Plan be constituted in such a manner as to involve local citizens, airport users, qualified technical staff and an advisory committee; and be patterned along the lines of the Citizens’ Advisory Committee which drafted the Snohomish County Shoreline Master Program.

Board of County Commissioners Conditions:

1. Two additional members are to be added to the Airport Commission - one to represent the residents in the immediate area of the airport and the other to represent the Airport pilots.

2. This Paine Field Community Plan shall be subject to periodic review, so once noise levels and patterns are set at an acceptable level, Paine Field may take advantage of technological and operational improvements.
WHEREAS, it further appears to this Board that:

1. There were no irregularities in the action taken on this matter, and the Hearings by the Planning Commission were conducted fairly and in good faith.

2. The Findings of the Planning Commission are in the best interests of the general welfare of the people of Snohomish County.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to the Findings of fact as set out above, this Board hereby ADOPTS the "GENERAL AVIATION" role for the PAINE FIELD COMMUNITY PLAN.

COPY RECEIVED:

PLANNING ______
AIRPORT ______
EVERETT PLANNING DEPARTMENT ______
(Gary Doughty)

Done in ______ regular ______ Session this ______ 11th ______ day of ______ April ______, 19 ______

ATTEST:

HENRY B. WHALEN
County Auditor and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Board

By: ____________________________

Constituting the Board of County Commissioners of Snohomish County, Washington
November 5, 2008

The Honorable Aaron Reardon  
Snohomish County Executive  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue  
Everett, WA  98201

Dear Executive Reardon,

We are writing to express our unified support for Paine Field’s current role as an industrial airfield that supports Washington State’s aerospace industry, general aviation and our communities. We expressly oppose efforts to bring scheduled passenger air service to Paine Field.

A significant concern is the impact passenger air service at Paine Field may have on Boeing and its operations. As the Prosperity Partnership noted in its signature report in September 2005: “the Central Puget Sound region is one of the world’s few epicenters of aircraft and parts manufacturing.” The heart of that epicenter is Paine Field, which Boeing uses to test and deliver its wide body planes. Snohomish County should do all it can to maintain and enhance Boeing’s presence and primary assembly facility.

Commercial passenger aircraft would need to use the long runway at Paine Field, the same runway Boeing uses to test and deliver its production planes from the adjacent assembly facility. While there are other options than Paine Field for commercial passenger service, Paine Field is the only place Boeing uses for testing and delivery of wide body planes. With delivery deadlines slipping and order backlogs growing, it is unwise to further encumber Boeing and its workers.

Once the door to commercial passenger service at Paine Field is opened, the County and its citizens will find a slippery slope on the other side of the door. It will be difficult to control or limit the growth of commercial passenger service, and eventually commercial passenger flights will impede or somehow restrict Boeing activities. Whether that happens in five years or 25 years, it won’t be a good thing for Boeing and for Snohomish County. The economic benefits from Boeing’s presence at Paine Field clearly dwarf any net economic benefits from allowing commercial passenger service at Paine Field. These impacts and threats must be fully considered and communicated to the public.

We urge you to make every effort to implement vigorously the county’s policy of “strongly discouraging” scheduled passenger air service at Paine Field. We do realize you and your staff are obligated to negotiate in good faith with the airlines that express interest in providing commercial air service to or from Paine Field. However, we are concerned that some believe FAA rules lock you into accommodating any airline that wants to schedule flights at Paine Field — this belief is wrong! Instead, we believe you can “strongly discourage” while still negotiating in good faith pursuant to FAA regulations by doing at least the following:
- Legally discourage scheduled air service by refusing to pay one dime towards subsidizing it. Investments in a passenger terminal, security facilities, baggage handling facilities, parking upgrades and related facilities are not appropriate, particularly now when the County is facing a budget deficit of at least $21 million and perhaps considerably more. In addition to not having the money, the County has no way of ensuring continuing use of the facilities by commercial airlines, who are greatly impacted by economic and market conditions.

- Reject any offers that include subsidies of any kind from any source including efforts to subsidize the funding of capital improvement costs or guaranteed ticket purchase programs through publicly financed agencies such as the Economic Development Council.

- Reject any pleas for reduced or waived landing fees or other fees. The County should not offer any inducements to any airlines, particularly any which reduce expected income to the County. Fees should be reflective of the market rate using Sea-Tac Airport as a pricing standard.

- Require a full cost analysis to ensure you have identified all costs that must be paid for by the airline applicant(s). Include indirect costs in the analysis to determine what degree any such costs can be incorporated into county demands of the airline applicant(s).

- Embrace the role of lead permitting agency. Because Snohomish County owns and operates Paine Field, it is unquestionably the lead permitting agency for any proposed use of Paine Field for commercial air service. Snohomish County needs to be assertive in its role as the lead permitting agency and require adequate studies, environmental impact statements and full noise mitigation assessments to ensure understanding of all the impacts that will come with commercial air service. Once studies are completed, the County must then identify and require appropriate mitigation activities for these impacts.

- Require airline applicants to pay for environmental impact studies, noise studies, traffic studies and remediation studies, not only for a small number of flights but for the full potential of flight activity, particularly given the inability to limit flights once they begin.

- Implement aggressive passenger fees. Because the County will be on the hook for the potential of billions of dollars in noise mitigation costs, fees should reflect that liability.

These actions are consistent with the Mediated Role Determination, Federal law and FAA regulations. Your own attorney, Kaplan Kirsch Rockwell, issued an opinion in 2006 that validates this point:

"...airport proprietors have considerable discretion in deciding whether and when to make capital improvements. Equally important for present purposes, airport proprietors generally can decide on the precise nature and scope of the capital improvements. Indeed, airport users typically are responsible for reimbursing an airport proprietor for its costs to build new projects serving those users even if the users consider such projects to be imprudent and unnecessary." (KKR Memorandum to Sno. Cty dtd 12 Oct 06, pp 27-28.)
Snohomish County as proprietor of Paine Field has a wise policy to “strongly discourage” a change in the airport role thereby keeping commitments to citizens and communities while avoiding costly litigation, indirect costs, lost tax revenue from reduced property values, school, health, environmental, transportation and other adverse impacts. This policy induced our cities to rezone thousands of acres surrounding Paine Field (or under the flight paths) from light industrial to residential housing. Now this policy protects the billions of dollars of investment it created.

The policy also protects Boeing from being “crowded out” by passenger service as they ramp up production of the 787 and continue production of the 747, 777, and 767 (especially if Boeing wins the tanker contract). Boeing requires time on the main runway for taxi testing, flight testing and other important activity required for FAA flight certification. If Paine Field offers commercial service, would Boeing need to wait for inbound and outbound airlines? Or would airlines circle our neighborhoods while waiting for Boeing to clear the runway? Flight testing and scheduled airline service don’t mix and we don’t have clear answers about how to make it work. It’s a risky proposition to impose costly delivery delays on our region’s biggest employer.

No wonder the county and our cities have supported the policy set forth in the MRD. Brier, Edmonds, Mukilteo, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace and Woodway, (representing more than 120,000 residents) have passed formal resolutions in support of the MRD and the current role of Paine Field and opposing scheduled passenger service.

We request you fully consider the bipartisan concerns and recommendations made on behalf of so many cities and Snohomish County citizens.

Sincerely,

Hon. Joe Marine
Mayor, City of Mukilteo

Hon. Carla Nichols
Mayor, Town of Woodway

Hon. Gary Haakenson
Mayor, City of Edmonds

Hon. Jerry Smith
Mayor, City of Mountlake Terrace

Hon. Don Gough
Mayor, City of Lynnwood

Hon. Bob Colinas
Mayor, City of Brier

Enclosures: Resolutions opposing expansion of Paine Field from Brier, Edmonds, Lynwood, Mountlake Terrace, Mukilteo and Woodway.

c: Everett Herald
Seattle Times
Seattle P-I
Mukilteo and Edmonds Beacon
KIRO, KOMO and KING TV/Radio

D.121
Dear Mr. Doran,

Thank you for your comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Paine Field/Snohomish County Airport (Airport). Many of your comments are related to the scope of the EA: what activity is considered to be reasonably foreseeable, aviation demand forecasting and airport capacity, and appropriate level of NEPA documentation. This response discusses those concerns first. The remainder of the response is organized based on the outline you provided in your letter to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

Our response is organized as follows:

1. Scope of the Environmental Assessment (EA)
   a. Reasonably Foreseeable Actions
   b. Aviation Demand Forecasting and Airport Capacity
   c. Appropriate Level of NEPA Documentation and Consultant Selection

2. Introduction and Executive Summary

3. Part I: FAA Threats Forced Snohomish County to Pass Terminal Resolution
   a. Page 8 Questions
   b. Page 11 Questions

4. Part II: EA Scoping is Improper, Creates Fatal Flaw: Does not Comply with NEPA
   a. Page 13 Questions
   b. Page 14 Questions Section 1
   c. Page 14-15 Questions Section 2
   d. Page 15-16 Questions Section 3
   e. Page 17 Questions
   f. Page 18 Questions
   g. Page 19 Questions Section 1
   h. Page 19 Questions Section 2
   i. Page 19 Questions Section 3
j. Page 20 Questions  
k. Page 21 Questions  
l. Page 22 Questions  
m. Page 23 Questions  

5. Part III: Comments on Impacts that the EA Failed to Address  
a. Page 24 Questions Section 1  
b. Page 24 Questions Section 2  
c. Page 25 Questions  
d. Page 27-28 Questions  
e. Page 32-33 Questions Section 1  
f. Page 33 Questions Section 2  
g. Page 34 Questions  
h. Page 35 Questions Section 1  
i. Page 35 Questions Section 2  
j. Page 37 Question  
k. Page 38-45 Questions  
l. Page 46 Questions  

6. SOC’s Overall Conclusions (Requests 1-7)  

1. SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  

The purpose of the EA is to evaluate the requests from both Horizon Air and Allegiant Air for the FAA to amend operations specifications and Airport operating certificate to allow scheduled commercial air service at Paine Field and, if requested, provide funding for the construction of a modular terminal building sufficient to accommodate the proposed passenger service. The actions associated with these requests have been fully evaluated in the EA. Actions that were speculative were not evaluated as they are not considered reasonably foreseeable. The following sections more thoroughly describe and respond to related questions and other points raised in your letter.  

a. REASONABLY FORESEEABLE ACTIONS  
Many of your comments are tied to the definition of what can be considered reasonably foreseeable. Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA require that documents address impacts that are "reasonably foreseeable." FAA Order 5050.4b Paragraph 9q defines reasonably foreseeable as the following:
“An action on or off-airport that a proponent would likely complete and that has been developed with enough specificity to provide meaningful information to a decision maker and the interested public. Use the following table to help determine if an action is reasonably foreseeable.”

(Footnote 4: Paragraph 905.c(1) and (2) provide definitions of “connected actions” and “similar actions,” respectively)

While it is true that if these projects are approved, both Horizon Air and Allegiant Air could increase the number of operations in the future using the same aircraft types without any additional environmental review, these actions are not reasonably foreseeable. Additional service by either Horizon Air or Allegiant Air with the aircraft included in their request letters in Appendix A of the EA to cities included in the airlines’ approved operations specifications would not constitute a Federal action and would not likely require additional environmental review unless FAA funding of further terminal expansion was required to accommodate that service or a new aircraft type was proposed.

Federal actions that are not considered reasonably foreseeable that may require future environmental review should they become ripe for decision making include:

- An operations specifications amendment request by another airline to begin service to Paine Field
- An operations specification amendment to add a new aircraft type by an existing airline
- Additional city destinations not currently covered by Horizon’s or Allegiant’s operations specifications
- FAA funding for a new or expanded terminal building or other airport facility development

Past, present, and future projects not included in the Proposed Actions are of independent utility. The aircraft to be utilized are already operating at Paine Field and are smaller and will operate less frequently than many of the other commercial aircraft being manufactured or serviced at Paine Field. The Airport is home to 650 based aircraft, Boeing Company, Aviation Technical Service (ATS), and other major aerospace companies. There are daily operations of Boeing 747, 767, 777, 787, 737 aircraft and regular operations by MD-80 series aircraft, corporate and military aircraft including FA-18 tactical jets, C-17, P-3, C-40, C-130, and C-5. ATS provides maintenance, inspection, and repair services for multiple airlines, including Southwest, Delta, Hawaiian, Alaska, UPS, and FedEx.

In this instance, the FAA has determined that “reasonably foreseeable” is based on the information provided by the airlines as to the number of operations and types of aircraft they are intending to operate, coupled with information about the number and type of aircraft that would be operating at the
Airport without new airline service. Future operations are comprised of the FAA’s Terminal Area Forecasts and the proposed operations by Horizon and Allegiant Air. The FAA does not believe that activity levels higher than those projected by the airlines (Appendix A) and included in the forecasts (Appendix G) are reasonably foreseeable due to coordination with the airlines and general national/local trends. Any other levels of activity would be purely speculative. Therefore, evaluation of an unconstrained commercial operation is not warranted or appropriate.

NEPA documents are to be prepared based on an evaluation of reasonably foreseeable conditions. Neither the NEPA nor Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations contain requirements about specific years to be evaluated. Rather, these regulations indicate that NEPA documents should address the reasonably foreseeable future. The only reference to analysis of project impacts beyond five years in FAA environmental guidance is in Section 14, entitled 14. Noise, of Appendix A in FAA Order 1050.1E. Paragraph 14.4g. states that “DNL (Day-Night Noise Level) contours, grid point, and/or change-of-exposure analysis will be prepared for the following: (1) Current conditions; and (2) Future conditions both with and without (no action) the proposal and each reasonable alternative. Comparisons should be done for appropriate timeframes. Timeframes usually selected are the year of anticipated project implementation and 5 to 10 years after implementation. Additional timeframes may be desirable for particular projects.”

The year 2016 was selected, in part, because it is the concurrency timeframe required under the Snohomish County Unified Development Code (SCC30.66B.155) as well as the timeframe required in accordance with the Clean Air Act General Conformity analysis years (based on the year of attainment/maintenance). The Draft EA considered noise impacts, in accordance with FAA guidance, for the first year of implementation (2010) and for one future outlier year (2016), both with and without the proposed activity levels. There were a number of reasons that this timeframe was considered reasonable and appropriate. For instance, the information from both Allegiant Air and Horizon Air (Appendix A of the EA) was given to the County in two year increments, starting with year 1, and continuing with years 3 and 5. The forecasts of aviation activity (Appendix G) were based on these projections supplied by the airlines.

Due to the timeframe required to respond to comments on the Draft EA and changes in operational activity at the Airport during that time, the aviation activity forecasts and analysis years from the Draft EA were updated prior to the publication of the Final EA. In the Final EA, 2008 remains the base year or existing year, while 2013 was considered the initial year of commercial airline service, and 2018 was considered the future year for applicable environmental consequence analysis.
The growth rates beyond 2018 (if any) cannot be accurately predicted at this time. It is unclear whether or not the air service would be successful, or if successful, how quickly the air service would increase. Such increases would be dependent on area residents choosing to fly using commercial service at Paine Field.

In response to concerns about future activity levels, the FAA requested that an additional appendix be prepared that identifies the operating capacity of the proposed terminal and the environmental effects associated with that operating capacity. Although not considered reasonably foreseeable, the FAA tasked the County to prepare an analysis to disclose the effects should activity grow and reach the maximum capacity of the proposed terminal. The FAA determined that the terminal is the limiting factor, so the maximum capacity of the modular terminal was examined as a theoretical scenario. This additional analysis was prepared for disclosure purposes to respond to comments about activity levels either above that identified by the airlines or outside the time period which the FAA believes is reasonably foreseeable. This analysis evaluated the Hirsh Report, *Estimates of Traffic Impacts and Terminal Capacity* (Draft and Final EA Appendix K), which reflects a theoretical activity level of the maximum capacity of the proposed terminal in terms of the maximum number of enplanements that could be accommodated and the resultant number of aircraft operations utilizing the proposed aircraft types. This analysis and its results can be found in Appendix P of the Final EA.

All future references in this letter of “reasonably foreseeable” are based on this definition.

**b. AVIATION DEMAND FORECASTING AND AIRPORT CAPACITY**

The Airport Master Plan, last completed for Paine Field in 2002, is a plan for long-term physical development that may be needed at the Airport. The Airport Master Plan’s purpose is to identify areas for potentially necessary facilities and to assess how airport land is best used in consideration of anticipated future demand. The primary purpose of a master planning document is to formulate a program to accommodate a reasonable projection of anticipated aviation activity demand. Although this “reasonable level of demand” will be used as a basis for long-term facility planning in the master plan update, no facilities will be built until actual demand occurs. In other words, market forces drive facility development, not forecasts. Proposed improvements presented in the Master Plan and illustrated on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) may not be justified and are not approved for construction or funding by the FAA. The Airport Master Plan and ALP should be considered as the first phase of an airport development project and an opportunity to provide information needed for a realistic short range (5-year) plan and also identify planning and design issues in sufficient detail for long-rang (20-year) facility requirements based on projected aviation demand.
Aviation demand forecasts use a sophisticated analytical process which includes a wide variety of physical, operational, and socioeconomic considerations to anticipate what will happen at an airport in the future. Ultimately, forecasts form the basis for future demand-driven improvements. They also provide data from which to estimate current and future “off-airport” impacts such as noise and over-flight traffic. Aviation demand forecasts provide value to the larger community, and are often incorporated by reference into other studies and policy decisions. Aviation demand forecasts developed for master plans typically include a 20-year planning horizon.

The 2002 Airport Master Plan completed for Paine Field included 4 scenarios for commercial operations and enplanements (passengers boarding commercial service aircraft departing from an Airport). These 4 scenarios considered multiple factors including the population located in the vicinity of the airport, the driving time to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport (SeaTac), and the forecast population growth of the region; and reasonably assumed that some level of unconstrained demand exists for passenger service at Paine Field. Detailed methodology is included in the Forecasts of Aviation Activity chapter of the 2002 Airport Master Plan.

The 2002 Master Plan aviation activity forecast scenarios range from 10,861 (Regional Service Low Range) to 40,872 (National Service High Range) for scheduled commercial service operations in 2016 and could accommodate between 144,630 and 1,461,553 passenger enplanements. The regional-low forecast for passenger enplanements is the lowest of the four scenarios and is based on the assumption that, if actual demand occurs, the Airport is most likely to accommodate passengers from a limited geographic area surrounding the Airport (a thirty minute drive time), and that routes flown out of the Airport will have a regional focus (within a 500-mile range). The adopted forecast in the 2002 Airport Master Plan was the regional low forecast (Scenario 3) which indicated approximately 10,861 passenger air carrier operations by 2016.

The remaining scenarios were dismissed because it was determined that they were not reasonably foreseeable. Neither Snohomish County nor the FAA has any information that would indicate that either the regional high or the national high scenarios included in the Airport Master Plan are reasonably foreseeable.

Many conditions have changed since the forecasting effort for the 2002 Airport Master Plan was conducted. As such, the FAA required a new forecasting effort for this EA based on new conditions and the information provided by the air carriers (Horizon Air and Allegiant Air). In addition, because the Proposed Actions would result in air carrier service at an airport that does not presently have service, two forecasts were required—one that reflected the No Action and the other reflecting activity with the Proposed Actions.
By comparison, the forecasting effort for the Final EA indicated approximately 8,340 passenger air carrier operations by 2018 which is lower than the Master Plan forecast. The Forecast for the EA are based on the FAA Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) and the proposed scheduled commercial service by Horizon Air and Allegiant Air. The EA forecast is based on an actual proposal for scheduled commercial air service while the Airport Master Plan forecast was based on market potential and other factors described in the Airport Master Plan.

While the forecast methods provide a means for developing quantifiable results, aviation forecasters must use their professional judgment to determine what is reasonable. The EA forecasts were reviewed and approved by FAA as described in more detail in Appendix G of the Draft and Final EA.

The capacity of the airfield system was also analyzed and disclosed in the 2002 Airport Master Plan in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5060-5, Airport Capacity and Delay. The Annual Service Volume (ASV) is a reasonable estimate of an airport’s annual capacity (defined as the level of annual aircraft operations that would result in an average annual aircraft delay of approximately one to four minutes). According to the Master Plan, under current policies and practices, the Airport has an ASV of approximately 367,000 operations. In 2008, the Airport recorded approximately 143,722 annual operations, or approximately 39 percent of the calculated capacity. Given the dramatic decrease in general aviation activity at the Airport in 2010, the Final EA forecast (Appendix G) indicates the Airport only reaching 122,127 total operations by 2018, or approximately 33 percent of annual capacity. Consideration or analysis of 367,000 annual operations in this EA is not considered appropriate because neither the County nor the FAA has received any indication of interest to provide passenger service beyond that proposed by Allegiant Air and Horizon Air. Consequently, analysis of environmental impacts resulting from commercial operations and enplanement levels that are not reasonably foreseeable is considered speculative.

c. APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF NEPA DOCUMENTATION AND CONSULTANT SELECTION

The process for determining the level of environmental review required for a proposed Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) action is identified in FAA Order 1050.1E, paragraph 401(l)(1). If the Proposed Actions is included in the lists in Chapter 3, Advisory and Emergency Actions and Categorical Exclusions, then that Proposed Actions has historically been shown to not have significant impacts and a categorical exclusion from (the lowest level of Federal environmental review) is the most appropriate environmental review. As in the case of Paine Field, if a project is not on the categorical exclusion list, but the FAA has no reason to expect the Proposed Actions to result in significant impacts, an EA (a mid-range level of Federal environmental review) is normally prepared. FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1, Chapter 4, Environmental Assessment and Findings of No Significant Impact includes actions that normally require an EA. The goal of the EA is to either determine and disclose the lack of significant impacts, or disclose
that the impacts are significant and recommend the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the highest level of Federal environmental review. FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1, Chapter 5, *Environmental Impact Statements and Records of Decision* includes actions that normally require an EIS. Based on available information and historical precedent, it was determined that an EA was the appropriate level of documentation required for the Proposed Actions.

The EA was prepared for the Proposed Actions at Paine Field and, based on federal thresholds of significance, no significant impacts were identified. The FAA and County have undertaken and completed the analysis reflected in the Draft and Final EA in accordance with all Federal rules, regulations, and orders. The EA meets the FAA’s NEPA orders and has been prepared to the standards required by FAA.

The FAA often delegates the preparation of EAs in accordance with FAA Orders 1050.1E and 5050.4B to the Airport Sponsor for projects involving Federal actions.

In the case of actions subject to EAs, FAA guidance enables the FAA to delegate responsibility for preparing the Draft EA to the Airport Sponsor. As such, Snohomish County’s role in this EA process is to prepare the environmental documentation (either the County itself or, in this case, through the use of consultants) for the proposed Federal actions at Paine Field and submit the Draft EA to the FAA. FAA typically provides funding assistance through the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) to Airport Sponsors to complete NEPA documentation. Ultimately, the FAA must accept and sign the EA for it to become a Federal document used in the decision making process.

The outcome of the NEPA review process has not been pre-determined. The FAA and County believe that the Draft and Final EAs provide an appropriate assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Actions both for existing conditions and under reasonably foreseeable conditions in accordance with all FAA Orders and guidance and the requirements of NEPA. The EA addresses the potential impacts of the Proposed Actions based on reasonably foreseeable conditions compared to the thresholds of significance outlined in the FAA Orders. The development of the EA and its conclusions take a critical look at the potential impacts that could occur if the Proposed Actions are implemented, as required under the NEPA.

If an EIS had been assumed, a different process would have been required. FAA Order 1050.1E requires that if an EIS is conducted, the responsibility cannot be delegated to the Sponsor and would have required FAA to undertake a different process. Unless the project is specifically called out as requiring an EIS (or known significant adverse effects are anticipated), the NEPA process often begins with the preparation of an EA. The EA is used to specifically identify if significant adverse impacts would result.
The scope of services generated by the Consultant requires it to assume assistance to the FAA in preparing the Draft and Final EA. At the conclusion of the EA process, the FAA then makes an environmental finding. The Consultant is often retained to assist the Sponsor with preparing material in support of FAA’s environmental finding. The EA Consultant envisioned that its role in assisting with the preparation of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Record of Decision (ROD) might be much different than that associated with the FAA finding that an EIS was needed. Therefore, the inclusion of the FONSI/ROD reference was to be clear that the level of effort would be commensurate with that type of FAA finding. This was not done to prejudice FAA’s determination, but rather to be clear about the costs, timeline, and scope for the services to be undertaken.

As to the preparation of the Draft EA and response to comments, the decision to approve the federal actions has not yet been made and cannot be made prior to an official environmental finding based on the Final EA. Following receipt of the Final EA from the Airport Sponsor, the responsible FAA official reviews the EA, the public comments, the expected impacts, the proposed mitigation, and then makes a decision. The FAA may decide that the anticipated environmental impacts are not significant or have been adequately mitigated where appropriate, and issue a FONSI/ROD.

If the outcome of an EA is that the project has unmitigated significant environmental effects, FAA then undertakes preparation of an EIS. FAA Order 5050.4B discusses these steps in paragraph 404. Figure 4-1 of Order 5050.4B captures this well in Steps 9 through 10 as:

- Step 9 Responsible FAA official determines significance of impacts
- Step 9a If impacts are NOT significant, responsible FAA official prepares and issues a FONSI, then proceeds to Step 10
- Step 9b If impacts ARE significant, responsible FAA official proceeds with an EIS (see chapter 5) rather than proceeding with Step 10.
- Step 10 Responsible FAA official proceeds with action, and if applicable, mitigation and monitoring.

A decision on whether an EIS is required has not yet been made.

Compliance with NEPA is not voluntary and it is the FAA’s obligation to ensure that the analysis is done correctly before accepting the EA as a Federal document.

The County’s EA contractor was selected after a competitive selection process not on a sole-source basis. Snohomish County, as the Airport Sponsor, retained a third-party, independent consultant to prepare the Draft EA. The third-party consultant was retained using the County procurement process. The process
also complied with FAA requirements which ensure a competitive selection is undertaken. Whether or not the Consultant has a prior working relationship with an airport sponsor is not relevant to the selection process. Rather, FAA’s grant assurances require that consultants be selected based on their qualifications to prepare the required studies, as was done in this case.

Barnard Dunkelberg & Company was selected. The list of preparers identifies the specific capabilities of each person that participated in preparing the EA. The firm Barnard Dunkelberg & Company has prepared over 60 major EAs and EISs for all sizes of airports across the nation, in addition to numerous categorical exclusions, environmental overlays, analyses, and reviews in association with master plans. Barnard Dunkelberg & Company has no financial interest in whether or not a project is constructed or initiated. Therefore, there is no potential for a conflict of interest.

2. INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In response to your comment “Save Our Communities believes that we have cogently illustrated a number of area’s in the DEA where the FAA simply ignored their own regulations, orders and the law.”:

The FAA have complied with all regulations, orders, laws, and requirements of the process. As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your comment that the “FAA engaged in coercion of Snohomish County to sway the vote of the County Council in favor of terminal construction…. The FAA pre-empted its own rules and, by forcing that vote, created the basis to start the EA. Details that demonstrate such coercion are provided herein. Although internal FAA communications demonstrate restraint and a commitment to a more fair process by most, there are others in the FAA seemingly committed to getting airlines into Paine Field no matter what the cost to the public.”:

Both the FAA and Snohomish County have followed all applicable rules and regulations in responding to the requests from the airlines to initiate commercial passenger service at Paine Field. The FAA has taken the appropriate actions related to the approval process for all Federal actions. The referenced communications reflect the parties seeking clarity concerning the requirements of the grant assurances, as well as the Federal agency steps and requirements in approving the Federal actions. Snohomish County has been and continues to negotiate in good faith with the air carriers in accordance with those requirements.
The FAA is not requiring, nor do they have the power to require, Snohomish County to change existing land use, existing zoning, or future planned land use to allow Paine Field to be served by the air carriers.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

**In response to your comment that** “The FAA’s overzealous drive includes the failure to hire a truly independent third-party contractor and the failure to direct that contractor to pursue a fair, unbiased and comprehensive analysis that genuinely meets the intent and purpose of NEPA. We ask that a new, qualified contractor be identified based on a proper bidding process:”

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

**In response to your comments that** “In support of the County’s freedom to act without coercion, we specifically request that the FAA demonstrate clearly to the County that discretionary funds are, in fact, not jeopardized by any action that the county takes, or does not take, with respect to funding a terminal, and that the County fully complies with FAA rules whether or not the County chooses to subsidize terminal construction.”

The FAA has not threatened or coerced the County concerning any aspect of the proposed project. Rather, the cited interactions between FAA officials and the County reflect advice offered to the County concerning the requirements of the FAA grant assurances. These interactions and advice are consistent with the citations in the attachment to the SOC letter.

**In response to your comments “Secondly, we believe the EA is fatally flawed based on its scope. Full details are provided herein. We ask that if actions proceed to change Paine Field from a Class IV to a Class I airport that an EIS is conducted with a scope based on full capacity of the airport and full impacts and mitigation accounted for. The FAA rules on economic nondiscrimination do not allow for local restrictions other than those that are safety related. That means no restrictions on the number and frequency of flights or the time of day they occur. The potential activity levels associated with changing the role of the airport are akin to looking at the maximum activity of a new commercial airport or new runway at SeaTac. The limited scope of the draft EA based on airline intentions hardly gets at this larger picture. SeaTac’s 3rd runway analysis was not based on a few daily flights so it is reasonable to expect opening another “new” scheduled service runway/airport in the region would get no less of an analysis. Additional specific requests for the EIS are included in the “Conclusions” section of our comments.”**
As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

3. PART I: FAA THREATS FORCED SNOHOMISH COUNTY TO PASS TERMINAL RESOLUTION

a. PAGE 8 QUESTIONS

In response to your questions, “(#1 Why did the FAA claim that $70 million of discretionary funding from the stimulus package was at risk? (#)2 – How did the FAA know this on January 7, 2009, before the new President was inaugurated and before Congress passed the stimulus bill?:"

As noted earlier, the FAA was advising the County of what might be at risk “IF” the County did not comply with its grant assurances. Such advice and examples of potential future funding are always part of public speculation, as was the case at the time of speculation of a stimulus bill that might be passed by the outgoing or incoming President.

In response to your question, “(#3 Are Boeing activities considered high in the national priority system?"

This question is unclear relative to the proposed project. Relative to the Proposed Actions at Paine Field, the FAA’s responsibility is to the Sponsor, after receipt of public and agency comments. On January 8, 2009, Boeing stated the following about the proposed project and its operation at Paine Field, “Boeing would not be negatively impacted by the addition of commercial air service to Paine Field.” Boeing also expressed concern in the letter that if Snohomish County were to refuse airline service at Paine Field, the FAA could withhold future airport improvement funding.

In response to your question, “(#4 How much of the discretionary funding given to Paine Field was for projects necessary to ensure Paine Field was in serviceable condition for Boeing and related activities?"

The FAA considers that all grants issued to the County for Paine Field are designed to keep the Airport open and “serviceable.” Such conditions are designed to aid all users of the Airport and are not specific to The Boeing Company.
In response to your question, “(#5 Is the FAA intending to circumvent its own AIP Handbook to fund a terminal beyond the limit of $200,000 per year?”

The FAA has not committed to any funding for the proposed terminal. Any grants would continue to be in accordance with all FAA requirements, including the AIP Handbook.

In response to your questions, “(#6 Did the FAA successfully suggest using entitlement funding from other airports to help fund the terminal? Did any airports that gave up their entitlement funding of $150,000 receive “any” discretionary funding after transferring their funds to Paine Field for terminal construction?”

Any discussions between the FAA and the County about potential funding of projects at Paine Field have occurred within the parameters of funding requirements of the FAA for such projects. No FAA grant funding/monies accepted by any other airport have been diverted or used by the County at Paine Field.

b. PAGE 11 QUESTIONS

In response to your question, “(#1 Why did the FAA violate the public trust, its own rules and possibly Federal law, while creating a high stakes, high-risk game involving the nation’s aerospace manufacturer?”:

The FAA has not threatened or coerced the County concerning any aspect of the proposed project. Further, the FAA does not believe that it violated the public trust, as the FAA has complied with all laws, regulations, orders, and requirements. Rather the cited interactions between FAA officials and the County reflect advice offered to the County concerning the requirements of the FAA grant assurances.

In response to your question, “(#2 Why is the FAA advocating so aggressively for Horizon & Allegiant Airlines?”:

The FAA has not advocated for any of Paine Field’s tenants. Rather the cited conversations reflect FAA advising the County of its grant assurance requirements. The County is not allowed to limit or restrict operations at the Airport, because it is a public use airport that has accepted federal funding, which requires certain assurances. In accepting federal funding, the County has agreed to comply with 39 specific grant assurances. These assurances require that the County, among other things, must “make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the Airport.” (Grant Assurance 22(a)).
The U.S. government deregulated the airline industry with Public Law 95-504, known as the “Airline Deregulation Act of 1978.” Since the deregulation of the airline industry in 1978, certificated U.S. air carriers are free to fly routes of their choice and serve airports of their choice. Airports that are composed of surplus federal property and/or receive federal funding are considered public use airports, and must be made available for use on a reasonable basis when a carrier seeks to start service. A consequence of that Act allowed airlines unrestricted choice as to which airports they serve. Other than to ensure safety, neither the Airport Sponsor (Snohomish County) nor the Federal government controls where, when, and how airlines provide service. Operators of public use airports, such as Paine Field, cannot deny access to an airline if the aircraft they propose to use can safely operate at that facility. Consistent with its grant assurance obligations, Snohomish County (as advised by the FAA) has been negotiating in good faith with Horizon Air and Allegiant Air to accommodate proposed passenger service at Paine Field.

In response to your question, “(#3) Why did the FAA break its own stated rules in the AIP Handbook and its stated position to SOC in its letter of December 5, 2005, that it does not force a role change?”:

As noted in the above response, the FAA’s advice has been in accordance with its regulatory requirements.

In response to your question, “(#4) Why did the FAA act pre-emptively when it had received no complaint by any airline?”:

When the FAA becomes aware that a grant assurance may be called into question, the agency often advises the airport sponsor of the issues associated with such conditions.

In response to your question, “(#5) In view of these findings, why should the EA not be negated? Alternatively, why should an EIS not be done?”

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#6) Has the County now received $70 million of stimulus funding that the FAA allegedly held in abeyance pending the County’s vote? What is the status of the $70 million of stimulus funding that the FAA said was in jeopardy?”
The FAA has not found the County to have violated any of its grant assurances, so no grant eligible projects have been denied. The FAA issued $11,002,765 in stimulus funding for the runway/taxiway rehabilitation to Snohomish County. The grant was closed when the project was completed.

4. PART II: EA SCOPING IS IMPROPER, CREATES FATAL FLAW: DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA

a. PAGE 13 QUESTIONS

In response to your question, “(#1) Is Ms. Suomi the official responsible for making the final decision on the EA disposition (FONSI or EIS)?”:

The approving official is the FAA Regional Administrator, Northwest Mountain Region, currently Ms. Kathryn Vernon.

In response to your question, “(#2) What are the criteria and procedures for requesting that an official be recused from a decision if they are found to be compromised in their ability to make an unbiased and objective decision?”:

Typically, if the FAA feels that the responsible federal official cannot objectively undertake its review, that review and approval responsibility is delegated upward. In this case, the responsible federal official has not been shown to have any bias or conflict of interest.

b. PAGE 14 QUESTIONS SECTION 1

In response to your question, “(#1) If the outcome is predetermined and public comments don’t matter because the project will continue in any event, then please answer how the intent, spirit and requirements of NEPA have been met?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#2) Does the FAA intend to assess and incorporate public comment or disregard the public entirely and issue a pre-determined FONSI?”:

FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1, paragraph 208.a states that:

NEPA and the CEQ regulations, in describing the public involvement process, require Federal agencies to: consider environmental information in their decision making process; obtain information from the public regarding environmental concerns
surrounding an agency’s Proposed Actions; fully assess and disclose potential environmental impacts resulting from the Proposed Actions and alternatives; and provide the public with this information and allow it to comment on these findings.

Public involvement for this EA provided more public hearings than is typical for a FAA EA. The FAA has undertaken an exhaustive review and consideration of the issues raised in the public comment period and this has had a large influence over the preparation of the Final EA. Thus, the FAA has not predetermined the outcome of the NEPA review process.

c. PAGE 14-15 QUESTIONS SECTION 2
In response to your question, “(#1 Why did the timeline schedules starting with the January 29, 2009 timeline end in a final step FONSI (Finding of No Significant Impact)?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#2 Is it true that an EA can result in moving to an EIS?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#3 Does the absence of the EIS option in the timeline as a possible result indicate a bias and predetermined thought process by those involved? If not, then why wasn’t the potential of an EIS option considered?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

d. PAGE 15-16 QUESTIONS SECTION 3
In response to your question, “(#1 Why was the EA based on minimal flight activity and passenger levels provided by Horizon and Allegiant? What were their forecasts based on?”:

The County is acting based on two specific airlines that have approached the County to begin operations at Paine Field. As a result, the EA reflects that purpose: the Proposed Actions is to allow passengers to fly between Paine Field and Portland, Spokane, and Las Vegas. The need for the Proposed Actions is to meet an unmet demand for commercial service within the area, as identified by Horizon and Allegiant Air. Thus, the County is evaluating the development of a new passenger terminal to satisfy this demand. The
FAA must review amendments to operations specifications and is required to either grant or deny the amendment to the operations specifications based on a number of criteria. The FAA will review the requests from both Horizon Air and Allegiant Air for the FAA to amend operations specifications to allow scheduled commercial air service to Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field to ensure that any amendments to the FAR Part 139 operating certificate meets all safety standards. Thus, the analysis relied on the level of activity that the airlines are proposing.

Activity levels beyond what is forecast are not considered reasonably foreseeable. Also, the potential addition of new carriers providing service at Paine Field beyond that of Horizon or Allegiant is not considered reasonably foreseeable and thus, if and when ripe for consideration, would require additional environmental review. See Sections 1a,b.

In response to your questions, “(#)2 If Horizon won’t commit to their own forecast then why should the County and the FAA? (#)3 Under what federal law or rule would Horizon, Allegiant, the County or the FAA be bound by these forecasts? What is the penalty for creating impacts beyond these minimal forecasts?:

There is no law that binds the carriers to a specific forecast estimate or the EA to the forecast environmental conditions. Rather, in accordance with CEQ guidance, NEPA documents are to be prepared based on reasonably foreseeable conditions. The FAA has determined the forecast used in the Draft EA and the Final EA to be the reasonably foreseeable future activity levels, as noted in above, based on the proposed project and the impacts as predicted with industry accepted techniques and tools. See Sections 1a,b.

In response to your question, “(#)4 Why didn’t the FAA comply with FAA Order 1050.1E CHG 1 requiring assessment to determine if the Proposed Actions or its alternatives have the potential to significantly affect the environment?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#)5 Why does the FAA and this EA fail to identify mitigation actions associated with the potential to significantly affect the environment?”:

The Draft and Final EA identify all of the impacts associated with the proposed project. The determination of the significance of the impacts was done in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1E. Mitigation is only required for actions where the project-related effects would exceed the federally-
defined thresholds of significance. As is noted, the Proposed Actions and their associated projects are not expected to produce impacts that would exceed the Federal thresholds and thus, compensatory mitigation is not required for the Proposed Actions at Paine Field.

Even though actions may not exceed defined thresholds, the County and airport users undertake best management practices (BMPs) to regularly reduce the effects of the Airport on the surrounding community, such as noise abatement measures and emission reduction actions. These actions are funded by the County or the tenants. These are referred to as BMPs as they are not mandated because of an exceedance of a federal threshold.

For traffic mitigation, the only required mitigation identified in the EA is traffic mitigation fees, which are a local requirement. Implementation of the Proposed Actions and associated projects will require contributing local mitigation fees to the two WSDOT intersections to aid in funding improvements to the I-5/128th Street SW interchange, per the interlocal agreement and WSDOT comments. Traffic mitigation fee payments to the WSDOT and the City of Mukilteo would mitigate the project’s impacts to the intersection of SR-525 at 84th Avenue NE by allowing the signal timing of the intersection to be optimized, which is anticipated to allow the intersection to operate at an acceptable level of service.

Under the Washington State Growth Management Act, state and local communities can impose impact fees based on new surface traffic that a project is expected to generate. Appendix F, Traffic Impact Analysis, notes that impact fees would be required based on the passengers that would be served at the Airport and their use of area roadways and local intersections. The traffic impact fees that would be paid by the Airport to Snohomish County, WSDOT, and the City of Mukilteo for the Proposed Actions have been calculated at approximately $333,262.85. See Chapter D, Environmental Consequences, Page D.36 of the revised EA.

In response to your question “(#6 What is the FAA's definition of "potential")?:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1a.

In response your question, “(#7 Does the FAA intend to enforce economic non-discrimination requirements to ensure unconstrained scheduled commercial air service if the Operating Certificate is changed from Class IV to a Class I Certificate)”: The FAA is required to implement and enforce all federal regulations.
As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your question, “(7)7a If Allegiant and Horizon initiate commercial air service at Paine Field, will the FAA allow the County to limit their activity to 10 flights a day for Horizon and 10 flights a week for Allegiant?“:

The County is not allowed to limit or restrict operations at the Airport because it is a public use airport that has accepted federal funding, which requires certain assurances. In accepting federal funding, the County has agreed to comply with 39 specific grant assurances. These assurances require that the County, among other things, must “make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the Airport.” (Grant Assurance 22(a)).

The U.S. government deregulated the airline industry with Public Law 95-504, known as the “Airline Deregulation Act of 1978.” Since the deregulation of the airline industry in 1978, certificated U.S. air carriers are free to fly routes of their choice and serve airports of their choice. Airports that are composed of surplus federal property and/or receive federal funding are considered public use airports, and must be made available for use on a reasonable basis when a carrier seeks to start service. A consequence of that Act allowed airlines unrestricted choice as to which airports they serve. Other than to ensure safety, neither the Airport Sponsor (Snohomish County) nor the Federal government controls where, when, and how airlines provide service. Operators of public use airports, such as Paine Field, cannot deny access to an airline if the aircraft they propose to use can safely operate at that facility.

In response to your question, “(7)7b Will the FAA allow the County to place any limit on Allegiant and Horizon flights and passenger throughput so long as such activity complies with safety and security operations?“:

The FAA will not allow the County to place any limits on activity that is conducted in accordance with Federal laws and regulations and which meets all safety and security mandates. Federal actions requiring future environmental review are included in Section 1a.

In response to your question, “(7)7c If the FAA does not allow restrictions, then how does the FAA reconcile using a limited scope of assessment?“:
As noted, the EA was prepared in accordance with all CEQ and FAA requirements concerning the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The County is not allowed to limit or restrict operations at the Airport, because it is a public use airport that has accepted federal funding, which requires certain assurances. In accepting federal funding, the County has agreed to comply with 39 specific grant assurances. These assurances require that the County, among other things, must “make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the Airport.” (Grant Assurance 22(a)). Thus, activity levels beyond that identified in the Draft and Final EA are not reasonably foreseeable, as defined by FAA guidance. See above response and Sections 1a, b.

In response to your comment, “(#8) Boeing has announced a three to five hour flight next week and the aircraft is not certified and therefore considered by FAA to be an experimental plane. If Horizon and Allegiant were operating scheduled commercial air service at Paine Field would the FAA allow the Boeing flight and airfield closure to take priority over scheduled Horizon and Allegiant flights? If not, then why aren't potential impacts to Boeing assessed?“:

According to a Boeing Company letter sent to County officials on January 8, 2009, “Boeing would not be negatively impacted by the addition of commercial air service to Paine Field.” As a result, since no adverse effects were anticipated, the EA did not address any effects. Boeing also expressed concern in the letter that if Snohomish County were to refuse airline service at Paine Field, the FAA could withhold future airport improvement funding.

In response to your question, “(#9) Why wasn't the EA based on independently assessing higher potential activity levels that would obviously produce greater impacts?“:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b.

In response to your question, “(#10) Why didn't the FAA start with an EIS?“:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.
e. PAGE 17 QUESTIONS

In response to your question, “(#1) Why is the FAA assisting the airlines at Paine Field so aggressively that the FAA has engaged in coercion, conflicts of interest, manipulating federal subsidies, and irresponsibly minimizing the scope of the EA?”:

The FAA has met its required duties to consider the environmental effects of the proposed project per NEPA. The FAA has not acted in any manner to coerce the County, nor have there been any conflicts of interest. The Draft and Final EA were prepared in a responsible fashion meeting all CEQ and NEPA requirements.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#2) How does this internal conflict measure up to the objectivity expected and required by FAA policy, FAA orders and NEPA?”:

The FAA has met its required duties to consider the environmental effects of the proposed project per NEPA. The FAA has not acted in any manner to coerce the County, nor have there been any conflicts of interest. The Draft and Final EA were prepared in a responsible fashion meeting all CEQ and NEPA requirements.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#3) How could any reasonable person including elected officials, senior FAA or DOT officials, or a judge not conclude that this process and predetermined outcome focus summarily fails the required objectivity litmus test?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#4) What is the FAA’s plan to correct these issues?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.
f. PAGE 18 QUESTIONS

In response to your question, “(#1) Why shouldn’t an EIS be based on the maximum potential capacity of Paine Field after being certified as a Class I airport?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EAs were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your question, “(#2) Internal FAA communications regarding scope initially included assessment of the full capacity of the terminal(s), so why was the assessment criteria removed from the scope?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EAs were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b.

In response to your question, “(#3) Why should a new EIS be based on a 20-year forecast? A 30-year forecast?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EAs were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b.

In response to your question, “(#4) Why was this EA referenced to an air emission conformity report with only a 5-year forecast?”:

Before a federal agency can approve an action, it must first be shown to conform to the State Implementation Plan if the project is located in a non-attainment or maintenance area. The Clean Air Act General Conformity regulation requires the consideration of three conditions in that conformity applicability analysis: 1) year of attainment (for the Puget Sound Region 2016); 2) peak year of project-related emissions; and 3) any milestone years. Thus, year 2016, which reflected 5 years from the base year in the Draft EA was considered. In preparing the Final EA, since the project has not been implemented, the airline forecast could be extended to 2018. However, in accordance with the conformity regulations 2016 must still have been considered.

The FAA and Snohomish County met several times with the Puget Sound Clear Air Agency concerning the proposed project. The purpose of these meetings was to brief the agency on the proposed project, solicit input concerning the analysis to be undertaken, and to come to a common understanding of the effects of the proposed project. In general Puget Sound Clean Air Agency concurred with the approach and findings in the Final EA. Coordination with Puget Sound Clean Air Agency is included in Appendix T.
In response to your question, “(#5 What is the legal or rule-based precedent requiring the EA scope to match timelines with an air emissions conformity report? If this was a project in 2014, would the timeline be matched to the SIP air emission conformity report of a scant one-year later?”:

As noted in the preceding response, the year 2016 is a requirement of the General Conformity applicability analysis since it represents the year of attainment for the Central Puget Sound Region.

g. PAGE 19 QUESTIONS SECTION 1
In response to your question, “(#1 How does the FAA respond to this conflict?”:

No conflict exists, as the Draft and Final EA meet all CEQ and FAA requirements.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your comment, “(#2 Shouldn’t the FAA address this conflict with a properly scoped EIS based on the maximum capacity of the airport? If not, why not?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

h. PAGE 19 QUESTIONS SECTION 2
In response to your question, “(#1 If the FAA allows for a "role change" for Paine Field then why not consider the impacts from "unconstrained activity" which FAA regulations require?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1b,c.

In response to your question, “(#2 Why does FAA’s Carol Suomi state that this is not a role change for the airport?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1b,c.
In response to your question, “(#3 How is the use of short-term minimal activity levels as the scope of activity for the EA compatible within the purpose, spirit and intent of NEPA?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1b,c.

i. PAGE 19 QUESTIONS SECTION 3
In response to your question, “(#1 Please comment on the above referenced items. Shouldn't the FAA order an EIS based on full potential impacts?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1b,c.

In response to your question, “(#2 Why is the FAA promoting an EA based on the airline applicant's activity levels, when the FAA knows those levels will easily be exceeded over a relatively short time?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1b,c.

In response to your question, “(#3 Was there any effort to design the scope in this EA to create conclusions that have de minimus impacts?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1b,c.

j. PAGE 20 QUESTIONS
In response to your question, “(#1 Why didn't the FAA invite interested governmental and non-governmental agencies to participate in the scoping process for this EA?”:

In response to comments regarding the absence of a scoping process, according to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Orders 1050.1E and 5050.4B, scoping is not required for Environmental Assessments (EAs). However, EA preparers should coordinate with resource agencies, industry groups, and the affected community as practicable and necessary to ensure the EA addresses those issues of greatest public concern. Documentation of coordination efforts for the EA can be found in Appendix B. The EA addresses the issues of greatest concern including aircraft noise, surface transportation, and air quality.
Because the primary effects of the project were expected to be surface traffic related, a scoping meeting was held with Snohomish County staff on September 17, 2009, and a scoping memorandum was received from WSDOT. Scoping discussions were held with City of Everett staff and a scoping request was made to the City of Mukilteo, but a response from the City of Mukilteo was never received. These scoping discussions were performed to, in part, determine the scope of surface traffic analysis required for the project.

_In response to your question, “(#2) Why didn’t the FAA and County Airport share documents and rationale related to making scope decisions?”:_

See prior response.

**k. PAGE 21 QUESTIONS**

_In response to your question, “(#1) Why did the FAA disregard FAA Order 5050.4B with regard to involving the public in EA preparation?”:_

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

_In response to your question, “(#2) How did the FAA conclude it could ensure the EA addressed those issues of greatest public concern without fully involving the public?”:_

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

**I. PAGE 22 QUESTIONS**

_In response to your question, “(#1) Did the FAA and/or Snohomish County perform a competitive bidding process to identify the consultant? If so, please provide documentation that demonstrates a fair, objective process was used. If not, why not?”:_

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

_In response to your question, “(#2) Why was the consultant chosen on a sole-source basis?”:_

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.
In response to your comment, “(#3) Please show how the procurement process for the EAs consultant followed the FAA’s Acquisition Management Policy”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#4) Has the Responsible Official prepared a disclosure statement specifying that the contractor has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project? (40 CFR 1506.5(c)), (FAA 1050.1E section 204b[1])”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#5) Why has the FAA and/or Snohomish County used the same consultant repeatedly for projects involving the airport over the past several years?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#6) Doesn’t this present a conflict of interest since the consultant has clearly lost their objectivity?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

m. PAGE 23 QUESTIONS
In response to your question, “(#1) How does the FAA reconcile public involvement with the release of the EA just prior to the Christmas holiday season?”:

The Draft EA was released as soon as it was complete and was not timed to occur during the holidays. Originally two hearings were scheduled for January 4th and 5th. Some early comments requested that additional public hearings be added not so close to the holidays, allowing people an opportunity to review the document and be available. Both the FAA and the County were responsive to these comments, and adjustments in scheduling and access were made. A third hearing was added on January 21, 2010 to enable those people who could not attend the first hearing dates (January 4th and 5th) to attend a hearing.
In addition to requests regarding an additional hearing date, requests were made to extend the comment period. The initial end of the comment period was January 15, 2010. This comment period was initially extended to January 29, 2010. Then, when a third hearing date was added, the comment period was extended to February 5, 2010. Although the FAA generally only has one public hearing on an EA, the County felt that additional hearings were reasonable due to the public interest in the Proposed Actions.

_In response to your question, “(#2) Why were EA hearings scheduled for the first two working days in the New Year? How does this represent good faith efforts to obtain public input?”:_

See response above.

_In response to your question, “(#3) Demonstrate how the EA process complied with public involvement policy and rules as set forth in FAA Order 1050.1E CHG 1, NEPA and CEQ?”:_

FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1, paragraph 208.a states that:

NEPA and the CEQ regulations, in describing the public involvement process, require Federal agencies to: consider environmental information in their decision making process; obtain information from the public regarding environmental concerns surrounding an agency’s Proposed Actions; fully assess and disclose potential environmental impacts resulting from the Proposed Actions and alternatives; and provide the public with this information and allow it to comment on these findings.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

5. **PART III: COMMENTS ON IMPACTS THAT THE EA FAILED TO ADDRESS**

a. **PAGE 24 QUESTIONS SECTION 1**

_In response to your question, “(#1) What are the qualifications of the company producing the Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA)?”:_

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.
In response to your question, “(#2 Will those qualifications and the standards and methodology they apply be made public?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#3 In particular, where have the employed methodology and standards been previously applied and how successful were they in accurately predicting the environmental impacts that resulted?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your comment, “(#4 Given the current lack of information about the EA’s process, why shouldn’t this EA be invalidated in favor of an EIS? If we cannot assess the assumptions and methodology, then we cannot assess the output. For this reason alone, the EA fails and an EIS should be done.”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

b. PAGE 24 QUESTIONS SECTION 2
In response to your question, “(#1 Doesn’t the public deserve, and doesn’t NEPA demand, an assessment of the reasonable worst case associated with all the involved federal actions including changing the airport role to allow for scheduled service?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1a,b,c.

In response to your comment, “(#2 Based on the flaws identified in the EA, shouldn’t an Environmental Impact Statement be conducted that properly addresses the full impacts, items that must be mitigated, and costs to mitigate?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.
c. PAGE 25 QUESTIONS

In response to your question, “(#1) Why hasn't more analysis and assessment been done to properly develop a baseline for air, ground, water, traffic and other environmental impacts?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

In response to your question, “(#2) Wouldn't the "no action" alternative be the more likely alternative if baseline comparisons were properly compared to the action alternatives, especially when compared against unconstrained flight activity with two-terminal capacity at Paine Field?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c and Section 5h, question #1.

In response to your question, “(#3) Why is purpose and need not defined? How can the consultant use undefined purpose and need as a basis for eliminating alternatives?”:

The purpose and need for the project is documented in Chapter A of the Draft and Final EA.

d. PAGE 27-28 QUESTIONS

In response to your question, “(#1) Why doesn't the EA include the option of the maximum activity levels to fully account for all air emissions?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b.

In response to your question, “(#2) Why did the EA skip over air toxins described by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency?”:

The Desk Reference that accompanies FAA Order 5050.4B states:

Airport-related hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). EPA has identified roughly 25 individual HAPs that are associated with emissions from aircraft and airport ground service equipment (GSE). However, EPA does not specify aircraft and airports in the definitions and categories of HAP sources in Section 112 of the CAA (“Hazardous Air Pollutants”). Nor has EPA established standards for HAPs. When compared with existing urban backgrounds, air quality monitoring studies near several large airports have not shown that increased HAP levels occur near those facilities. In fact, only a small percentage of an urban area’s overall air pollution is attributable to airport emissions. Nevertheless, due to the emission levels of unburned
hydrocarbons and particulates near airports, EPA’s National Air Toxic Program notes that airports are complex facilities that emit HAPs. Therefore, to comply with NEPA’s disclosure requirements, FAA reports HAPs emissions in its environmental documents for information purposes only. FAA does not use that information to assess human health risks. The responsible FAA official should consider whether 40 CFR Section 1502.22, which addresses incomplete and unavailable information, applies to HAPS emissions for major airport development projects.

(1) For major projects normally requiring an EIS (e.g., new airport, new runway, major runway extension), the responsible FAA official should decide, in consultation with Federal, State, and local air quality agencies whether it is appropriate to conduct a HAPs emission inventory. This is especially so when the action would occur in areas that are classified as nonattainment or maintenance for O3 or particulate matter (PM).

(2) As needed, consult APP-400 to determine the HAPs FAA will analyze the methodology FAA will use to conduct that analysis.

In 2003, the PSCAA completed a toxics evaluation for the Puget Sound region. Relative to airports, the following was concluded:

Emissions from the two airports (SeaTac and Boeing field) could impact the SeaTac and Georgetown monitors. However, the results do not reflect significantly higher pollutant levels at these locations when compared with other sites. In fact, SeaTac potential risks appear slightly lower than Beacon Hill. It is possible that the airport emissions do not significantly impact the monitors because the emissions are diluted over the area. It is also possible that the pollutants of concern at the airport are not those included in the monitoring study.

Because of this information, the FAA did not feel that the evaluation of HAPS would be warranted.

The FAA and Snohomish County met several times with the Puget Sound Clear Air Agency concerning the proposed project. The purpose of these meetings was to brief the agency on the proposed project, solicit input concerning the analysis to be undertaken, and to come to a common understanding of the effects of the proposed project. In general, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency concurred with the approach and findings in the Final EA.
In response to your comment, “(#3) There needs to be a rigorous analysis of PM 2.5 since the County is on the brink of falling out of attainment on this priority pollutant. Will a new EIS be done to include such rigorous analysis?”:

The evaluation of air quality included in the Draft and Final EA address the project-related emissions of PM2.5. As is noted in the EA, no significant adverse air quality impacts are expected and thus, an EIS is not required.

In response to your question, “(#4) Why did the EA not include a rigorous assessment of CO2 emissions given EPA’s recent announcement and pending rules and legislation at the state level?”:

In response to these comments and in close coordination with the Puget Sound Clear Air Agency, the FAA included the following discussion in the Final EA:

In January 2012, the FAA issued FAA Order 1050.1E< Change 1 Guidance Memo #3 titled "Considering Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA): Interim Guidance". ¹ This section addresses the effects of the Proposed Actions at Paine Field in accordance with the FAA guidance.

Of growing concern is the impact of proposed projects on climate change. Greenhouse gases are those that trap heat in the earth's atmosphere. Both naturally occurring and anthropogenic (man-made) greenhouse gases include water vapor (H₂O), carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and ozone (O₃).²³

Research has shown that there is a direct link between fuel combustion and greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, sources that require fuel or power at an airport are the primary sources that would generate greenhouse gases. Aircraft are probably the most often cited air pollutant source, but they produce the same types of emissions as cars. Aircraft jet engines, like many other vehicle engines, produce CO₂, water vapor, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, oxides of sulfur, unburned or partially combusted hydrocarbons [also known as volatile organic compounds (VOCs)], particulates, and other trace compounds.

² All greenhouse gas inventories measure carbon dioxide emissions, but beyond carbon dioxide different inventories include different greenhouse gases (GHGs).
³ Several classes of halogenated substances that contain fluorine, chlorine, or bromine are also greenhouse gases, but they are, for the most part, solely a product of industrial activities. For example, chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) are halocarbons that contain chlorine, while halocarbons that contain bromine are referred to as bromofluorocarbons (i.e., halons) or sulfur (sulfur hexafluoride: SF₆).
According to most international reviews, aviation emissions comprise a small but potentially important percentage of human-made greenhouse gases and other emissions that contribute to global warming. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) estimates that global aircraft emissions account for about 3.5% of the total quantity of greenhouse gas from human activities. In terms of relative U.S. contribution, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) reports that aviation accounts “for about 3% of total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from human sources” compared with other industrial sources, including the remainder of the transportation sector (23%) and industry (41%). The 2012 USEPA nationwide inventory of greenhouse gas emissions, notes that aviation-related emissions represented about 2.1% of emissions. That report also found “Across all categories of aviation, CO2 emissions decreased by 20.6 percent (36.9 Tg) between 1990 and 2010.”

The scientific community is developing areas of further study to enable them to more precisely estimate aviation’s effects on the global atmosphere. The FAA is currently leading and participating in several efforts intended to clarify the role that commercial aviation plays in greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. The most comprehensive and multi-year program geared towards quantifying climate change effects of aviation is the Aviation Climate Change Research Initiative (ACCRI) funded by FAA and NASA. ACCRI will reduce key scientific uncertainties in quantifying aviation-related climate impacts and provide timely scientific input to inform policy-making decisions. FAA also funds Project 12 of the Partnership for Air Transportation Noise & Emissions Reduction (PARTNER) Center of Excellence research initiative to quantify the effects of aircraft exhaust and contrails on global and U.S. climate and atmospheric composition.

Aviation activity levels and airport development projects have the potential to both affect climate change and be affected by climate change. Changes to generation and/or use of natural resources such as air quality and energy supply can potentially affect climate change (e.g., by increasing the amount of greenhouse gases emitted), but projects can also be impacted by climate change (e.g., rising sea levels). At this point, there is no consistent scientific indication of when and how the climate will change.

---

Research has shown that there is a direct link between fuel combustion and greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, sources that require power/fuel at an airport are the primary sources that would generate greenhouse gases. Aircraft are probably the most often cited air pollutant source, but they produce the same types of emissions as cars. Based on FAA data, operations activity at Snohomish County Airport, relative to aviation throughout the United States, represents less than 1% of U.S. aviation activity. Therefore, assuming that greenhouse gases occur in proportion to the level of activity, greenhouse gas emissions associated with existing and future aviation activity at the Airport would be expected to represent less than 0.03% of U.S.-based greenhouse gases. Therefore, emissions of greenhouse gases from this project are not expected to be significant.

As discussed above, changes to resource categories such as air quality and natural resources and energy supply can potentially affect climate change (e.g., by increasing the amount of greenhouse gases emitted), but projects can also be impacted by climate change (e.g., rising sea levels). At this point, there is no consistent scientific indication of when and how the climate will change.

The EA adequately addresses FAA guidance and requirements for Air Quality and Climate Change. There is no FAA requirement for GHG quantitative evaluation. At this time a full airport and project-related greenhouse gas inventory has not been prepared. However, parts of the information are available, and others will be generated when the County prepares its Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) documentation. The following data is available:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>Project-Related Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>17,068</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Service Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Access Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17,068</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2013</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>23,527</td>
<td>25,159</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Service Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Access Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23,527</td>
<td>26,735</td>
<td>3,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>23,424</td>
<td>27,276</td>
<td>3,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Service Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Access Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23,424</td>
<td>24,696</td>
<td>5,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>23,432</td>
<td>27,283</td>
<td>3,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Service Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Access Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>2,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23,432</td>
<td>29,449</td>
<td>6,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** BridgeNet Consulting Services, July 2012 Using EDMS 5.1.3; Surface emissions: Synergy Consultants, July 2012. Note that EDMS is not able to quantify CO2 emissions from GSE and CO2 emissions for ground access vehicles assumes no diverted trips. GAV calculated assuming average MPG of 22.5 and 19.56 lbs of CO2 per gallon fuel. * Project-related emissions for 2013 are conservative and assume a full year of operations in addition to construction of the proposed terminal.

*In response to your question, “(#5) How does the EA assess health impacts without an acceptable air emissions analysis to establish a baseline?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.
In response to your question, “(#6) Given the foreseeable expansion of activity based on the proposed federal actions including the desired and expressed growth of the two applicant airlines, how can an air emissions assessment be accepted for a few flights looking no more than five years out?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your comments, “(#7) Why do other EAs and EIS's on major projects or proposals have to look out farther than five years? For example, a 2008 Mead & Hunt EA, conducted prior to the construction of an Air Traffic Control Tower for University Park Airport in State College, PA included a 20 year table that looked back 4 years (to 2004) and projected out to 2020. The Puget Sound Regional Council is finalizing a 2040 plan, the FAA produces 20 year forecasts, and NEPA compliance efforts around the country including airport projects provide precedent for comprehensive scopes based on potential impacts rather than minimal assessments.”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your question, “(#8) What rules prevent looking out 20 years at the potential activity level of the proposed federal actions in order to comply with NEPA by identifying potential significant impacts and associated mitigation?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your question, “(#9) How does the limited scope and timeline compare with other air emissions assessments of major proposed projects or federal actions requiring NEPA compliance?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

Based on the reasonably foreseeable conditions, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant adverse effects. The Clean Air Act General Conformity also requires the consideration of reasonably foreseeable conditions. Included in the Conformity Applicability Analysis is the consideration of three specific conditions: 1) year of attainment (for the Puget Sound Region 2016); 2) peak year of project-related emissions; and 3) any milestone years. Thus, year 2016 was considered in the Conformity applicability analysis in both the Draft and Final EA.
In response to your question, “(#10 With an expanded scope, why would the FAA oppose a more thorough air National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) assessment and EIS?”:

In response to comments regarding the air quality analysis, in preparing the approach to the air quality analysis, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order 1050.1E, and Order 5050.B were used. In addition, a coordinating meeting was conducted with the PSCAA to review the proposed approach to evaluating air emissions. Based on FAA guidance and the concurrence of PSCAA, an emissions inventory was prepared. As that inventory notes, the proposed project would result in emissions which, under the General Conformity Regulations, are considered de-minimis and therefore is considered under the NEPA to have no significant impacts. These results are described in pages D.2 through D.9 of the Draft EA. Therefore, conducting the more costly dispersion analysis was not required and was determined not to be necessary to the environmental evaluation.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

e. PAGE 32-33 QUESTIONS SECTION 1
In response to your question, “(#1 Why did the consultant fail to address the MRD and subsequent 33 years of residential development surrounding Paine Field?”:

The May 16, 2007 Executive Summary of the Report on the Mediated Role Determination for Paine Field states the following:

In 1978 at the request of Snohomish County, the University of Washington, Office of Environmental Mediation convened a panel to recommend the future role of Paine Field. The “mediated role determination” (MRD) panel suggested that general aviation and commercial aeronautical work (such as Boeing’s Everett plant) be the dominant uses of Paine Field. The MRD Panel recommended encouraging those uses, and discouraged any uses incompatible with community harmony. The existing airport uses that would be discouraged included supplemental/charter air passenger service, large transport crew training operations, air cargo aviation, and military aviation.

In late 1978 and early 1979, the Snohomish County Planning Commission adopted the recommendations and forwarded them to the County Commissioners who adopted the recommendations with few changes. These two documents are colloquially known as the “MRD Document.”
The community and aviation business changed dramatically in the past quarter century. Populations boomed. Aeronautical technologies improved, with larger jets becoming quieter. Environmental and land use and planning laws became ever more stringent. The form of County government changed from a commission system (in which the commissioners handle both the legislative and executive functions of government) to an executive/council form of government (in which the executive leads, provides policy direction, and operates the government while an elected council decides overarching policy issues and approves the budget). The 1980s saw many disagreements around the Country between local jurisdictions and the aviation industry over noise and other impacts from a burgeoning scheduled passenger air service industry. Those disagreements led the federal government to pre-empt local attempts to control the type, frequency, and noise of scheduled passenger air service with the passage of the Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA) of 1990 (49 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.). Among the requirements of ANCA was the establishment of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 161 Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions. Since the passage of FAR Part 161, only one airport has met the requirements to enable a restriction on the types of aircraft operating at that airport.

After booming through the 1990s, the economy saw a downturn with the dawn of the 21st century. The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City exacerbated the economic problems. Boeing laid off thousands. The County Council and then County Executive Bob Drewel formed a task force to develop methods of stimulating the local economy. The task force produced an economic stimulus action plan in 2002.

The 2002 action plan called for exploration of regional air service and for specific steps to prepare for regional air service at Paine Field. This plan concerned the communities of south Snohomish County. Many south County residents believed the MRD Document forbade scheduled passenger air service and were concerned that scheduled passenger air service would disrupt and diminish the quality of life that attracted them to the area.

In 2005, County Executive Aaron Reardon formed an advisory panel of 12 community members to review and update the role of Paine Field defined by the Snohomish County Commissioners in 1978, and charged the community panel to update the MRD Document.

The community panel held its first meeting in November 2005 and heard from numerous experts on such diverse topics as land use, noise, airport operations, and airport law.

Some community panel members viewed the MRD Document as an important, fundamental social contract between the County government and the citizens and south County cities. Some
of these community panel members would like to see the MRD Document rewritten to more clearly state a dislike for scheduled passenger air service.

Other community panel members believed the MRD Document has been overtaken by events and is no longer relevant. They believe the MRD Document is subsumed within Comprehensive Plans mandated by the State’s Growth Management Act and the County’s Airport Master Plan. They say the MRD Document informed the decisions made in the Comprehensive and Master Plans, and the Plans now describe the appropriate role of Paine Field.

These community panel members would like to see scheduled passenger air service at Paine Field and felt such service would drive economic development and provide a substantial convenience to users. This perspective was countered by other community panel members who vehemently disagreed, arguing no evidence supported the claim that scheduled passenger air service would stimulate economic development and claiming that scheduled passenger air service would devalue property and diminish a cherished quality of life.

The panel completed its charge in December 2006. The community panel substantially agreed on how to update the language, though some felt no need to update the MRD Document at all. For example, the community panel generally agreed that references to military aircraft operations could be deleted because Paine Field no longer hosts a military aviation unit.

The efforts of the community panel identified three primary, fundamental factors influencing the future role of the Snohomish County Airport (Paine Field):

1. Current federal law does not allow the County to prohibit or limit scheduled passenger air service.
2. Current federal law does not require the County to encourage or subsidize scheduled passenger air service.
3. The County can and should insist that an airline pay its own way and mitigate its impacts.

The MRD is advisory in nature. Federal law does not allow the County to prohibit or limit scheduled passenger air service.
In response to your comment, “(#2) The scope of the EA fails to address the proposed new airline activity out of Paine Field. How would airline activity, based on Paine Field’s full capacity as allowed under federal law, be compatible with the land use policies of Snohomish County and its surrounding cities over the past 33 years?“:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your question, “(#3) What impacts would this have?“:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your question, “(#4) How would such impacts be mitigated for the home-owners, schools, churches, hospitals and other related facilities that both surround Paine Field and are under the proposed flight paths of the airport at full capacity?“:

Mitigation is only required for actions where the project-related effects would exceed the federally defined thresholds of significance. As is noted, the Proposed Actions and their associated projects are not expected to produce impacts that would exceed the Federal thresholds and thus, compensatory mitigation is not required for the Proposed Actions at Paine Field.

Even though actions may not exceed defined thresholds, the County and airport users undertake best management practices (BMPs) to regularly reduce the effects of the Airport on the surrounding community, such as noise abatement measures and emission reduction actions. These actions are funded by the County or the tenants. These are referred to as BMPs as they are not mandated because of an exceedance of a federal threshold.

For traffic mitigation, the only required mitigation identified in the EA is traffic mitigation fees, which are a local requirement. Implementation of the Proposed Actions and associated projects will require contributing local mitigation fees to the two WSDOT intersections to aid in funding improvements to the I-5/128th Street SW interchange, per the interlocal agreement and WSDOT comments. Traffic mitigation fee payments to the WSDOT and the City of Mukilteo would mitigate the project’s impacts to the intersection of SR-525 at 84th Avenue NE by allowing the signal timing of the intersection to be optimized, which is anticipated to allow the intersection to operate at an acceptable level of service.
Under the Washington State Growth Management Act, state and local communities can impose impact fees based on new surface traffic that a project is expected to generate. Appendix F, Traffic Impact Analysis, notes that impact fees would be required based on the passengers that would be served at the Airport and their use of area roadways and local intersections. The traffic impact fees that would be paid by the Airport to Snohomish County, WSDOT, and the City of Mukilteo for the Proposed Actions have been calculated at approximately $333,262.85.

In response to your question, “(#5) How does the FAA plan to pay for the substantial mitigation costs needed for the affected communities throughout Snohomish County?”:

As noted other than local traffic mitigation, no other mitigation is needed. The airlines using the Airport would be charged fees that would enable the County to pay these impact fees.

f. PAGE 33 QUESTIONS SECTION 2
In response to your question, “(#1) How would the 65 DNL noise contours change based on unconstrained maximum capacity at Paine Field?”:

As shown in Figure C.4 of the EA, most land use surrounding the Airport is and will remain industrial and commercial. These types of land uses are generally considered compatible with airports. Adjacent to the industrial and commercial land use which surround the Airport, residential uses exist today and are planned to continue developing within the vicinity of the Airport. The comprehensive plans of the City of Everett, the City of Mukilteo, and Snohomish County’s 2025 Comprehensive Plan were reviewed as part of the EA. As stated in the EA, because airports are designated as essential public facilities, the implementation of both land use and development controls is vested within the authority of local city, county, or state governments and these governments are responsible for ensuring compatible land use and appropriate zoning requirements around airports. Discussion of existing land uses, comprehensive plans and future land uses are included on Page C.9 of Chapter C, Affected Environment.

The EA evaluates existing and future aircraft noise for both the No Action and the Proposed Actions scenarios in significant detail. The EA used the FAA’s Integrated Noise Model (INM), version 7.0a to develop the 65 DNL noise contours and evaluate noise and land use impacts which is consistent with the FAA FAR part 150 Land Use Guidelines. Nighttime operations are included in the noise analysis as required by the FAA. Operational levels were derived from the aviation demand forecasts discussed in Section 1b of this letter. The forecast represents activity levels and type that are reasonably foreseeable. Including speculative activity levels in the noise analysis is not appropriate.
Under both the No Action and the Preferred Alternatives, small portions of the 65 DNL contour extends off the Airport over Airport Road to the east, over Boeing Company property to the northeast, over SR 525 and commercial land uses south and southwest of the Airport. The noise analysis determined that the No Action and the Preferred Alternative would have no significant impacts on land use surrounding Paine Field. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would not result in the disruption of any communities, the relocation of residences or businesses, or result in any changes to existing or planned land uses. The Noise analysis is included on Page D.21 of Chapter D, Environmental Consequences of the Draft EA.

Based on the reasonably foreseeable conditions, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant adverse effects. As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b.

In response to your question, “(##)2 How would they change based on frequent nighttime flights?”:

See prior response

In response to your question, “(##)3 How would such noise be mitigated?”:

As is noted in prior responses, the proposed project is not expected to produce significant adverse impacts, and thus mitigation other than the previously mentioned local surface traffic impact fees is not expected.

In response to your question, “(##)4 How will the FAA, the County or the airlines pay for such mitigation?”:

The airlines using the airport would be charged fees that would enable the County to pay the anticipated traffic impact fees. No mitigation is anticipated for noise.

g. PAGE 34 QUESTIONS
In response to your question, “(##)1 How did the EA address these important impacts?”:

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations directs federal agencies to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its actions on minority populations and low-income populations. Environmental Justice analysis considers the potential of Federal actions to cause disproportionate and adverse effects on low-income or minority populations.
This analysis ensures no low-income or minority population bears a disproportionate burden of effects resulting from Federal actions. To help describe environmental justice, the FAA Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions incorporates the following definition from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Office of Environmental Justice:

“The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental effects resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of Federal, State, local, and tribal programs and policies.”

The EA completed Environmental Justice analysis in accordance with FAA guidance. U.S. Census data and Census block maps were reviewed and determined that no known special population groups are located within the project area. Four U.S. Census Designated Places were identified within the vicinity of the Airport and they include the Paine Field-Lake Stickney CDP, the Picnic Point-North Lynwood CDP, Mukilteo city and Everett city. Documented on Page C.20 of the Draft EA, these four CDPs have a combined population of 156,843 residents, of which, 80.5 percent were white, 3.1 percent were black, 1.3 percent were Indian or Alaska Native, 7.7 percent were Asian, less than 1 percent were Native Hawaiian, 2.9 percent where some other race, 4.2 percent were two or more races, and 6.5 percent were identified as Hispanic or Latino (of any race). Additionally, based on analysis of the Census data, approximately 13.6 percent of the population in the vicinity of the Airport is living below the poverty level and 10.2 percent are unemployed.

Based on analysis of the census data, there are special population groups in the surrounding community; however, there are no special population groups or neighborhoods located within the direct impact area (construction footprint) or within the 65 DNL noise contour (the indirect impact area). Because there are no special populations within the project areas and no significant impacts are associated with the project, there are no disproportionate impacts on special populations as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Page C.20 outlines the special populations that are within close proximity to the Airport. On Page C.19, the Draft EA states that there are no known special population groups within the project study area (65 DNL contour and the “footprint” of the proposed “modular” terminal expansion).
The analysis of impacts to children’s health and safety was prepared in accordance with FAA Orders 1050.1E Change 1 and 5050.4B. Per Executive Order 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, Federal agencies:

(a) shall make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children; and

(b) shall ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks

The analysis of children’s health and safety was included in the EA and can be found on Page D.32 of the Final EA. In response to comments, the locations of schools were added to the noise contour figures in the EA. There are no anticipated significant noise impacts on schools (see Figures D1 through D6 of the Final EA) and there are no other significant adverse effects on schools regarding air quality, water quality or other resources which could affect the health of children or impact schools. Because there are no significant adverse impacts (including noise) to any population groups or neighborhoods according to FAA defined thresholds of significance, there are no significant adverse impacts or disproportionate impacts to children’s health or safety.

*In response to your question, “(#2) Why does the FAA find disregarding these impacts to be compliant with the intent, spirit and purpose of NEPA?”*:

The airlines using the airport would be charged fees that would enable the County to pay traffic impact fees.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c.

**h. PAGE 35 QUESTIONS SECTION 1**

*In response to your question, “(#1) What are the impacts to schools from noise, pollution, and impacts to the learning environment, based on full operational capacity of the Airport (with two terminals)?”*:

Your comments indicate that Paine Field is proposing to construct two independent terminals in addition to the existing terminal, which collectively would provide over 60,000 square feet of terminal space. The EA proposes to construct a 29,350 square foot modular terminal building, consisting of 18,000 square feet of passenger terminal space, 1,664 square feet of bag make-up, 1,535 square feet of entrance concourse, and 8,100 square feet of bag concourse, as shown in Figure B3 of the EA. The proposed
terminal would accommodate 225 people in the gate boarding area; this is the maximum number of people that can be accommodated on one Q400 (Horizon) and one MD83 (Allegiant) aircraft.

The FAA conditionally approved ALP for Paine Field illustrates a future terminal developed in the Airport Master Plan. However, the future terminal illustrated on the ALP is not feasible at this time and is not included in the EA. Rather, the “modular” terminal expansion of the existing terminal would be constructed instead of the future passenger terminal considered during the Master Plan process and subsequently shown on the ALP.

The 2002 Airport Master Plan facility requirements were a conservative estimate of spatial needs based on then forecast growth in activity. The Master Plan forecasts were not based on actual airline derived passenger projections, but were based on generalized “rule of thumb” airport planning estimates. The Master Plan used this approach, because at the time, there was not a specific air service proposal, and thus the needs of a possible carrier could not be precisely anticipated. This resulted in the Master Plan space requirements that overestimated the space that may be needed so that adequate room was identified on the ALP to accommodate a terminal. Recognizing that the Airport currently meets the requirements for both aircraft parking and automobile parking spaces, the County decided that the larger, more permanent terminal and parking facilities recommended in the Airport Master Plan and shown on the ALP was not warranted to accommodate the air service activity proposed by Horizon Air and Allegiant Air. A more detailed evaluation of the terminal needs was prepared based on the anticipated activity forecast by Horizon and Allegiant Airlines, which indicated a terminal building smaller than that identified on the ALP. Given the uncertainty of the success of the service, the County proposes the development of a modular terminal. There are many examples throughout the industry of air service starts and stops as well as airports building terminals only to have airlines cease operations and the terminal goes unused.

An ALP is for planning purposes only. Projects shown on the ALP are not absolute and are subject to changes in demand, environmental review, and other factors. All projects on an ALP are only conditionally approved. Once demand for a project is present, an environmental process is required. While it is true that all projects that are funded must be on the ALP, not all projects on the ALP proceed to funding due to lack of justification based on changed operational levels.

Proposed improvements shown on an ALP are not absolute and are permitted to be modified so long as the modification is consistent with the original intent. In the case of Paine Field, the ALP illustrates a proposed passenger terminal to support the implementation of commercial service. However, because the proposed service requires less terminal space then that shown on the ALP and due to the volatility and unknown potential of success or failure of commercial service at Paine Field, the FAA will permit the
Airport to modify the terminal concept to a “modular” expansion of the existing terminal building. This does not require an amendment to the ALP because it is consistent with the designated use shown on the current ALP. An “As-Built” ALP will be prepared upon completion of the “modular” terminal expansion. Post construction, the FAA would change the approval of the ALP from conditional to unconditional as it relates to the terminal and the ALP would show the facility as existing rather than proposed. In the event additional demand for terminal space is identified in the future, NEPA compliance would be required.

See previous response to children’s health and safety.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

_In response to your question, “(#2) Is the FAA aware of the number of schools near Paine Field and/or those schools likely impacted by over-flights (those in the flight path)? See map, below.”:_

See Section 5g, question #1.

## i. PAGE 35 QUESTIONS SECTION 2

_In response to your question, “(#1) Shouldn’t a rigorous analysis based on a role change of the Airport from Class IV to Class I at full capacity, include more than just noise but also air emissions, traffic, disruptions to learning, health impacts to children and so on?”:_

See Section 5g, question #1.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

_In response to your question, “(#2) Why isn’t the Executive Order 13045 referenced in the Draft EA adhered to and not dismissed because schools are not in the “project area”? What about schools located under the flight paths, subject to noise, pollution and other environmental impacts due to the change of Paine Field from a Class IV to a Class I airport? Schools that are not in the project area are still subject to analysis, since the proposal includes a change in the role of an airport to a Class I status”:_

See Section 5g, question #1.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.
j. PAGE 37 QUESTION

In response to your question, “(#1 Why didn’t the EA include an assessment of impacts on the entire human environment?”:

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

k. PAGE 38-45 QUESTIONS

In response to your comment, “(#1 Please justify why the allowable impacts have not been analyzed.”:

The anticipated operations by Horizon Air and Allegiant Air have been analyzed under the direction of the FAA. The trip generation calculations have been compared to the Hirsh Associated analysis, to data collected at Bellingham International Airport, and the recent traffic impact analysis for the Bellingham International Airport. All of these comparisons show that the analyzed trip generation is conservative. The trip generation analyzed for the project, which is anticipated to have fewer than half as many existing annual enplanements as Bellingham International Airport, is 60% greater than the peak-hour trips from commercial operations at Bellingham International Airport.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your question, “(#2 Why was the consultant off in their traffic trip estimates by a factor of 3x?”:

The assumption in the Mead & Hunt report that approximately 1,500,000 origin and destination passengers would use Paine Field is based on the assumption of Paine Field having similar service as SeaTac. The analysis performed in the traffic impact analysis for the EA assumes the reasonably foreseeable level of service as proposed by Allegiant and Horizon, which is a much different operation than SeaTac and does not include long distance flights described in the Mead & Hunt report. Horizon Air and Allegiant Air are only currently proposing to service Portland, Spokane and Las Vegas from Paine Field.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1a.
In response to your questions, “(#3) If Horizon or Allegiant Air increases the number of operations proposed or increases the passenger capacity of the airplanes proposed, what areas of impact would require a new study? What specifically would trigger a new study? Please cite applicable law or regulations that support this idea”:

Some comments asked if the Proposed Actions would “open the door” entirely to unconstrained commercial air service actions and what would require additional environmental review prior to implementation. Actions requiring future environmental review are included in Section 1a.

Additional service by either Horizon Air or Allegiant Air to the cities with aircraft included in their request letters in Appendix A of the EA or service to other cities included in the airlines’ approved operations specifications would not constitute a Federal action and would not likely require additional environmental review unless FAA funding of further terminal expansion was required to accommodate that service or a new aircraft type was proposed.

In response to your comment, “(#4) The EA states that impacts were correlated with trips generated at Bellingham International Airport. Please provide a table showing the flights analyzed for the proposal to allow commercial air out of Bellingham and the actual number of flights since commercial air service has started at Bellingham International Airport (BLI).”

Data was collected at Bellingham International Airport during a 2-hour period where there was one arrival and one departure each for Horizon Air and Allegiant Air. At Bellingham International Airport one arrival and departure each for Horizon Air and Allegiant Air occurs over approximately 2 hours, not the compressed 1 hour that is analyzed in the traffic impact analysis for Paine Field Preferred Alternative. This Bellingham International Airport data resulted in 201 trips during the 2-hour period summarized in the attachments of the traffic impact analysis on Page A-13. It is also important to note that the existing peak-hour trip generation of Bellingham International Airport is only 131 trips, based on 385,000 annual enplanements. The Paine Field project is only anticipated to have 238,200 annual enplanements in in the Draft EA (updated to 2018 in the Final EA), but the traffic impact analysis has been performed for 212 PM peak-hour trips, a 60% increase over the existing trip generation of Bellingham International Airport.

In response to your comment, “(#5) Gibson’s Proposed Commercial Service at Paine Field Traffic Impact Analysis states: “The project may change some travel patterns in the Puget Sound region since it is anticipated that the project may divert some vehicle trips to Paine Field from SeaTac International Airport and Bellingham International Airport. This change in regional travel patterns could reduce the number of vehicles at the intersections and along the arterials analyzed in this report. Please provide data showing the number supporting the above claim showing which intersections and arterials will
see reduced vehicle volumes and the number of vehicles reduced. Also, explain which arterials and intersections the vehicles will be relocating to use”:

All of the trips generated by the project were assumed to be new trips to the road system, which represents a conservative analysis. All of the trips were assumed to be new despite the fact that it is anticipated that the project will divert some trips via regional routes within Snohomish County to Paine Field from SeaTac and Bellingham International Airport. The diversion of trips on a microscopic scale, intersection by intersection, is almost impossible to determine to a reasonable level of certainty. The diversion of trips is able to be determined on a macroscopic level, an area-wide analysis. This is the level at which the VMT analysis was performed. A diversion of trips has therefore not been included in the analysis for the traffic impact analysis. For consistency the VMT analysis in the EA also assumes all trips to be new. This assumption means that all of the trips generated to the project are new to the analyzed intersections and arterials, which is a conservative estimate of the impacts of the project.

In response to your comment, “(#6 The EA Traffic Analysis states, "Scoping discussions were held with staff at Snohomish County, The Washington State Department of Transportation, the City of Mukilteo, and the City of Everett." Please provide letters from Jim Bloodgood, Snohomish County Traffic Engineer, Lorena Eng WSDOT NW Region Administrator, Dong Ho Chang City of Everett Traffic Engineer, and Larry Waters City of Mukilteo Public Works Director stating that they have reviewed Gibson’s traffic analysis and they concur that the project description, assumptions, and analysis accurately represent the traffic impacts that are likely to be seen by allowing unlimited commercial air service at Paine Field. Please review and provide comments that the mitigation fees proposed in the EA are sufficient to cover any and all roadway impacts as a result of Horizon and Allegiant being allowed unlimited commercial flights out of Paine Field Airport”:

As of the date of this comment, written review comments have been received from WSDOT and the City of Everett. The responses from WSDOT and the City of Everett both agreed with the scope of the analysis, the results of the analysis, and the mitigation fees calculated for the respective jurisdictions. Official written comments have not been received from Snohomish County. However, Snohomish County staff has stated in a phone conversation with GTC staff that an official response will not occur until the SEPA process starts, which is after the NEPA process. A response has not been received from the City of Mukilteo.
In response to your comment, “(#7 When planners analyze impacts to roadway systems, they use a 20-year horizon. Why was a 20-year horizon not utilized when completing this critical traffic analysis? This represents a significant flaw in the EA that requires a full EIS with at least a 20-year scoping period as discussed throughout this document:”

The future analysis to the year 2018 was performed under the direction of the FAA and also correlates closely with the Snohomish County 6-year concurrency window for developments. Horizon Air and Allegiant Air only provided data up to anticipated 2018 operations, and as stated previously, the 2018 operations would maximize the expected peak-hour capacity of the proposed terminal. Therefore, even if more daily operations were to occur beyond 2018, the critical peak-hour trip generation would not change with a 20-year forecast based on the information provided and the size of the terminal operations.

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b.

In response to your comment, “(#8 Please provide the data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers reference that supports the assumption of 1.5 and 2.4 persons per vehicle used in this analysis”:

The vehicle occupancy rates of 1.5 and 2.4 are not from the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Horizon Air expects a 1.5 vehicle occupancy rate and Allegiant Air expects a 2.4 vehicle occupancy rate. The Hirsh associates report (EA Appendix K) notes that due to the high proportion of business travelers on Horizon flights, use of a more conservative 1.5 vehicle occupancy rate for Horizon is correct. This data was compared to data collected at Bellingham International Airport during the peak-hour, which showed an average vehicle occupancy rate of 2.08. The weighted average vehicle occupancy rate, based on 1.5 for Horizon Air and 2.4 for Allegiant Air, is 2.00. The vehicle occupancy rate used in the traffic impact analysis is therefore more conservative than what was observed at Bellingham International Airport.

In response to your question, “(#9 What is the person per vehicle number used for arterials as typically applied by WSDOT?”:

WSDOT typically only collects vehicle occupancy data for the major freeways in the vicinity of the site, such as I-5 and I-405, and typically only collects this data for the HOV lanes. There are commuter HOV lanes along Airport Road/128th Street SW between the site and I-5. These lanes provide increased operation and incentive for higher occupancy vehicles. The U.S. Department of Transportation Federal
Highway Administration has documented that vehicle occupancy rates vary significantly based on the purpose for travel, with recreational trips having the highest documented vehicle occupancy.

In response to your comment, “(#10 Since commercial airport users will clearly be coming from the interchanges of I-5 and SR 526/SR 527 please explain why this interchange was not included in the traffic analysis?”:

Analysis of freeway uncontrolled ramp interchanges, including the I-5 at SR-526/SR-527 interchange, was not performed since analysis of freeway interchanges is typically only performed by WSDOT as part of their regional freeway analysis and planning. Analysis of controlled intersection interchanges with county and city arterials (such as I-5 at SR-96/128th Street SW) is typically required by WSDOT under the interlocal agreement and scoping process. In addition, the analysis of the I-5 at SR-526/SR-527 uncontrolled ramp interchange was not requested by WSDOT during the scoping process.

In response to your comment, “(#11 Since commercial airport users will clearly be coming from I-5/ I-405 Swamp Creek Interchange please explain why this interchange was not included in the traffic analysis”:

Analysis of freeway interchanges, including the I-5 at I-405 interchange, was not performed since analysis of uncontrolled ramp freeway interchanges is typically only performed by WSDOT as part of their regional freeway analysis and planning. In addition, the analysis of the I-5 at I-405 interchange was not requested by WSDOT during the scoping process.

In response to your comment, “(#12 The intersection of SR 525 and Lincoln Way is known as a backup point. Explain why this intersection was not included in the traffic analysis”:

The trip generation and trip distribution information were provided to WSDOT during the scoping process. The intersection of SR-525 at Lincoln Way was not analyzed since analysis of this intersection was not requested by WSDOT during the scoping process.

In response to your comment, “(#13 Currently Snohomish County and WSDOT’s SR 96 experience extreme backups and delays on 128th Street (SR 96) between SR 99 and I-5. Please explain how these impacts will be addressed and mitigated, using a 20-year time frame”:

The impacts of the development to the I-5 at SR-96/128th Street SW interchange were evaluated in the traffic impact analysis and documented in Table 21 on Page 48 of traffic impact analysis included in Appendix F of the Final EA. The table shows that under the 2018 conditions documented in the traffic
impact analysis in the Final EA the additional trips from the project will increase the delay by 2.7 seconds for the southbound ramps and by 1.1 seconds for the Northbound ramps. Mitigation fees for the improvements to this interchange are proposed to be paid as part of the WSDOT mitigation fees identified in the traffic impact analysis. These mitigation fees will help fund future improvements of the I-5 at SR-96/128th Street SW interchange to handle future traffic demands. The analysis of the arterial unit included in the traffic impact analysis for the Final EA shows that the arterial will operate an acceptable level of service in both directions during the AM and PM peak-hours.

In response to your comment, “(#14 The Traffic Analysis states that the intersection of SR 99 and 128th (SR 96) will be at Level Of Service ("LOS") F in 2016 with or without the project (LOS F is the worst possible LOS). The City of Everett has identified that capacity improvements for single-occupancy vehicles to the intersection of SR 99 are not practical due to the existing lane configuration and lack of right-of-way. If this intersection is operating at LOS F how will drivers get to Paine Field Airport if this is one of the main access routes? Please list what roadways and intersections drivers will divert to in efforts to avoid this LOS F intersection”:

The analysis shows that the intersection of SR-99 at Airport Road/128th Street SW will operate at LOS F, regardless of whether the project occurs or not. The project will increase the delay at the intersection by 4.0 seconds under the 2018 conditions, which is an increase of 4.6%, as documented in the traffic impact analysis in the Final EA. This minor increase in delay is not anticipated to cause drivers to divert to different intersections or routes.

In response to your comment, “(#15 The estimate of 956 vehicle trips per day based on 23 airplane operations per day does not properly assess the impact to roadways since the airlines will not be limited to 23 operations per day. Please include an assessment of the available runway capacity for commercial operations and analyze the maximum roadway impacts that would be seen”:

The trip generation information contained in the traffic impact analysis is based on information from Horizon Air and Allegiant Air. The impacts of the project on the surrounding arterials and intersections are based on peak-hour trip generation. The peak-hour trip generation is conservative when compared to similar operations at Bellingham International Airport. Snohomish County and the surrounding jurisdictions analyze impacts to arterials and intersections based on the peak-hour trip generation, not the daily trip generation. Please see Appendix P for discussion of the potential impacts from the terminal operating at its maximum capacity.
In response to your comment, “(#)16 The traffic analysis did not assess impacts to the arterial SR 525. Please assess the impacts to SR 525 from the Mukilteo Ferry terminal to 1-5 with the assumption as allowed by this project that commercial air service is only limited by the market and runway capacity”:

The analysis of impacts to SR-525, including the arterial as a whole and individual intersections, has been performed in accordance with Snohomish County, WSDOT and City of Mukilteo guidelines. The SR-525 arterial has not been analyzed since sections are owned by WSDOT and sections are owned by the City of Mukilteo. WSDOT and the City of Mukilteo both evaluate impacts of development with intersection analysis, not arterial analysis like Snohomish County. Intersections along SR-525 north of the SR-526 intersection and SR-525 between the SR-526 intersection and the Beverly Park Road intersection are not impacted with 10 directional PM peak-hour trips, which is the threshold for analysis used by the City of Mukilteo. WSDOT intersections along SR-525 south of the Beverly Park Road intersection were not requested to be analyzed by WSDOT.

In response to your comment, “(#)17 The traffic analysis did not assess the impacts during peak summer travel periods. The Washington State Ferry Service operates the largest number of ferry commuters in the State at the Mukilteo terminal. Please analyze the peak summer ferry volumes with anticipated peak summer commercial air service market capacity and determine its effects on the 1-5, SR 525, SR 526 and 128th Street (SR 96) arterials and their associated intersections and interchanges.”

The analysis performed for this report is based on the typical AM peak-hour and PM peak-hour of the surrounding roadways, based on intersection counts performed between November 2007 and August 2009. Count data was collected throughout the year, with October and December being the only months in which count data was not collected for the traffic impact analysis in the Draft EA. Count data for the traffic impact analysis in the Final EA were collected in the year 2012. The AM peak-hour typically falls within 7:00 AM and 9:00 PM and the typical PM peak-hour falls within 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM. Snohomish County, WSDOT, the City of Mukilteo and the City of Everett do not require, and did not request during traffic scoping, analysis of impacts during Boeing shift-changes, peak ferry times, during holidays or other non-typical peak times. It was determined during the scoping process that the impact of the project would be analyzed for the typical AM peak-hour (Snohomish County arterials) and PM peak-hour (Snohomish County arterials, and intersections for surrounding jurisdictions). The analysis was also analyzed with the peak trip generation of the project occurring during these commuter peak-hours, which would result in the highest cumulative peak-hour traffic.
In response to your comment, “(#18 The traffic analysis in the EA as sent to Lorena Eng, WSDOT NW Regional Administrator, analyses the maximum impact of allowing unlimited commercial air service by Horizon and Allegiant as being 956 daily vehicle trips assuming from 1.5 to 2.4 people per vehicle. With these minimal volumes, out of the 15 intersections Ms. Eng requested Snohomish County analyze only 7 realized 10 or more peak-hour trips. The other 8 did not receive more than 10 peak hour trips and were not analyzed. In addition, several critical intersections and interchanges that lead from 1-5 to the airport such as 1-5/1405/SR 525 Swamp Creek Interchange, SR 525 and Lincoln Way, the SR 525 arterial were not analyzed because the analysis shows it will not receive more than 10 peak hour trips. These under-estimated impacts will have severe impacts to 1-5, SR 525, the 1-5/128th Street interchange and 128th Street (SR 96) from 1-5 to Paine Field Airport, and the SR 99/128th Street signal, which is already operating at Level Of Service F. If the analysis included over half a million trips as supported by the Paine Field 2004 Mead & Hunter report titled "Passenger Core Market Analysis," what would be the impact to the 15 intersection analysis requested by WSDOT’s NW Regional Administrator Lorena Eng?”:

The peak-hour trip generation used for the analysis is conservative based on information in the Hirsh Associates report, data collected at Bellingham International Airport, and the ITE trip generation rate. The arterial and intersection analysis in the traffic impact analysis is based on this peak-hour trip generation and not the daily trip generation. In addition, the major freeway interchanges in the area, including I-5 at I-405 and I-5 at SR-526/SR-527, would not typically be required to be analyzed, regardless of the number of passengers. This analysis would typically be performed by WSDOT. Any expansion of the proposed terminal or an additional terminal would require a separate traffic impact analysis.

In response to your comment, “(#19 The intersection of SR 526 and Everett Mall Way is not considered in the traffic analysis. Since this is the first intersection from 1-5 to the Airport from the North, this should have been assessed. Please provide the currently LOS at this intersection during the PM peak”:

The intersection of SR-526 at Everett Mall Way is a City of Everett intersection and is not impacted with 50 PM peak-hour trips. Analysis of this intersection is therefore not required under the typical City of Everett requirements. The distribution included in the traffic impact analysis shows 18% of the development’s trips on SR-526 west of I-5. These trips do not impact the SR-526 at Everett Mall Way intersection since there are uncontrolled ramp connections between SR-526 and I-5.
In response to your comment, “(#20 The analysis states, "The project will, however, add trips to three intersections that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service, whether or not the proposed project is implemented. These intersections are SR 99 at Airport Road and the 1-5 southbound and northbound ramps at 128th Street SW (SR 96). The traffic report only analyzes the southbound off ramp to 1-5 at 128th but does not detail any analysis of the 1-5 northbound ramps at 128th Street SW. Please add this analysis to the report based on full capacity at Paine Field":"

The intersection of the I-5 northbound ramps at 128th Street SW was included in the traffic impact analysis as intersection #17 (as documented in the traffic impact analysis for the Final EA). The intersection is impacted with a total of 37 peak-hour trips from the project. The analysis shows that this intersection currently operates at LOS D and will change to LOS F under the 2018 without project conditions, as documented in the traffic impact analysis for the Final EA. This summary is included in Table 21 on Page 48 of the traffic impact analysis in the Final EA. The development is contributing $32,695.20 for impacts to WSDOT intersections. These mitigation fees, in part, will help improve the 128th Street SW interchange to provide capacity for future volumes.

In response to your comment, “(#21 If the carriers are not limited to the flights proposed, why are the FAA Snohomish County, WSDOT, and Everett not demanding mitigation fees for the fully allowable impacts?“:

The Draft and Final EA’s analyze the proposed service by Horizon Air and Allegiant Air as documented in the traffic impact analysis. The peak-hour level of service analysis is based on one arrival and departure each for Horizon Air and Allegiant Air. This is all that is reasonably foreseeable from the proposed 2-gate terminal. Any addition to the proposed terminal or the construction of an additional terminal would require additional compliance with NEPA. See Sections 1a,b.

In response to your comment, “(#22 The traffic report states that, "Based on the trip generation and identified codes the total traffic mitigation fees identified in this report for payment to Snohomish County, WSDOT and the City of Mukilteo for the project is $333,262. The Snohomish County mitigation fees are $206,161.40, the WSDOT mitigation fees are $32,695.20 and the City of Mukilteo mitigation fees are $94,406.25." Please provide letters from the agency officials stating that they concur with the above mitigation fee for the resultant impact”:

WSDOT and the City of Everett have both submitted review comments concurring with the mitigation fees in the traffic impact analysis. WSDOT, in the letter dated January 10, 2010, agreed with the $32,695.20 and the City of Everett, in the letter dated February 3, 2010, agreed that there are no
mitigation fees due. Snohomish County and the City of Mukilteo have not submitted formal review comments concurring with or disputing the mitigation fees included in the traffic impact analysis.

*In response to your comment, "(#23 Please provide comments from the City of Everett traffic engineer stating he agrees with the assessment that Everett will expect no traffic mitigation fees for the impact of commercial air service at Paine Field":*

A review letter dated February 3, 2010 was received from Allan Giffen, the City of Everett Director, SEPA responsible officer, agreeing with the conclusions of the traffic impact analysis.

*In response to your comment, "(#24 The traffic analysis assumption that 2% of the people flying on the commercial airlines will be arriving by bicycle allows Horizon and Allegiant to reduce their mitigation fees by 5%. Please provide your data source for the assumption that 2% of the commercial air travelers arrive by bicycle":*

The bicycle racks equivalent to 2% of the peak-hour trip generation is directly from Snohomish County’s Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements in Snohomish County Code 30.66B.640. Developments that have adequate on-site measures are able to receive a 5% discount in trip generation and mitigation fees. Adequate on-site measures include, in part, bicycle racks and sidewalk connectivity. There will be bicycle racks and sidewalk connectivity between the terminal and the transit stops on Airport Road, which should allow the project to receive the 5% TDM reduction. It is important to note that the traffic impact analysis was performed without a reduction for bicycle, transit or other TDM related factors. The only reduction applied to the traffic impact analysis was 1% of the trips staying on the airport grounds and not impacting the surrounding road system.

*In response to your comment, "(#25 Please detail the back up for the assumption that only 34 employees will be needed to support commercial air service at Paine Field":*

The number of employees on the site is based on information from the airlines and Paine Field staff and assumes that there will be two shifts with 17 new employees on each shift.

*In response to your comment, "(#26 Please provide the compounded annual growth rate, the 5-year growth rate, the lane saturation volume and the flow rate used in this analysis":*

The baseline turning movement calculations were calculated using Snohomish County pipeline data and growth rates. The Snohomish County pipeline data is a database that provides turning movement data from developments that have been submitted and approved, but not yet constructed. Snohomish County
pipeline data was not available at all of the study intersections. Annually compounding growth rates were used where Snohomish County pipeline data was not available. However, the annually compounding and average annual growth rates have been calculated for the PM peak-hour to adequately respond to this comment. The annually compounding growth rates, as calculated between the existing turning movements and 2018 baseline turning movements, range between 0.78% and 4.79%, as documented in the traffic impact analysis in the Final EA. The average annual growth rates, as calculated between the existing turning movements and 2018 baseline turning movements, range between 0.80% and 5.40%, as documented in the traffic impact analysis in the Final EA.

The default ideal flow rate of 1,900 vehicles per hour per lane was used and adjustments based on number of lanes, lane width, amount of green time, etc. were made by the Synchro software used to analyze the arterials and intersections (the lane saturation and flow rates for each individual movement for each scenario are contained in the intersection level of service Synchro printouts contained in the Traffic Impact Analysis, Attachments J through X). Attachments J through X can be found on the CD attachment to the Final EA. It is important to note that the arterial analysis was calibrated to data collected in the field to match the existing operation as accurately as possible. The existing signal timings were also used to ensure the analysis represented the existing operation as closely as possible.

**In response to your comment, 
“(#)27 Airport users will likely travel on Beverly Park Edmonds Road west of SR 525. What volume of additional vehicles added by potential commercial air service would require arterial or intersection improvements on this section of Beverly Park Road?”:**

Beverly Park Road west of SR-525 is Snohomish County arterial unit #223. This arterial is no longer a critical arterial unit and therefore it was not analyzed as part of the traffic impact analysis. Since the arterial unit is not required to be analyzed and was not analyzed, it is difficult to determine how many trips from the project would need to be added to arterial unit #223 before arterial or intersection improvements would be required. However, it is anticipated that the project would have to generate a large number of trips since the project impacts arterial unit #223 with 4% of its trips (8 peak-hour trips) and the arterial is not a critical arterial unit.

**In response to your comment, 
“(#)28 Page 12 of the traffic analysis states, "ITE’s data shows that there would be 6.9 peak-hour trips per light." This is low for planes that carry from 76 to 150 passengers. Please explain”:**

The ITE PM peak-hour trip generation rate included in the traffic impact analysis is correct. It is possible that the peak trip generation of an airport is not the same as the peak-hour of the adjacent street system. The data collected at Bellingham International Airport as part of the traffic impact analysis shows
that during the peak-hour of the count there were 148 vehicles. Arguably, the peak-hour trip generation of the project could therefore be 148 peak-hour trips. This is similar to the PM peak-hour trip generation of 157 trips calculated using the ITE rate.

**In response to your comment, “(#)29 Page 13 of the traffic analysis states “48 % of the trips will come from Beverly Park Road, SR 99, SR 525 and 1-5, SR 527 and 35th Ave SE." please analyze the route from these facilities to the Airport. Please provide analysis from 1-5 to SR 525 through Swamp Creek interchange, SR 99 and Lincoln Way. Please provide analysis of the SR 527/ SR 526/1-5 interchange. This should be done as part of an EIS.”:**

The arterial and intersection analysis included in the traffic impact is based on the requirements of Snohomish County, WSDOT, the City of Mukilteo and the City of Everett for analysis of development impacts. In addition, the analysis was scoped with the jurisdictions. The analysis included the arterials and intersections along 128th Street SW/Airport Road from I-5 to SR-526, the major route to and from the project. The traffic impact analysis also included analysis of the arterials and intersections from south of 148th Street SW to Airport Road along Beverly Park Road. There are a number of intersections along Beverly Park Road, SR-99 and SR-525 that do not meet the requirements of WSDOT, the City of Mukilteo or the City of Everett for analysis. In addition, WSDOT did not require the analysis of freeway interchanges since this analysis is not typically required of a development and that analysis is typically performed by WSDOT. The analysis has been performed for the existing conditions, 2013 opening conditions without and with the project and the 2018 future conditions without and with the project. This analysis is in the same format as what would be required for an EIS.

**In response to your comment, “(#)30 Please propose a solution to the LOS F intersection at SR 99 and Airport Road since it will be an impact to Boeing commuters, Boeing suppliers, airport users, local residents and local businesses”:**

The City of Everett response letter, dated February 3, 2010, states that the City of Everett agrees with the analysis and conclusions of the traffic impact analysis, as part of the EA. The City of Everett has stated that additional capacity for single-occupancy vehicles, such as additional lanes, is not practical. However, the Swift bus rapid transit is now in service along SR-99, which allows transit to have improved service along the corridor. Additionally, the City of Everett is conducting an extensive Evergreen Way corridor study to evaluate the land use and transportation facilities along the SR-99 corridor in this area.
In response to your comment, “(#31 Page 47 of the traffic analysis states, "The intersection of SR 525 and Beverly Park Road is programmed to be improved to allow the existing second southbound left-turn and second westbound left-turn lanes to be opened up to traffic." It states that these, not currently completed improvements, have been assumed to be completed in the airport traffic analysis. Please comment on the anticipated impacts to traffic and SR 525 as a result of SR 525 southbound to northbound U-turn movement will be eliminated by the opening of the second left turn lane."

The dual southbound and westbound left-turn lanes at the intersection of SR-525 at Beverly Park Road are now open and were included in the analysis included in the Final EA. In addition, the southbound U-turn movement on SR-525 is permitted. The dual southbound left-turn lanes on SR-525 have therefore not had an effect on the southbound to northbound U-turn movement.

In response to your comment, “(#32 Why are the growth rates used for the traffic study inconsistent? Page 16 states that a 2% annually compounded growth rate was used for 2010 turning movements. Page 18 states that where pipeline data was not available, .5% annually compounding growth rate was used along 84th street. What is the annual growth rate for the ferry traffic using 84th Street? The report also uses growth rates of .53%, .93%, and 1.78%. Please explain these inconsistencies. How does this correlate with the anticipated growth rate of commercial air service at Paine Field over the next 20 years? Note again that Allegiant's prospective growth rate of flights is 500% in the next 5 years":

A description of each of the growth rates included in the comment is below:

- 2% - Annually compounding growth rate used to calculate the 2010/2011 without project turning movement volumes in the Draft EA (2013 in the Final EA), based on converting the Snohomish County pipeline data to an annually compounding growth rate. This is appropriate for a short-term forecast of 1 to 2 years.
- 0.5% - Annually compounding growth rate that was used to calculate the 2016 without project turning movement volumes in the Draft EA (2018 in the Final EA) at intersections where Snohomish County pipeline data was not available. This rate is a conservatively high growth rate since it is equivalent to an annual straight-line growth rate of 0.63%. The growth rate used in the Swift Bus Rapid Transit Implementation Traffic Report is a 0.53% annual straight-line growth rate.
- 1.78% - Annual straight-line growth rate averaged over all of the study intersections used for the arterial and intersection analysis in the Draft EA. This growth rate is a combination of pipeline data and growth rates. The annual straight-line growth rate average over all of the study intersection used for the arterial and intersection analysis in the Final EA is 1.95%.
It is important to note that the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), which performs future growth projections for the Puget Sound area, has used an average annual straight-line growth rate of 1.3% to calculate the 2040 future traffic volumes. The average annual straight-line growth rate of 1.78% in the Draft EA and 1.95% in the Final EA for the study intersections is therefore higher than the growth rate used by PCSC in their calculations.

In response to your comment, “(#33 What is the number of passengers that are reasonably expected to fly out of Paine Field over the next 20 years based on the latest market studies?”:

While increases in passengers associated with this project beyond 2018 are possible, the growth rates beyond 2018 cannot be accurately predicted at this time. It is unclear whether or not the air service would be successful, or if successful, how quickly it would increase. Such increases would be dependent on area residents choosing to fly using commercial service at Paine Field.

In response to your comment, “(#34 Does the Airport Master Plan estimate additional trip generators in future years based on its master plan expansion? What are the numbers of trips anticipated each year through 2020?”:

Additional trip generators were not included in the traffic impact analysis for the project. The traffic impact analysis was solely performed for the terminal that is being proposed for Horizon Air and Allegiant Air commercial service. Any additional development that occurs in the area will be subject to the requirements of the jurisdiction in which the development is located and, potentially, surrounding jurisdictions. The surrounding jurisdictions also analyze change-in-use requests to ensure that the new proposed use does not generate additional trips than what has been approved or requires that the additional trips be analyzed.

In response to your comment, “(#35 How have the effects of reduced vehicle speeds and increased idling time been accounted for in the noise and air impacts? Has there been an analysis to evaluate the need for noise walls based on increased vehicle volume and the potential need for future roadway improvements?”:

A noise analysis for vehicle traffic is not required under NEPA or CEQ regulations based on the increase in vehicle traffic trips anticipated as a result of the project. The project is only anticipated to increase vehicle trips in the vicinity of the Airport by approximately 5 percent.

The emissions for the air quality analysis were modeled using the FAA’s Emissions Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS). The FAA’s EDMS is the state of the art model approved by FAA and EPA for use in
evaluating airport-related emissions. As described in the following response, EDMS was used to evaluate airport-related sources, and employee commute, while NONROAD was used to evaluate construction equipment emissions. Both models are EPA approved models.

As noted in the Draft and Final EA, emissions from construction equipment were evaluated using the EPAs approved NONROAD model. EDMS was used in the construction analysis to identify emissions associated with employee work commute since the vehicle types used in worker commute are the same as that of passenger and airport employees.

A noise analysis for vehicle traffic is not required under NEPA or CEQ regulations based on the increase in vehicle traffic trips anticipated as a result of the project. The project is only anticipated to increase traffic volumes in the vicinity of the Airport by approximately 2 percent. In terms of change in noise, this would result in an increase in DNL noise level of less than 0.1 dBA.

In response to your comment, “(#36 The EA states that trips will be generated from drivers on SR 99. Please evaluate the potential impacts of commercial airport trips at the intersection of SR 99 and 148th”:

The intersection of SR-99 at 148th Street SW is approximately 4 miles away from the project location and has not been analyzed since it was not requested by WSDOT in their scoping letter.

In response to your comment, “(#37 Please provide the date for the installation of the signal at the intersection of Center Road and Beverly Park Road, which was assumed as operational for this analysis”:

The traffic signal at the intersection of Center Road at Beverly Park Road became operational on August 11, 2009, based on information from Snohomish County.

In response to your comment, “(#38 Has the full traffic volumes generated at build-out from Korry Manufacturing been included in the commercial airport traffic analysis?”:

The trips from the full build-out of the Korry Manufacturing development were included in the Snohomish County pipeline data and have therefore been included in the traffic impact analysis in the Draft EA. The existing count data utilized in the Final EA includes the trips generated by the Korry Manufacturing development.

In response to your comment, “(#39 Table 9 has not included the analysis of the 128th Street SW at 1-5 Northbound ramps as it purports in the executive summary. Please provide this analysis:”
Table 9 is a list of intersections that were used in the Snohomish County arterial analysis. The intersection of the I-5 northbound ramps at 128th Street SW is not part of an arterial analyzed in the traffic impact analysis. Snohomish County arterial unit #228 has an east terminus of the I-5 southbound ramps. The analysis of the I-5 northbound ramps at 128th Street SW is documented in Table 21 of the traffic impact analysis in the Final EA.

In response to your comment, “(#40 The analysis of intersection #4 Beverly Park Road and SR 525 presents a maximum peak hour increase of 4 through vehicles and 9 turning vehicles. The analysis states that the project will generate 212 vehicle trips and 40% of these trips will take Beverly Park Road. Please explain why the intersection analysis does not show 40% of the peak hour vehicle trips”:

The intersection of SR-525 at Beverly Park Road is only impacted with 13% of the project’s trips, as shown in Figure 2 of the traffic impact analysis. The 40% stated in the comment is assumed to be a reference to the statement that “48% of the trips will travel to and from the south along Beverly Park Road, SR-99, SR-525, Interstate-5, SR-527 and 35th Avenue SE.” from Page 13 of the traffic impact analysis in the Draft EA (Page 12 of the traffic impact analysis in the Final EA) and that the 40% stated in the comment should have been 48%. The 48% referenced on Page 13 of the report in the Draft EA is the total of the trips traveling to and from the south along Beverly Park Road, SR-99, SR-525, Interstate-5, SR-527 and 35th Avenue SE, and not just one of these routes.

In response to your comment, “(#41 We are requesting the WSDOT perform an independent traffic analysis to assess the impacts of commercial air service at Paine Field. The analysis bears review as the increase in overall traffic volumes at the intersection of SR 525 and Beverly Park Edmonds Road from 2010 without the project to 2016 with the project only increases turn movements by 1 to 81 and through movements by 18 to 110”:

The comment is not clear as to which movements these volumes relate to and it was not able to be determined from the turning movement counts. However, the intersection of SR-525 at Beverly Park Road has 5,796 total intersection trips during the PM peak-hour (Page F-10 of the traffic impact analysis (Appendix F) attachments) under the 2013 without project conditions. These volumes increase to 6,270 total intersection trips during the PM peak-hour (Page F-11 of the traffic impact analysis (Appendix F) attachments) under the 2018 with project conditions. The volumes represent an increase of 474 trips during the PM peak-hour from the 2013 without project conditions to the 2018 with project condition of which 28 are project related trips.
In response to your comment, “(#42 On page 41 of the traffic analysis it states that arterial flow rates will be 10.3 mph in 2016 with project conditions. What will the travel time be from 1-5? What will the travel time be from 128th Street interchange to Paine Field Airport during the PM peak in 2016 with the project? Also, what will be the reverse travel time from the airport to 1-5 during this same time period? Has the increased car volume and idling time been accounted for in the noise and air study?”:

The time it takes to travel from I-5 to Paine Field has been calculated using the Segment Travel Time information presented in the traffic impact analysis (specifically Tables 15, 16, 19 and 20) in the Final EA. It is anticipated that it will take approximately 8 minutes and 45 seconds to travel from I-5 to Paine Field during the PM peak-hour. To travel from Paine Field to I-5 during the PM peak-hour it is estimated that it will take over 10 minutes. A noise analysis for vehicle traffic is not required under NEPA or CEQ regulations and was not completed in the Draft or Final EA. The emissions for the air quality analysis were modeled using the FAA’s Emissions Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS).

In response to your comment, “(#43 STAYBRIDGE Suites in Mukilteo at the intersection of SR 525 and Paine Field Blvd paid the WSDOT $140,000 in roadway mitigation fees. Please explain how a hotel can be required to pay this amount with commercial airport expansion generating only $32,000 in mitigation fees to WSDOT”:

The WSDOT mitigation fees for the project are based on the standard WSDOT traffic mitigation fee of $36 per daily trip, which results in approximately $32,000 in WSDOT traffic mitigation fees. These mitigation fees were approved in WSDOT’s response dated February 3, 2010. It is not known how the trip generation or WSDOT traffic mitigation fees were calculated for the STAYBRIDGE Suites development.

In response to your comment, “(#44 Please list the High Accident Location intersections on SR 525, SR 99, SR 96 and Beverly Park Edmonds Road that are included in the 2007 WSDOT publication. Please discuss what level of traffic volume increases would require improvements at these locations”:

The interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and WSDOT only requires the HAL locations to be documented in the traffic study. It becomes WSDOT’s responsibility to determine whether additional mitigation is required for the development’s impact on those HALs and then request reasonably related mitigation. WSDOT has not requested any additional mitigation for impacts to the HAL locations. Additionally, it should be noted WSDOT does not have an adopted prediction methodology between volume increase and accident impacts.
In response to your comment, “(#45 The forecast reports in Appendix G show aviation growth rates at Paine Field from the 23 daily operations proposed to be a 7.3 % increase in 2010 with a 9.9% increase in 2016. If commercial growth rates are 9.0% how can roadway growth rates be 0.5%?”:

The aviation growth rates are different from the roadway growth rates since the volumes on the analyzed roadways consist of several types of trips, of which most are not related to aviation at Paine Field. Therefore, the aviation growth rate can be higher than the traffic growth on the roadways.

In response to your question, “(#46 If the airlines have the ability to increase flights and airplane size at any time, how will mitigation for the increase be analyzed and paid?”:

The analysis and mitigation fees included in the traffic impact analysis are based on the reasonably foreseeable anticipated operation of Horizon Air and Allegiant Air, which will be serviced by the proposed terminal. Additional flights or changes in aircraft could require additions to the proposed terminal or a whole new terminal, which would require additional analysis and possible mitigation fees.

In response to your comment, “(#47 Appendix I contains the Proposed Commercial Service at Paine Field Vehicles Miles Traveled Analysis. Page 4 states that the catchment area has a radius of approximately 30 miles. The traffic analysis in Appendix F is flawed in that it does not analyze the impacts to the catchment area. Please explain why traffic impacts to the catchment area were not analyzed”:

The traffic impact analysis does not analyze the whole catchment area since the impacts to the majority of the catchment area do not meet the thresholds established by the surrounding jurisdictions for requiring analysis or were not included as arterials or intersections that required analysis during the scoping process.

In response to your comment, “(#48 The Central Puget Sound Region Designated Maintenance Areas are included in Appendix I, please comment on how air quality due to increased traffic volumes and increased airplane volumes impact the Catchment area as defined in the Mead & Hunt Passenger Core Market Analysis”:

The emissions for the air quality analysis were modeled using the FAA’s Emissions Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS).

EDMS was accepted as an U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) “Preferred Guideline” model in 1993 under Title 40 CFR part 51 Appendix W. In 2005 the FAA and EPA recognized that EDMS employs a suite of standalone compliance models already listed in the “ Preferred Guideline” such as MOBILE6.2,
NONROAD, AERMOD, AERMET, and AERMAP. Consequently, EDMS was relocated to section 6.2.4 “Modeling Guidance for Other Governmental Programs” in 40CFR51 Appendix W to coincide with FAA’s policy that EDMS is the required model to assess airport emissions.

The emissions inventory presented in the Draft EA was prepared using FAA's EDMS version 5.1. Preparation of the Draft EA was initiated in early 2009. At that time, Version 5.1 was the most recent version of EDMS offered by FAA. In November 2009, the FAA issued Version 5.1.2 and in November 2010 Version 5.1.3 was released. As noted on the FAA's web site, Version 5.1.2 corrected several output reports associated with the FAA's Voluntary Airport Low Emission (VALE) grant program, which is not related to analysis used in this EA. However, Version 5.1.3 corrected bugs in earlier versions as well as other improvements. In preparing the Final EA, because a new airport activity forecast was being evaluated which required new runs of EDMS, the most recent version EDMS 5.1.3 was used.

It is important to note that at the time the analysis was initiated, the air quality emissions inventory was conducted using the most recent version of the model required by the FAA for use in NEPA documents – the FAA’s Emissions Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS). Relative to model use, FAA Order 1050.1E Appendix A.2 states:

2.4c. Modeling Requirements. The EDMS is FAA’s required methodology for performing air quality analysis modeling for aviation sources. EDMS also offers the capability to model other airport emission sources that are not aviation-specific, such as power plants, fuel storage tanks, and ground access vehicles. (underline added)

2.4d. Except for air toxics or where advance written approval has been granted to use an equivalent methodology and computer model by the FAA Office of Environment and Energy, the air quality analyses for aviation emission sources from airport and FAA proposed projects conducted to satisfy NEPA, general conformity, and 49 USC 47106(c) requirements under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (as amended) must be prepared using the most recent EDMS model available at the start of the environmental analysis process. In the event that EDMS is updated after the environmental analysis process is underway, the updated version of EDMS may be used to provide additional disclosure concerning air quality but use is not required. (Underline added)

I. PAGE 46 QUESTIONS

In response to your question, “(#)1 Why are the above cumulative impacts not considered?”:
Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations state that cumulative impacts represent the “...impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over time.” The cumulative impacts assessment, which was prepared in accordance with CEQ regulations and FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1 and Order 5050.4B, is described in the Final EA in Chapter D, *Environmental Consequences*, starting on Page D.40. The cumulative impacts section in the Final EA describes past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects on and adjacent to the Airport that have the potential for cumulative impacts when considered with the Proposed Actions. Cumulative impacts are described in Chapter D, *Environmental Consequences*, starting on Page D.40 of the EA which provides a summary of future on-airport projects, none of which are related to or required by the Proposed Actions.

Off-airport past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects are only related to surface transportation, socioeconomic environment, and noise. The EA only considers the potential cumulative impacts of other projects when combined with the off-airport surface transportation, socioeconomic environment, and noise impacts expected as a result of the Proposed Actions. The EA demonstrates that neither the No Action nor the Proposed Actions would result in any significant adverse impacts at or in the vicinity of Paine Field when considered cumulatively with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects.

Preparation of the Draft EA complied with applicable FAA Orders and guidance implementing NEPA. The orders outline FAA accepted methodologies, methods, models, techniques, and thresholds of significance for the impact assessment and preparation of EA documents based on actions that are “reasonably foreseeable”.

The evaluation of operations or enplanements beyond 2018 would be speculative and not reasonably foreseeable. Not only would aircraft operation numbers be speculative, but the types of aircraft flown, the destinations flown, and the time of day or night those operations could occur would also be speculative. This type of information is necessary for inputs to the models for noise, air, and traffic analysis. An infinite number of possibilities could be imagined, none of which would be based on actions which are reasonably foreseeable. The maximum capacity of the Airport is a theoretical number driven by the type of aircraft, and will vary based on the aircraft fleet mix. In addition, any additional airlines or aircraft types desiring to operate at the Airport would be subject to additional environmental documentation. If the number of passengers exceeded the capacity of the proposed terminal, the terminal would require expansion or a new terminal. Such expansion of the terminal would in turn require modification to the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), which would be another Federal action, triggering NEPA compliance.
As previously noted, in response to comments received, the FAA tasked the County to prepare an analysis to disclose the effects should activity grow and reach the maximum capacity of the proposed terminal. This analysis and its results can be found in Appendix P of the Final EA.

While the list of projects considered reasonably foreseeable has not changed from that presented in the Draft EA, the analysis in the Final EA has been refined to address the comments received, changed years of analysis, changed baseline conditions, and changed operational levels. The Final EA clearly states that based on Federal significance thresholds, there would be no significant cumulative impacts.

*In response to your question, “(#2) Does the 5-year timeline limit the cumulative impact assessment? What would cumulative impacts look like over a more reasonable timeframe, such as 20 years? 30 years?”:*

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

*In response to your comment, “(#3) Please provide the citation, documentation, rationale and precedence for defining potential, reasonable and foreseeable as they relate to NEPA scope requirements”:*

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1a.

6. SOC’s OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

*In response to your request, “(#1) The FAA should immediately order a new Environmental Impact Statement with the inclusion of both new terminals and their REAL maximum capacity.”*

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

*In response to your request, “(#2) The FAA should conduct the scoping process properly, inviting all governmental and non-governmental interested parties.”*

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c and Section 4j, question #1.
In response to your request, “(#3) The impacts of two large terminals in operation 24 hours a day, seven days a week must be studied.”

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Section 1c, Section 4d, question #1, and Section 5h, question #1.

In Response to your request, “(#4) Since the Draft EA failed to properly scope out the impacts of changing the airport role and operating certificate to allow scheduled service, we ask that the “No Action Alternative” be the default alternative until comprehensive full-capacity EIS is completed and compared to alternatives.”

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your request, “(#5) We urge the FAA to reject a flawed minimal assessment that concludes there are no significant impacts in changing the role of Paine Field. The system should not allow incremental “approvals” that, by design, circumvent requirements to mitigate impacts beyond certain thresholds.”

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.

In response to your request, “(#6) We request an EIS with a scope that extends out at least 20 years, and preferably, 30 years. The Draft EA only looks out to 2016 further minimizing the downstream impact analysis. This limited scope skews the entire assessment including but not limited to impacts from air emissions, noise, traffic, parking, water runoff and impacts to children required by Presidential Executive Order.”

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c, Section 5d, questions #1-6 (Air Quality), Section 5f, question #1 (Noise), Section 5k, questions #1-48 (Traffic), Section 5h, question #1 (Parking), Chapter C, Affected Environment page C.21 Water Quality and Chapter D, Environmental Consequences page D.36 Water Quality of the Draft EA (Water Runoff), and Section 5g, question #1 (Impacts to Children).
In response to your request, “(#7) We request an EIS be conducted with a scope that addresses foreseeable potential activity levels resulting from a change in the airport operating certificate to allow commercial service. The public and our region deserve a fair, transparent and honest decision making process, particularly when the decision involves an irreversible regional game changer.”

As noted in prior responses, preparation of the Draft and Final EA were done in accordance with all FAA and CEQ requirements for NEPA compliance. See Sections 1a,b,c.
-----Original Message-----
From: Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov [mailto:Cayla.Morgan@faa.gov]
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2010 3:49 PM
To: Waggoner, Dave; Dolan, Bill; Ryk Dunkelberg; Ryan Hayes
Subject: Fw: Paine Field

Cayla Morgan
Environmental Protection Specialist
Seattle Airports District Office
Federal Aviation Administration
425-227-2653

----- Forwarded by Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA on 02/19/2010 02:49 PM -----

| From: joanD <j.abraham@kte.net>
| To: Cayla Morgan/ANM/FAA@FAA
| Date: 02/05/2010 03:03 PM
| Subject: Paine Field

D.190
I am against opening up Paine Field for more commercial flights. The environmental study was ridiculous, as it did not mention the fumes extra air traffic puts into neighborhoods. Recently a study was done in California that showed an airport around homes has as much plane emission as fleets of trucks. No-one has even mentioned how bad it is to breathe the air that wafts over already. Increasing that would increase problems for the elderly, children and those with lung problems. Also, we live in a sensitive area, right by the water, and we do not need more fuel drop-offs or emissions or airport pollutants.

Thank you for your time,
Joan Douglas
6110 93RD PL SW
Mukilteo, WA 98275
Dear Joan Douglas:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

**General Response 5-6:** Sources of existing air pollution

**General Response 6-1:** Significance of Project Effects

**General Response 9-8:** What are the health and quality of life effects associated with the project?

**General Response 10-2:** Air quality conformity

**General Response 10-4:** Would there be an increase in fuel dump/fuel smell/residue?
From: County Executive [mailto:county.executive@co.snohomish.wa.us]
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2010 5:17 PM
To: Waggoner, Dave; Air Service Comments
Subject: FW: STOP COMMERCIAL AIR AT PAINE FIELD

Amy Ockerlander
Snohomish County Executive Office
3000 Rockefeller, M/S 407
Everett, WA 98201-4046
Phone: 425-388-3090
Fax: 425-388-3434
Email: amy.ockerlander@co.snohomish.wa.us
www.snooco.org

From: dcdmba@aol.com [mailto:dcdmba@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2010 12:32 PM
To: County Executive
Subject: STOP COMMERCIAL AIR AT PAINE FIELD

My husband is a physician and practice owner in Everett. We are residents and an integral part of the Everett community. As such, WE ARE EXTREMELY CONCERNED about the movement to bring commercial airline service to Paine field. Changing the status of Paine Field will have an ADVERSE IMPACT on the entire region. We are urging you to take action to stop commercial air. WE HAVE BEEN VERY DISAPPOINTED IN THE EVERETT ELECTED OFFICIALS TO TAKE ACTION TO PREVENT COMMERCIAL AIR AT PAINE FIELD.

The mayors and City Councils of Brier, Edmonds, Lynwood, Mountlake Terrace, Mukilteo, and Woodway oppose expansion of Paine Field. They campaigned, they know their citizens and the unanimous opposition to commercial service at Paine Field is a reflection of the voters.

It is extremely concerning that our Everett elected officials have chosen to ignore the will of the people and are pushing ahead to support commercial air. Perhaps you think our votes aren't significant but we do urge you to listen!

As a taxpayers and voters, my husband and I as well as my grown daughters who live in the area are concerned that tax stimulus funds will be used to build a terminal at Paine field. It would be totally inappropriate to use stimulus funds for this purpose.

The introduction of commercial air will reduce home values, reduce tax revenues, as well as adversely impact the learning and health environment. There is an important
relationship between government and the people who support government. THE MRD is the agreement that paved the way for rezoning 8000 acres from industrial use to residential. It calls for the County to support Boeing and strongly opposes scheduled air service. EVERY HOMEOWNER WHO BUILT ON PURCHASED PROPERTY SINCE 1978 BELIEVED THE MRD SERVED AS PROTECTION AGAINST COMMERCIAL EXPANSION. The document has been reaffirmed six times. The MRD is a COVENANT BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE AND SHOULD BE HONORED. We would have never moved to this area if we believed commercial air would be introduced!

Local FAA has made false assertions regarding a threat to federal funding. The country and all of our elected officials can strongly discourage and still meet the good faith negotiation.

Paine Field is used by the largest employer in Snohomish County, Boeing. I URGE YOU TO WORK WITH OTHER ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES, THE OTHER CITIES, AND THEIR COUNCILS, TO PROTECT THE REGION AND KEEP PAINE FIELD AS A QUASI EXCLUSIVE RESOURCE FOR BOEING. Urge them to modify the "Centennial Rule" to apply to Paine Field. This will allow for FAA funds to help maintain the airport without the FAA strings. If a similar airport in Colorado could do this without a Boeing manufacturer, then why can't the State of Washington get it done?

We support the promotion of Light Rail to SeaTac. We urge you to support the use of Sea Tac and the increased capacity of the Third runway so the port can cost effectively retire that public debt.

Commercial flight will be the deathnell to the health of our children, to the quality of life, and to the residential tax base in this area.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

D. Chris Douglas, M.B.A.
Chief Executive Officer
Overlake Internal Medicine Associates
1407 - 116th Ave. N.E.
Suite #117
Bellevue, WA 98004-3819

Phone: (425) 974-7601
Fax: (425) 990-5261
Pager: (425) 973-6253
e-mail: dcdmba@aol.com
Dear Chris D. Douglas:

Thank you for your comments to Snohomish County and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Response 1-1:</th>
<th>Why can't the County limit or restrict operations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Response 1-2:</td>
<td>What is the Centennial rule? Does it apply here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Response 1-6:</td>
<td>What are the FAA and County roles in this EA and has a decision been made to move forward?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Response 1-16:</td>
<td>How will the proposal be funded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Response 2-1:</td>
<td>MRD document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Response 4-4:</td>
<td>Relationship between capacity at other airports and Paine Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Response 9-1:</td>
<td>What is the impact upon property values?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Response 9-4:</td>
<td>E.O. 13045 Children's Health and Safety impact analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Response 9-8:</td>
<td>What are the health and quality of life effects associated with the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello,

My wife and I live in the Harbour Pointe area of Mukilteo and want to voice our complete disappointment with the draft environmental assessment about the impact of commercial air traffic at Paine Field.

There are a number of significant deficiencies with the assessment:

- It did not use currently approved and accepted statistical models and techniques
- It did not use current environmental data for the area
- Sound impacts were based upon averages over a 24 hour period and only within a very small noise contour surrounding the airport.
- Actual noise decibel measurements during take offs and landings were not measured within a 5 mile radius of the airport. Actual noise is what is disruptive.
- Endangered species were not accurately assessed, such as the Spotted Owl.

I urge the FAA and Snohomish County to order a new environmental assessment that uses current data and statistical models in order to get an accurate evaluation. The assessment completely ignores the impact to house values; the very tax base Snohomish County has coveted and encouraged to grow over the last 30 years. There is not one example anywhere in the United States where an airport expansion did not significantly decrease home property values (anywhere from 15% to 25%).

In 2007, the Congressional Research Service compiled a report for congress and the FAA titled Environmental Impacts of Airport Operations, Maintenance, and Expansion. While the report tries to help with mitigation of issues, one of its key conclusions was, "Aviation noise may have a negative impact on the quality of life and property values of members of a surrounding community."

In 1994, the consulting firm of Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc. was commissioned by the Federal Aviation Administration to prepare a study entitled, The Effect of Airport Noise on Housing Values: A Summary Report. Clearly, the FAA was concerned about this matter. The study developed a methodology for evaluating the impact of noise on housing values, by comparing market prices in similar neighborhoods that differed only in the level of airport related noise. The study found that the effect of noise on prices was highest in moderately priced and expensive neighborhoods. For two moderately priced "paired" neighborhoods north of LAX, the study found "an average 18.6 percent higher property value in the quiet neighborhood, or 1.33 percent per dB of additional quiet."

A 1996 study, funded by a grant from the Legislature of the State of Washington, used somewhat similar methodology and found that the proposed expansion of Seattle-Tacoma Airport would cost five nearby cities $500 million in property values and $22 million in real-estate tax revenue. The study of single family homes in "very good" condition, with "three or more bedrooms and two or more baths" and "excluding the most expensive and inexpensive units to provide more representative comparisons" found that "a housing unit in the immediate vicinity of the airport would sell for 10.1 percent more---if it were located elsewhere." The study also concluded that, "all other things remaining equal, the value of a house and lot increases by about 3.4% for every quarter of a mile the house is farther away from being directly underneath the flight track of
departs/approaching jet aircraft".

A study was conducted by Bell & Associates, Inc. of Santa Monica and Laguna Niguel, in 1994 regarding the effect of airport operations on surrounding home values. In all, 190 sales comparables were studied. The results of this paired-sales analysis are summarized on Exhibit 5 of the report. This study indicates that airport proximity **consistently has a negative impact on value**. This market data indicates that single family residences located in proximity to an airport are worth less than an otherwise similar property that is not located by an airport. This **impact on value ranges from -15.1% to -42.6% and averages -27.4%**.

The largest study of health impacts at airports was carried out for the Dutch government and published in 1999. It is called "Public health impact of large airports". It looked at the range of health impacts, including noise and air pollution. "The committee concludes that there is **sufficient evidence that episodes of air pollution with levels observed within an airport operations system cause short-term effects like an increased mortality rate and an increased frequency of hospital admissions due to acute respiratory and cardiovascular morbidity. A decrease in pulmonary function is also one of the acute effects for which the committee considers there to be sufficient evidence.**"

Airport expansion to commercial flights is only desired by a small percentage of county residents along with commercial property land owners. The cities of Mukilteo, Mill Creek, Edmonds and Lynnwood (and the majority of their residents) are completely opposed to airport expansion. We do not want or need the type of economic impact linked to airports.

Respectfully,

Tom and Jeannie Dowd
12819 52nd Place West
Mukilteo, WA 98275
Dear Tom & Jeannie Dowd:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

General Response 1-8: Adequacy of FAA guidance and use of FAA guidance
General Response 1-13: Additional study should be conducted
General Response 6-4: What are the quality of life impacts?
General Response 7-1: Use of DNL
General Response 7-2: Noise Measurements and Supplemental Metrics requested
General Response 9-1: What is the impact upon property values?
General Response 9-8: What are the health and quality of life effects associated with the project?
General Response 11-1: What is the impact on wildlife?

Please also refer to the following individual response.

Current Environmental Data:

In response to comments regarding the use of current environmental data, the Environmental Assessment (EA) uses the best available data for the analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed Federal actions. All the dates and information sources are identified within the EA.
Paine Field airport has been a Snohomish County property and business group for decades. The introduction of air service to the airport will be detrimental to the citizens that live in its airspace. For years local communities have been building their schools, housing communities and parks near this airstrip, knowing that no major commercial air service would take place. Currently, there is a noise ordinance at the airport from 10 PM — 7 AM where planes and businesses on the airport grounds need to be quiet. Planes still can take off, but it means with air service there will be more noise from planes being repaired and preparing for early morning flights. Currently, Mukilteo on the west side of the airport has a nice barrier of trees protecting it from a vast amount of airport noise. Each year more trees are removed and more commercialization comes in. Eventually, our sound barrier will be gone and we will have constant noise from plane traffic. Children trying to sleep on a school night, children sitting in their classrooms during the day trying to learn, people sitting in their backyards trying to enjoy a peaceful day, church services and people playing in our parks will be drowned out my the constant moan of airplanes taking off and landing. This would not be good for the community. Property values would go down in NW Everett, Mukilteo and Lynnwood. Taxes would go up to fill the gaps for lower assessed values and the quality of living would be diminished.

It is more discouraging to know after this initial EIS is done that more air service could come to town without a further EIS. All assumptions are being made based on 4 flights a day and no 30 plus. Twenty years ago when the 3rd runway was being battled in Seattle it was the need for the future and the current Washington State Transportation session that was completed last year stated their wasn’t a need to expand air service in the state till 2050. More words on paper for bureaucrats and more frustrations of citizens who actually live around these airports to read about on how their lives can change when new commercial airplanes invade their homes. The state spent thousands for this study and it should be included in this EIS. Millions were spent on the 3rd runway in Seattle to alleviate the airport and its only being partially used. Lets give it a chance to work before opening up yet another airport for commercial service for the need for the future.
Dear Joe & Sharon Dremiller:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

General Response 1-10: Scope of the EA analysis for future operations and passengers
General Response 1-13: Additional study should be conducted
General Response 2-1: MRD document
General Response 3-14: What actions will require additional environmental review?
General Response 4-2: What is the relationship of the Proposed Project to WSDOT's Long-Term Air Transportation Study (LATS)
General Response 4-4: Relationship between capacity at other airports and Paine Field
General Response 5-1: Existing aircraft noise concerns
General Response 5-2: Current curfew is broken
General Response 9-1: What is the impact upon property values?
Dear Cayla Morgan and Dave Waggoner,

I recently moved from St. Louis to Seattle and bought a home in Mukilteo. I investigated Paine field before buying the house and felt my proximity to the airport given the nature of it wouldn't be a problem. I however don't support increased activities at the airport. In searching for a house I chose against houses near SEATAC and Boeing field just because of the airport activity.

I think a decision like this should be made by those affected, local residents and not by those who will benefit from it. This is not unlike the New London Connecticut eminent domain issue where the government favors one private party over another. Seattle government is spending billions to expand light rail to provide easy access to SEATAC. Why are we spending money on light rail if we also need to expand service at Paine Field. SEATAC is located away from Seattle for a reason, because no one wants the air traffic close by. It makes sense to consolidate the impact to one area. St. Louis decimated a local city Bridgeton to expand Lambert Field. Paine Field should remain just as it is and not be expanded to a SEATAC North.

A full Environmental impact study should be done before this plan moves forward.

Steven Dunsford
Dear Steven Dunsford:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA, Snohomish County, and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

**General Response 1-6:** What are the FAA and County roles in this EA and has a decision been made to move forward?

**General Response 1-13:** Additional study should be conducted

**General Response 1-15:** EA did not reflect the opposition of the community

**General Response 4-4:** Relationship between capacity at other airports and Paine Field

**General Response 4-5:** Other modes of transportation may be better alternatives

**General Response 6-1:** Significance of Project Effects

**General Response 6-4:** What are the quality of life impacts?
From: County Executive [mailto:county.executive@co.snohomish.wa.us]
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2010 12:27 PM
To: Waggoner, Dave; Air Service Comments
Subject: FW: Paire Field Expansion

Amy Ockerlander
Executive Analyst
Snohomish County Executive Office
3000 Rockefeller, M/S 407
Everett, WA 98201-4046
Dir. Phone: 425-388-3090
Main Phone: 425-388-3460
Fax: 425-388-3434
Email: amy.ockerlander@snoco.org
www.snoco.org

From: Deborah Knutson [mailto:DKnutson@snoedc.org]
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2010 5:14 PM
To: Steven Dunsford; County Executive; webhelp@everettclinic.com
Subject: RE: Paire Field Expansion

Hello Mr. Dunsford,
Thank you for your e-mail. I appreciate the issues you have raised and encourage you to submit
your letter directly to Ms Cayla Morgan. Her contact information is in the attachment which also
includes information on the next public hearing scheduled for January 21. The FAA will be
collected written comments for review.

Thanks again for your comments
Deborah Knutson

Deborah Knutson
Economic Development Council of Snohomish County
(425) 248-4211

From: Steven Dunsford [mailto:steven.dunsford@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 10, 2010 2:20 PM
To: Deborah Knutson; County.executive@co.snohomish.wa.us; webhelp@everettclinic.com
Subject: Fwd: Paire Field Expansion

Dear Cayla Morgan, Richard Cooper and Aaron Reardon,

I recently moved from St. Louis to Seattle and bought a home in Mukilteo. I investigated
Paine field before buying the house and felt my proximity to the airport given the nature
of it wouldn't be a problem. I however don't support increased activities at the airport. In
searching for a house I chose against houses near SEATAC and Boeing field just because of the airport activity. I chose to live in Snohomish County because it was away from that activity.

I think a decision like this should be made by those affected, local residents and not by those who will benefit from it. This is not unlike the New London Connecticut eminent domain issue where the government favors one private party over another. Seattle government is spending billions to expand light rail to provide easy access to SEATAC. Why are we spending money on light rail if we also need to expand service at Paine Field. SEATAC is located away from Seattle for a reason, because no one wants the air traffic close by. It makes sense to consolidate the impact to one area. St. Louis decimated a local city Bridgeton to expand Lambert Field. Paine Field should remain just as it is and not be expanded to a SEATAC North.

Increasing airport activity will spoil the very community you are purportedly here to serve. You should use good judgement on this. There are more desirable types of commercial enterprise to expand.

A full Environmental impact study should be done before this plan moves forward.

Steven Dunsford
Media Advisory – Dec. 29, 2009
Contact: Christopher Schwarzen
Office: 425-388-3883
Email: Christopher.Schwarzen@snoco.org

FAA agrees to third public hearing on commercial air

The Federal Aviation Administration agreed Tuesday to schedule a third public hearing to accept comments on the draft environmental assessment pertaining to two proposals to initiate commercial air at Snohomish County’s Paine Field Airport.

The public hearing will be held Jan. 21, 2010, at the Lynnwood Convention Center. The format for the Jan. 21 public hearing will be similar to those being held Jan. 4 and Jan. 5, and will begin at 6 p.m.

Public meetings scheduled for 6 p.m. Monday, Jan. 4, 2010, at Meadowdale High School in Lynnwood, and 6 p.m. Tuesday, Jan. 5, 2010, at the Snohomish County PUD Auditorium in Everett, have not been changed.

The public comment period also will be extended until Feb. 5, 2010. The draft environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act was released Dec. 4 and the deadline for comments was initially Jan. 15, 2010, before being changed in mid-December to Jan. 29.

The draft environmental assessment is available for review at the Paine Field Airport office, in local public libraries, on the Paine Field Web site www.painefield.com/airserviceeaa.html, and at www.snoco.org/departments/airport.

Comments can be submitted in person during the three scheduled public meetings. Comments also may be submitted by e-mail to cayla.morgan@faa.gov or airserviceeacments@snoco.org.

Comments sent by mail should be addressed to:

- Cayla Morgan, Environmental Protection Specialist, Seattle Airports District Office, Federal Aviation Administration, 1601 Lind Avenue S.W., Renton, WA 98057-3556.

- Dave Waggoner, Director, Snohomish County Airport, 3220 100th Street S.W., Suite A, Everett, WA 98204.

The environmental review was conducted in response to two requests to begin commercial air service at Paine Field received by Snohomish County in 2008. Although Snohomish County Executive Aaron Reardon and some County Council members have said they do not support commercial air service at Paine Field, federal law obligates the county to accommodate commercial service.
Federal law does not allow the county to prohibit or limit scheduled passenger air service. Instead, it requires that the county negotiate with the airlines in good faith to accommodate their proposed service.

Horizon Airlines has indicated it wants to operate four times a day to Portland and twice per day to Spokane, using 75-seat Bombardier Q400 turboprop airplanes on both routes. Allegiant has said it plans to operate twice a week to Las Vegas, using 150-seat MD83 jet aircraft.

Before airlines may begin commercial service, the FAA must amend the county’s operating certificate for Paine Field as well as the airlines’ operating specifications. The county was required to prepare the environmental assessment for FAA approval before those amendments can occur. The preparation of the environmental assessment was funded by an FAA grant and by the time reviews are finished is expected to have cost more than $450,000.

###
Response to Comment

Dear Steven Dunsford:

Thank you for your comments to Snohomish County; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

**General Response 1-6:** What are the FAA and County roles in this EA and has a decision been made to move forward?

**General Response 1-13:** Additional study should be conducted

**General Response 1-15:** EA did not reflect the opposition of the community

**General Response 4-4:** Relationship between capacity at other airports and Paine Field

**General Response 4-5:** Other modes of transportation may be better alternatives

**General Response 6-1:** Significance of Project Effects

**General Response 6-4:** What are the quality of life impacts?
January 28, 2010

Dear Ms. Morgan,

I am insulted by the recent Environmental Assessment regarding converting Paine Field from a Class IV to a Class I airport. The assessment does not adequately or responsibly identify the known potential impacts. The assessment is inadequate and dishonest in its scope.

I am disgusted by the apparent corruption in regards to this matter. The FAA and Dave Waggoner appear to have an agenda all their own, while ignoring the very serious and devastating impacts commercial flights at Paine Field will have on our community.

It is unconscionable to change the classification of Paine Field considering the fact that the surrounding communities were built on the assumption that Paine Field would continue to be an airport used for general aviation and usage by the Boeing company.

The 37,000 + children who live in this community and attend elementary school, middle school, high school, day care and preschool deserve to breathe the cleanest air possible. They deserve a quality learning environment where teachers don’t have to suspend lessons while waiting for aircraft noise to subside. They need us to stand up to this nonsense on their behalf.

As a resident and taxpayer in Snohomish County, I am OPPOSED to commercial air service at Paine Field, and OPPOSED to any tax dollars, stimulus or otherwise, being spent on any improvements or expansion of Paine Field that are related to commercial air service.

Sincerely,
Kimberly Dwan
13814 60th Ave W
Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Kimberly Dwan:

Thank you for your comments to the FAA, Snohomish County, and Paine Field Airport; they have been noted. Please refer to the following general responses (see Appendix S) that apply to your comments.

**General Response 1-6:** What are the FAA and County roles in this EA and has a decision been made to move forward?

**General Response 1-11:** Flawed/inadequate/biased EA

**General Response 2-2:** Boeing reaction to the Proposed Project and effect of the Project on Boeing

**General Response 3-13:** What is a Class I Airport? Explanation of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 139

**General Response 7-7:** Noise impacts on schools
PAINE FIELD ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
GENERAL RESPONSES

ISSUE 1, STUDY PROCESS

1-1 Why can’t the County limit or restrict operations?

Comments stated that the County should limit or restrict commercial operations. Other comments expressed concern that once commercial operations are allowed that there will be no limit to those operations. The County is not allowed to limit or restrict operations at the Airport, because it is a public use airport that has accepted federal funding, which requires certain assurances. In accepting federal funding, the County has agreed to comply with 39 specific grant assurances. These assurances require that the County, among other things, must “make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the Airport.” (Grant Assurance 22(a)).

The U.S. government deregulated the airline industry with Public Law 95-504, known as the “Airline Deregulation Act of 1978.” Since the deregulation of the airline industry in 1978, certificated U.S. air carriers are free to fly routes of their choice and serve airports of their choice. Airports that are composed of surplus federal property and/or receive federal funding are considered public use airports, and must be made available for use on a reasonable basis when a carrier seeks to start service. A consequence of that Act allowed airlines unrestricted choice as to which airports they serve. Other than to ensure safety, neither the Airport Sponsor (Snohomish County) nor the Federal government controls where, when, and how airlines provide service. Operators of public use airports, such as Paine Field, cannot deny access to an airline if the aircraft they propose to use can safely operate at that facility. Consistent with its grant assurance obligations, Snohomish County has been negotiating in good faith with Horizon Air and Allegiant Air to accommodate proposed passenger service at Paine Field.

If the FAA were to find the Airport in non-compliance with its grant assurances, the consequences could include the suspension of grant funding, loss of the Part 139 Certificate, and the County could be required to pay back historical grant funding. The requirements of Grant Assurance 22a are similar to the requirements of the quitclaim deed for airport property from the Federal government to Snohomish County. Deed covenants require that the land be used for public airport purposes for the use and benefit of the public, without unjust discrimination or granting of exclusive rights. If Snohomish County does not meet these deed requirements, if portions of the Airport are transferred for non-airport purposes, or if the entire property ceases to be used as an airport, the property may revert back to the Federal government at their option.¹ See General Response 1-4 on grant funding and grant assurances, and General Response 3-15 on what actions would require additional environmental review.

¹ Quitclaim Deed, Book 889859, Volume 421, Pages 449-467.
1-2 What is the Centennial rule? Does it apply here?

Some comments recommended invoking the Centennial Rule at Paine Field to enable the County to reject the commercial service request at Paine Field. The Centennial Rule, Title 49 U.S. Code (USC) 47107 (q) and (r), provides an exception test under which a general aviation airport can prohibit scheduled air passenger service yet otherwise remain “in compliance” and qualify for federal funding under FAA rules. Specifically, the rule states:

“Notwithstanding any written assurances prescribed in subsections (a) through (p), a general aviation airport with more than 300,000 annual operations may be exempt from having to accept scheduled passenger air carrier service, provided that the following conditions are met: (1) No scheduled passenger air carrier has provided service at the airport within 5 years prior to January 1, 2002.

(2) The airport is located within or underneath the Class B airspace of an airport that maintains an airport operating certificate pursuant to section 44706 of title 49. (3) The certificated airport operating under section 44706 of title 49 does not contribute to significant passenger delays as defined by DOT/FAA in the ‘Airport Capacity Benchmark Report 2001’. (r) An airport that meets the conditions of subsections (q)(1) through (3) is not subject to section 47524 of title 49 with respect to a prohibition on all scheduled passenger service.”

Paine Field does not meet the primary requirement of the Centennial Rule to be a general aviation airport with more than 300,000 annual operations. Paine Field accommodated approximately 143,722 annual operations in 2008, 114,784 in 2010 and the Final EA only forecasts 122,127 annual operations by 2018. Therefore, the Centennial Rule does not apply to Paine Field.

1-3 An independent investigation is needed because the FAA pushed the County to approve the terminal

Comments suggested that the FAA pushed Snohomish County to support construction of a terminal, thus an independent investigation should be completed. Both the FAA and Snohomish County have followed all applicable rules and regulations in responding to the requests from the airlines to initiate commercial passenger service at Paine Field. The FAA has taken the appropriate actions related to the approval process for all Federal actions. The referenced communications reflect the parties seeking clarity concerning the requirements of the grant assurances, as well as the Federal agency steps and requirements in approving the Federal actions. Snohomish County has been and continues to negotiate in good faith with the air carriers in accordance with those requirements.

The FAA is not requiring, nor do they have the power to require, Snohomish County to change existing land use, existing zoning, or future planned land use to allow Paine Field to be served by the air carriers.
1-4 The County should no longer seek FAA funds

Some comments were received stating that no additional taxpayer money or FAA grants should be given to Snohomish County for Paine Field and that the County should pay back funds already received from the FAA.

Even if Snohomish County were to no longer take any FAA grants for Paine Field, the County would still be obligated due to the tens of millions of dollars already received in FAA grant funding. The County would also have to pay FAA back for any funds received in the past. The County does not believe that it is feasible or prudent to pay the FAA back because the County would then be responsible for the on-going operation of the Airport. The County would likely have to significantly increase fees charged to tenants or would have to obtain other County funding (derived from taxpayers), which is not considered prudent in today’s economic climate. See also General Response 1-1.

1-5 Mitigation

Comments received concerning mitigation were varied. Some comments mentioned the need for mitigation for anticipated environmental impacts associated with the Airport and the proposed actions/projects. Other comments questioned what roadway traffic, noise, and air quality mitigation would be required as a result of the proposed actions and who would be responsible for that mitigation.

Mitigation is only required for actions where the project-related effects would exceed the Federally defined thresholds of significance (see also General Response 6-1). As is noted, the proposed actions and their associated projects are not expected to produce impacts that would exceed the Federal thresholds and thus, compensatory mitigation is not required for the proposed actions at Paine Field.

Even though actions may not exceed defined thresholds, the County and airport users undertake best management practices (BMPs) to regularly reduce the effects of the Airport on the surrounding community, such as noise abatement measures and emission reduction actions. These actions are funded by the County or the tenants. These are referred to as BMPs as they are not mandated because of an exceedance of a federal threshold.

For traffic mitigation, the only required mitigation identified in the EA is traffic mitigation fees, which are a local requirement. Implementation of the proposed actions and associated projects will require contributing local mitigation fees to the two WSDOT intersections to aid in funding improvements to the I-5/128th Street SW interchange, per the interlocal agreement and WSDOT comments. Traffic mitigation fee payments to the WSDOT and the City of Mukilteo would mitigate the project’s impacts to the intersection of SR-525 at 84th Avenue NE by allowing the signal timing of the intersection to be optimized, which is anticipated to allow the intersection to operate at an acceptable level of service.

Under the Washington State Growth Management Act, state and local communities can impose impact fees based on new surface traffic that a project is expected to generate. Appendix F,
Traffic Impact Analysis notes that impact fees would be required based on the passengers that would be served at the Airport and their use of area roadways and local intersections. The traffic impact fees that would be paid by the Airport to Snohomish County, WSDOT, and the City of Mukilteo for the proposed actions have been calculated at approximately $333,262.85.

In regards to noise mitigation, the federal threshold for significance is 65 DNL. As stated on Page D.21 of the EA, there are no noise sensitive land uses within the 65 DNL noise contour or greater. Therefore, no noise mitigation is required. See General Response 7-1.

In response to comments about air quality mitigation, Snohomish County is in attainment for all pollutants as defined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This means, that while past pollutant levels in parts of the county may have exceeded standards, currently the standards are being attained. The area retains a maintenance designation for carbon monoxide due to exceedances during winter months of the standard during mid-1980s and conditions in 1992.

As the proposed actions would generate emissions less than de-minimis, mitigation would not be required. However, Snohomish County notes that it continues to work with its existing and future tenants to reduce emissions and implement best management practices. The County will investigate participation in the FAA’s Voluntary Airport Low Emission (VALE) grant program to reduce pollutant emissions from its fleet vehicles and those of its tenants. These programs (such as participation in the VALE program) are voluntary and not related to the proposed actions; no mitigation is required from the proposed actions. See General Response 10-2.

1-6 What are the FAA and County roles in this EA and has a decision been made to move forward?

Some comments requested clarification of the role of the FAA and the County in the EA process and the environmental decision making process. Also, some comments suggested that the decision to move forward with the proposed federal actions has already been made.

The FAA is the agency responsible for meeting the requirements of NEPA for federal actions related to the airport. Because the federal actions were not eligible for a categorical exclusion, the FAA required the preparation of an EA to determine if the action would produce significant adverse effects. Both the FAA and County have been involved in this EA process from the beginning of scope development.

In the case of actions subject to EAs, FAA guidance enables the FAA to delegate responsibility for preparing the Draft EA to the Airport Sponsor. As such, Snohomish County’s role in this EA process is to prepare the environmental documentation (either the County itself or, in this case, through the use of consultants - See General Response 1-10) for the proposed Federal actions at Paine Field and submit the Draft EA to the FAA. FAA typically provides funding assistance through the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) to Airport Sponsors to complete NEPA documentation. Ultimately, the FAA must accept and sign the EA for it to become a Federal document used in the decision making process.
As of the preparation of the Draft EA and response to comments, the decision to approve the federal actions has not yet been made and cannot be made prior to an official environmental finding based on the Final EA. Following receipt of the Final EA from the Airport Sponsor, the responsible FAA official (See General Response 1-7) reviews the EA, the public comments, the expected impacts, the proposed mitigation, and then makes a decision. The FAA will either decide that the anticipated environmental impacts are not significant, or have been adequately mitigated where appropriate, and issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Record of Decision (ROD). Alternatively, the FAA will decide that the anticipated environmental impacts are significant and recommend the preparation of an EIS.

1-7 Who will make the final environmental determination?

Some comments asked who would make the environmental determination on the proposed actions. The approving official is the FAA Regional Administrator, Northwest Mountain Region.

1-8 Adequacy of FAA guidance and use of FAA guidance

Some comments questioned FAA’s implementation of and compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as well as analysis methodologies used in the EA. Some comments stated that the EA was biased toward the FAA, and that there was insufficient detail in the EA.

The FAA has the authority and responsibility, consistent with NEPA and CEQ, to prepare and issue guidance for the preparation of environmental documents addressing FAA actions. The FAA has published such guidance and Airport Sponsors are required to follow that guidance when preparing EA’s.

Preparation of the Draft EA followed the policies, procedures, and guidelines as outlined in FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures and Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions. These orders outline FAA accepted methodologies, methods, models, techniques, and thresholds of significance for the impact assessment and preparation of EA documents. The EA was prepared in compliance with NEPA, and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations. All environmental documents prepared under FAA oversight follow and adhere to these same Orders, setting national standards for the preparation of environmental documentation.

1-9 Roles of consultant and their qualifications

Some comments questioned the role of the consultant in the Environmental Assessment (EA) process and the qualifications/potential for bias of the consultant to complete NEPA analysis. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) often delegates the preparation of Environmental Assessments (EAs) to the Airport Sponsor for projects involving federal actions. Snohomish County, as the Airport Sponsor, retained a third-party, independent consultant to prepare the Draft EA. The third-party consultant was retained using the County procurement process. The
process also complied with FAA requirements which ensure a competitive selection is undertaken. Barnard Dunkelberg & Company was selected.

Compliance with NEPA is not voluntary and it is the FAA’s obligation to ensure that the analysis is done correctly before accepting the EA as a Federal document. Barnard Dunkelberg & Company has no financial interest in whether or not a project is constructed or initiated. Therefore, there is not potential for a conflict of interest. For information on the FAA and County roles, see also General Response 1-6.

1-10 Scope of the EA analysis for future operations and passengers

Some comments received on the Draft EA stated that the scope of the EA should be broader in terms of the level of operations analyzed and more long-term in nature, believing that once commercial service was initiated at the Airport, that the airlines would choose to operate many more flights and enplane many more passengers than what was projected in the Draft EA. A majority of the comments questioned the projected numbers of operations and passengers used in the analysis, indicating that they were too low.

Preparation of the Draft EA complied with applicable FAA Orders and guidance implementing NEPA (see General Response 1-8). The orders outline FAA accepted methodologies, methods, models, techniques, and thresholds of significance for the impact assessment and preparation of EA documents based on actions that are “reasonably foreseeable”. The FAA does not believe that it is reasonably foreseeable that activity levels will be higher than those projected by the airlines (Appendix A). Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA require that documents address impacts that are “reasonably foreseeable.” FAA Order 5050.4B Paragraph 9q defines reasonably foreseeable as:

“An action on or off-airport that a proponent would likely complete and that has been developed with enough specificity to provide meaningful information to a decision maker and the interested public. Use the following table to help determine if an action is reasonably foreseeable.”

(footnote 4: Paragraph 905.c(1) and (2) provide definitions of “connected actions” and “similar actions,” respectively)

The evaluation of operations or enplanements beyond 2018 would be speculative and not reasonably foreseeable. Not only would aircraft operation numbers be speculative, but the types of aircraft flown, the destinations flown, and the time of day or night those operations could occur would also be speculative. An infinite number of possibilities could be imagined, none of which would be based on actions which are reasonably foreseeable. This is especially true in response to the comment requesting that the maximum capacity of the Airport be evaluated. The maximum capacity of the Airport is a theoretical number driven by the type of aircraft, and will vary based on the aircraft fleet mix. In addition, any additional airlines or aircraft types desiring to operate at the Airport would be subject to additional environmental documentation. If the number of passengers exceeded the capacity of the proposed terminal; the terminal would require expansion or a new terminal. Such expansion of the terminal would in turn require modification to the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), which would be another Federal action, triggering NEPA compliance. For more information on what actions would require additional environmental review, please see General Response 3-15.
However, in response to these public comments, the FAA tasked the County to prepare an analysis to disclose the effects should activity grow and reach the **maximum capacity of the proposed terminal**. The FAA determined that the terminal is the limiting factor, so the maximum capacity of the modular terminal was examined as a theoretical scenario. This additional analysis was prepared for disclosure purposes to respond to comments about activity levels either above that identified by the airlines or outside the time period which the FAA believes is reasonably foreseeable. See also General Response 3-12. This analysis evaluated the Hirsh Report, Terminal Capacity Estimates (Draft and Final EA Appendix K) which reflect a theoretical activity level of the maximum capacity of the proposed terminal in terms of the maximum number of enplanements that could be accommodated and the resultant number of aircraft operations utilizing the proposed aircraft types. This analysis and its results can be found in Appendix P of the Final EA. For more information on methods, scope and impact analysis, please see General Responses 1-8 and 1-12.

### 1-11 Flawed/inadequate/biased EA

Some comments indicated that the EA was flawed and inadequate in its analysis of environmental impacts of the Airport or the proposed actions and its associated projects.

The FAA and County believe that the EA provides an appropriate assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed actions both for existing conditions and under reasonably foreseeable conditions in accordance with all FAA Orders and guidance (General Response 1-8) and the requirements of NEPA. During the preparation of the EA, the most up-to-date models were used in all modeling exercises, per FAA Orders. FAA policy is that the same model will be used throughout the preparation of an EA even if a new model is available. However, based on public comments, the air quality analysis in the Final EA was updated with the most recent version of the model. The EA addresses the potential impacts of the proposed actions based on reasonably foreseeable conditions compared to the thresholds of significance outlined in the FAA Orders and described in General Response 6-2. The development of the EA and its conclusions take a critical look at the potential impacts that could occur if the proposed actions are implemented, as required under the NEPA. For more information on the scope and analysis within the EA, please see General Responses 1-8, and 6-1.

### 1-12 Adequacy of public involvement and release of the Draft EA and Public Hearings

Some comments questioned the adequacy of public involvement in the EA process including both the public review of the draft EA document and the public hearing arrangements. Some comments related to the timing for the release of the Draft EA, with some suggesting that the release near the holidays and perceived lack of notification was deliberate in an effort to reduce the level of public involvement. Also, comments were received noting the lack of space in the third public hearing in Mukilteo, stating that it was poorly planned and limited the ability to hear commenters.

FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1, paragraph 208.a states that:

> NEPA and the CEQ regulations, in describing the public involvement process, require Federal agencies to: consider environmental information in their decision making process; obtain
information from the public regarding environmental concerns surrounding an agency’s proposed action; fully assess and disclose potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed action and alternatives; and provide the public with this information and allow it to comment on these findings.

The Draft EA was published with electronic versions of the entire EA placed on the County’s website and hard copies available for review and comment at the following locations:

- Snohomish County Planning and Development Services Customer Support Center,
- Snohomish County Airport administrative office, and
- Seven local libraries.

Public involvement for this EA provided more public hearings than is typical for a FAA EA. Snohomish County ultimately conducted three public hearings. Each hearing included an open house to enable the public to discuss the actions/project with the County, the FAA and consultant staff, followed by a presentation, and a formal comment forum. Notices for the three public hearings were run in the Everett Daily Herald, the Mukilteo Beacon, and Mukilteo Tribune. In addition, notices of the hearings were posted at the local libraries where the EA was available, as well as on the County website.

The Draft EA was released as soon as it was complete and was not timed to occur during the holidays. Originally two hearings were scheduled for January 4th and 5th. Some early comments requested that additional public hearings be added not so close to the holidays, allowing people an opportunity to review the document and be available. Both the FAA and the County were responsive to these comments, and adjustments in scheduling and access were made. A third hearing was added on January 21, 2010 to enable those people who could not attend the first hearing dates (January 4th and 5th) to attend a hearing.

In addition to requests regarding an additional hearing date, requests were made to extend the comment period. The initial end of the comment period was January 15, 2010. This comment period was initially extended to January 29, 2010. Then, when a third hearing date was added, the comment period was extended to February 5, 2010. Although the FAA generally only has one public hearing on an EA, the County felt that additional hearings were reasonable due to the public interest in the proposed actions.

All of the hearings were held starting at 6 p.m. to allow adequate time for the open houses, the hearing presentations, and verbal testimony, while balancing the fact that many people get off work around 5 p.m. The general process and procedures for the hearings allowed each person to accept one speaking card that equated to an initial allotment of three minutes for public testimony. Three minutes is the generally allowed length of comment time used at Snohomish County public meetings. If, after those three minutes were finished, a commenter wished to make additional comments, they were invited to submit additional verbal comments after all other people who wished to give testimony had received their first opportunity to speak. Or the person was invited to submit their additional comments in writing either at the hearing or by mailing or emailing their additional comments to the contact addresses. This process ensured that everyone who wished to provide verbal testimony would have a chance to speak without any one person monopolizing the entirety of the hearing. Due to the large number of commenters,
some people did not get a chance to orally finish the entirety of their comments. Recognizing that this was frustrating, the agencies hope that the commenters took the opportunity to submit the remainder of their comments in writing.

In regards to the stated inadequacies of the Mukilteo public hearing site, the FAA and the County worked with local authorities when trying to find a site in Mukilteo as was requested by a number of early commenters. The Kamiak High School in Mukilteo was found to offer the most room for a public hearing. There was no way for the agencies to determine the exact count of those in attendance prior to the night of the public hearing. Although some people were not able to attend, the same options to submit written comments were available to all interested individuals.

1-13 Additional study should be conducted

Some comments requested additional study and some comments specifically requested that the FAA prepare an EIS. Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations and FAA guidance require the preparation of and EISs for certain actions or in cases where an EA has shown significant adverse impacts.

As described in General Response 1-6, the FAA will review the Final EA, expected impacts, and proposed mitigation. If the impacts exceed the significance thresholds for any affected resource, the FAA may then recommend the preparation of an EIS. Should the impacts not exceed the significance thresholds for any affected resources; the FAA may prepare a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Record of Decision (ROD). Please see General Responses 1-8, 1-11, and 1-12 regarding additional information on EA preparation guidance, scope of the EA, and comments on the analysis contained within the EA.

The Draft EA for the proposed actions and projects showed that there would be no significant unresolved project-related effects. Therefore, while an EIS for the proposed actions is not warranted, in response to comments requesting additional study for higher activity levels, the FAA asked the Consultants to prepare additional analysis for the maximum capacity of the proposed terminal. While the FAA does not believe this activity level scenario is reasonably foreseeable, it has been included in response to comments for disclosure purposes (See General Response 1-11).

1-14 What is the role of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and why is it not mentioned in EA?

Some comments asked why there was no discussion of the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) analysis in the NEPA EA. Other comments questioned when SEPA compliance would be undertaken.
Certain actions by Airport Sponsors located in Washington must comply with SEPA. Similar to FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1 and Order 5050.4B, the Department Ecology has issued guidance on compliance with SEPA, titled “SEPA Handbook”. Snohomish County is responsible for SEPA compliance.

The County and FAA recognize that SEPA compliance is required. While the approach to the SEPA process has not been finalized, the County may adopt the NEPA document for purposes of meeting SEPA requirements in accordance with Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-610. Thus, to preserve this option, the FAA and the County agreed to complete the NEPA process first and to then begin the SEPA process. The County will comply with SEPA and will provide public notice in compliance with the SEPA process.

**1-15 **EA did not reflect the opposition of the community

Some comments stated that the EA did not reflect the opposition of the community to the proposed actions. Other comments asked what the role of community support was in the EA.

The Draft EA did not discuss community support or opposition to the proposed actions. The public hearings and comment period provided opportunity for the community to comment upon the proposed actions and projects. Comments were received both in support of the proposed actions and in opposition to the proposed action. The FAA and Snohomish County have considered all comments received concerning the Draft EA in preparing the Final EA. These comments resulted in modifications to the main body of the EA as well as the preparation of additional analysis in Appendix P, as described in General Response 1-11.

A detailed response was prepared for all substantive comments, as reflected in this document. Similar comments were grouped together and responses were then prepared and are provided in this document. Individual/unique comments were responded to individually. The general grouped responses are included in Appendix S while the individual responses are provided either at the bottom of the letter/email or on the page following the letter/email in Appendix Q. Comments obtained at the hearings were responded to in Appendix R. The Final EA reflects changes that were made in the Draft EA based on public and agency comments. The next steps for the EA process are described in General Response 1-6.

**1-16 **How will the proposal be funded?

Some comments asked how the proposal would be funded and whether this would be a good use of public funds. The operations specifications for air carrier operations and the amendment to the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 139 certificate do not require FAA or County funding. Preparation of the NEPA documentation was funded through the FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP) of the Aviation Trust Fund and Airport funds. The airlines and the FAA would be responsible for their own administrative actions. The modification and expansion of the terminal building is estimated to cost approximately $3 million. Snohomish County has

---

2 The Trust Fund is generated through fees on aviation activities such as passenger tickets and aircraft parts.
not yet decided how the proposed modular terminal addition will be funded. Options for funding the terminal development and the specific approach to the terminal funding will be determined during negotiations with the airlines to reach agreement on a lease or license.
ISSUE 2, BACKGROUND

2-1 MRD document

Some comments cited the “mediated role determination” as an agreement or promise by the County that Paine Field would never have commercial service. In some instances, the commenters stated that they moved to the area because of the promise that commercial service would never be implemented. The May 16, 2007 Executive Summary of the Report on the Mediated Role Determination for Paine Field states the following:

In 1978 at the request of Snohomish County, the University of Washington, Office of Environmental Mediation convened a panel to recommend the future role of Paine Field. The “mediated role determination” (MRD) panel suggested that general aviation and commercial aeronautical work (such as Boeing’s Everett plant) be the dominant uses of Paine Field. The MRD Panel recommended encouraging those uses, and discouraged any uses incompatible with community harmony. The existing airport uses that would be discouraged included supplemental/charter air passenger service, large transport crew training operations, air cargo aviation, and military aviation.

In late 1978 and early 1979, the Snohomish County Planning Commission adopted the recommendations and forwarded them to the County Commissioners who adopted the recommendations with few changes. These two documents are colloquially known as the “MRD Document.”

The community and aviation business changed dramatically in the past quarter century. Populations boomed. Aeronautical technologies improved, with larger jets becoming quieter. Environmental and land use and planning laws became ever more stringent. The form of County government changed from a commission system (in which the commissioners handle both the legislative and executive functions of government) to an executive/council form of government (in which the executive leads, provides policy direction, and operates the government while an elected council decides overarching policy issues and approves the budget). The 1980s saw many disagreements around the Country between local jurisdictions and the aviation industry over noise and other impacts from a burgeoning scheduled passenger air service industry. Those disagreements led the federal government to pre-empt local attempts to control the type, frequency, and noise of scheduled passenger air service with the passage of the Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA) of 1990 (49 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.). Among the requirements of ANCA was the establishment of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 161 Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions. Since the passage of FAR Part 161, only one airport has met the requirements to enable a restriction on the types of aircraft operating at that airport.
After booming through the 1990s, the economy saw a downturn with the dawn of the 21st century. The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City exacerbated the economic problems. Boeing laid off thousands. The County Council and then County Executive Bob Drewel formed a task force to develop methods of stimulating the local economy. The task force produced an economic stimulus action plan in 2002.

The 2002 action plan called for exploration of regional air service and for specific steps to prepare for regional air service at Paine Field. This plan concerned the communities of south Snohomish County. Many south County residents believed the MRD Document forbade scheduled passenger air service and were concerned that scheduled passenger air service would disrupt and diminish the quality of life that attracted them to the area.

In 2005, County Executive Aaron Reardon formed an advisory panel of 12 community members to review and update the role of Paine Field defined by the Snohomish County Commissioners in 1978, and charged the community panel to update the MRD Document.

The community panel held its first meeting in November 2005 and heard from numerous experts on such diverse topics as land use, noise, airport operations, and airport law.

Some community panel members viewed the MRD Document as an important, fundamental social contract between the County government and the citizens and south County cities. Some of these community panel members would like to see the MRD Document rewritten to more clearly state a dislike for scheduled passenger air service.

Other community panel members believed the MRD Document has been overtaken by events and is no longer relevant. They believe the MRD Document is subsumed within Comprehensive Plans mandated by the State’s Growth Management Act and the County’s Airport Master Plan. They say the MRD Document informed the decisions made in the Comprehensive and Master Plans, and the Plans now describe the appropriate role of Paine Field.

These community panel members would like to see scheduled passenger air service at Paine Field and felt such service would drive economic development and provide a substantial convenience to users. This perspective was countered by other community panel members who vehemently disagreed, arguing no evidence supported the claim that scheduled passenger air service would stimulate economic development and claiming that scheduled passenger air service would devalue property and diminish a cherished quality of life.

The panel completed its charge in December 2006. The community panel substantially agreed on how to update the language, though some felt no need to update the MRD Document at all. For example, the community panel generally agreed that references to military aircraft operations could be deleted because Paine Field no longer hosts a military aviation unit.
The efforts of the community panel identified three primary, fundamental factors influencing the future role of the Snohomish County Airport (Paine Field):

1. Current federal law does not allow the County to prohibit or limit scheduled passenger air service.
2. Current federal law does not require the County to encourage or subsidize scheduled passenger air service.
3. The County can and should insist that an airline pay its own way and mitigate its impacts.

The MRD is advisory in nature. As stated previously in General Response 1-1, federal law does not allow the County to prohibit or limit scheduled passenger air service.

2-2 Boeing reaction to the Proposed Project and effect of the Project on Boeing

Some comments expressed concern that the proposed actions may negatively affect Boeing operations and/or cause Boeing to relocate facilities to other airports or other states. According to a Boeing Company letter sent to County officials on January 8, 2009, “Boeing would not be negatively impacted by the addition of commercial air service to Paine Field.” Boeing also expressed concern in the letter that if Snohomish County were to refuse airline service at Paine Field, the FAA could withhold future airport improvement funding. For further description of these issues please see General Responses 1-1 and 1-4.

2-3 Airport Master Plan

Some comments asked about the purpose of the Airport Master Plan and its relation to the analysis in the EA. Other comments indicated that the EA was not consistent with the Master Plan.

The Airport Master Plan is a plan for long-term physical development that may be needed at the Airport. The Airport Master Plan’s purpose is to reserve areas for potentially necessary facilities and to assess how airport land is best used in consideration of anticipated future demand. Airports typically undertake preparation of a Master Plan every 5-10 years in response to changing local and national conditions. Snohomish County completed its most recent long-range plan in 2002 for Paine Field. The 2002 Airport Master Plan included a list of projects to be implemented over 20 years and other projects to be implemented as dictated by demand. One of the projects scheduled to be implemented when demand materialized was a commercial passenger terminal project. As activity levels have changed at the Airport, the County has pursued recommendations in the Plan. Until receiving the request for service from Horizon and Allegiant, there was no need to develop the commercial passenger terminal project.

Some comments compared the forecasts included in the EA to the forecasts included in the 2002 Airport Master Plan. Some comments implied that amending the Airport’s Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 139 operating certificate enables an uncalculated and unanalyzed number of air carrier operations and that the forecasts included in the Airport Master Plan should be analyzed rather than the forecasts included in the EA. Many conditions have changed since
the forecasting effort for the 2002 Master Plan was conducted. As such, the FAA required a new forecasting effort for this EA based on new conditions and the information provided by the air carriers (Horizon Air and Allegiant Air). In addition, because the proposed action would result in air carrier service at an airport that does not presently have service, two forecasts were required – one that reflected the No Action and the other reflecting activity with the proposed actions. These forecasts were reviewed and approved by FAA as described in more detail in Appendix G of the Draft and Final EA. The preferred forecast in the 2002 Airport Master Plan was the regional low forecast (Scenario 3) which indicated approximately 10,861 passenger air carrier operations by 2016. By comparison, the forecasting effort for the Final EA indicated approximately 12,055 passenger air carrier operations by 2018 which is only slightly higher than the Master Plan forecast. See also General Response 1-11.

Some comments also recommended that the EA consider either the regional high or the national high scenarios included in the Airport Master Plan and evaluate the environmental impacts of those scenarios. Neither Snohomish County, nor the FAA has any information that would indicate that either the regional high or the national high scenarios included in the Airport Master Plan are reasonably foreseeable. For information related to the environmental impacts related to the maximum capacity of the proposed terminal, please see Appendix P of the Final EA. For more information regarding the Master Plan and the proposed terminal scenarios, please see General Response 3-5.
ISSUE 3, PROJECT AND PURPOSE AND NEED

3-1 What is the purpose and need for the action or project?

Some comments raised questions concerning the purpose and need for the proposed Federal actions and the need for the County to accommodate commercial passenger operations beyond that forecast by the two airlines proposing service at Paine Field. The purpose and need are explained on Pages A.1 through A.4 in the Final EA. The purpose of the proposed action is to allow passengers to fly between Paine Field and Portland, Spokane and Las Vegas. The need for the proposed actions is to meet an unmet demand for commercial service within the area, as identified by Horizon and Allegiant Air. The County is evaluating the development of a new passenger terminal to satisfy this demand. The FAA must review amendments to operations specifications and is required to either grant or deny the amendment to the operations specifications based on a number of criteria. The FAA will review the requests from both Horizon Air and Allegiant Air for the FAA to amend operations specifications to allow scheduled commercial air service to Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field to ensure that any amendments to the FAR Part 139 operating certificate meets all safety standards.

Activity levels beyond what is forecast are not considered reasonably foreseeable and are not pertinent to the purpose and need of the proposed project. For more information on what reasonably foreseeable actions were determined and the effects of these actions, please see General Responses 1-11 and 6-1. Also, the potential addition of new carriers providing service at Paine Field would require additional environmental review, as described in General Response 3-14.

3-2 What are the effects of the Proposed Project on general aviation?

Some comments questioned the effect of the proposed actions on general aviation operations at Paine Field. As indicated in Table B2 of the Final EA, passenger air carrier operations are expected to be approximately 13,931 by 2018 out of a total of 122,127 aircraft operations. In other words, with the proposed actions, air carrier operations are expected to account for less than 12 percent of total aircraft operations. General aviation operations are expected to total 104,479 operations in 2018 regardless of whether or not the proposed actions are implemented. Thus, the initiation of commercial service is not expected to affect the level of general aviation operations at Paine Field. Furthermore, the Annual Service Volume (ASV), or the number of aircraft operations that an airport can accommodate without undue delay, was determined to be 367,000 annual operations. As Paine Field would operate well below the ASV with or without the proposed actions, impacts to general aviation operations due to commercial service are not anticipated.
3-3 Concerns that only half of the activity was considered

Several comments stated that there was confusion over the term “enplanements”, and that the activity reported is only half of what should have been considered in the analysis.

Enplanements refer to passengers boarding flights, deplanements refer to passengers that get off the aircraft on arrival, and total passengers refers to both enplanements and deplanements. The Draft and Final EA used total passengers in the assessment. Similarly, total operations (the sum of all arrivals and all departures) were used. This confusion appears because a standard reporting of airport activity often occurs through the use of enplanements to enable comparison of one airport to another. However, for purposes of assessing the effect of the Airport and the proposed actions, enplaned and deplaned passengers (total passengers) and total operations were included. Performing environmental assessments using total passengers and operations is standard practice in FAA NEPA documents.

3-4 EA Conflicts with proposed terminal in Airport Master Plan

Some comments suggested that the proposed terminal expansion conflicts with the planned permanent terminal in the Airport Master Plan. The County’s proposed project reflects construction of a modular terminal to accommodate the proposed air service. The alternative to construct a larger, more permanent terminal was considered in the EA and is described on Page B.5 of the EA.

The 2002 Airport Master Plan facility requirements were a conservative estimate of spatial needs based on then forecast growth in activity. The Master Plan forecasts were not based on actual airline derived passenger projections, but were based on generalized “rule of thumb” airport planning estimates. The Master Plan used this approach, because at the time, there was not a specific air service proposal, and thus the needs of a possible carrier could not be precisely anticipated. This resulted in the Master Plan space requirements that overestimated the space that may be required so that adequate room was reserved on the ALP to accommodate a terminal. Recognizing that the Airport currently meets the requirements for both aircraft parking and automobile parking spaces, the County decided that the larger, more permanent terminal and parking facilities recommended in the Airport Master Plan and shown on the ALP was not warranted to accommodate the air service activity proposed by Horizon Air and Allegiant Air. A more detailed evaluation of the terminal needs was prepared based on the anticipated activity forecast by Horizon and Allegiant Airlines, which indicated a terminal building smaller than that reserved on the ALP. Given the uncertainty of the success of the service, the County proposes the development of a semi-permanent modular terminal. There are many examples throughout the industry of air service starts and stops as well as airports building terminals only to have airlines cease operations and the terminal goes unused.

Some comments also suggested that because a larger terminal is shown on the Airport’s ALP, the expansion of commercial service that might operate within this larger terminal is reasonably foreseeable and should be addressed in this EA. The purpose of an Airport Master Plan is to reserve space for potentially needed future facilities and the presence of a facility on an ALP does not indicate that demand for that facility is imminent or reasonably foreseeable. For
information regarding the forecasts used in the EA and the Airport Master Plan, please refer to General Response 2-3 and 3-13.

3-5 Why was 2016 selected as the future year?

Some comments stated that there would be growth beyond the Draft EA future year (2016) and that those future operations should be analyzed in the EA. The comments questioned why 2016 was selected as the future year and not additional dates further into the future.

Neither the NEPA nor Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations contain requirements about specific years to be evaluated. Rather, these regulations indicate that NEPA documents should address the reasonably foreseeable future (See General Response 1-11). The only reference to analysis of project impacts beyond five years in FAA environmental guidance is in Section 14 entitled Noise, of Appendix A in FAA Order 1050.1E. Paragraph 14.4g. states that “DNL (Day-Night Noise Level) contours, grid point, and/or change-of-exposure analysis will be prepared for the following: (1) Current conditions; and (2) Future conditions both with and without (no action) the proposal and each reasonable alternative. Comparisons should be done for appropriate timeframes. Timeframes usually selected are the year of anticipated project implementation and 5 to 10 years after implementation. Additional timeframes may be desirable for particular projects.”

The year 2016 was selected, in part, because it is the concurrency timeframe required under the Snohomish County Unified Development Code (SCC30.66B.155) as well as the timeframe required in accordance with the Clean Air Act General Conformity analysis years (based on the year of attainment/maintenance). The Draft EA considered noise impacts, in accordance with FAA guidance, for the first year of implementation, 2010, and for one future year, 2016, both with and without the proposed activity levels. There were a number of reasons that this timeframe was considered reasonable and appropriate. First, the information from both Allegiant Air and Horizon Air (Appendix A of the EA) was given to the County in two year increments, starting with year 1, and continuing with years 3 and 5. The forecasts of aviation activity (Appendix G) were based on these projections supplied by the airlines.

Due to the timeframe required to respond to comments on the Draft EA and changes in operational activity at the Airport during that time, the aviation activity forecasts and analysis years from the Draft EA were updated prior to the publication of the Final EA. In the Final EA, 2008 remains the base year or existing year, while 2013 was considered the initial year of commercial airline service, and 2018 was considered the future year for applicable environmental consequence analysis.

The growth rates beyond 2018 (if any) cannot be accurately predicted at this time. It is unclear whether or not the air service would be successful, or if successful, how quickly the air service would increase. Such increases would be dependent on area residents choosing to fly using commercial service at Paine Field (See General Response 3-1).
In response to concerns about future activity levels, the FAA requested that an additional appendix be prepared that identifies the operating capacity of the proposed terminal and the associated environmental effects. These issues are documented in Appendix P.

3-6 There should be an alternative future activity scenario

In response to comments received concerning alternative activity scenarios that might arise with the amended Part 139 certificate and commercial passenger terminal, an expanded analysis was prepared for the Final EA. This analysis in Appendix P, considers the theoretical maximum level of operations that could occur at the proposed terminal and the resulting environmental effect. For more information see General Responses 1-11 and 3-15.

3-7 Parking capacity

Some comments indicated that the EA failed to address parking needs of the passengers or that a future parking plan was not provided. The vehicle parking requirements associated with the proposed actions were identified using generally accepted airport planning practices and estimates of parking demands. The County determined that the existing number of vehicle parking spaces is adequate based on the anticipated passenger demand. As described on Page B.7 of the EA, Snohomish County shows a Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirement of 115 parking spaces for buildings similar in size to the proposed terminal and 141 spaces required for the terminal, the airport office, and Precision Engines (a private business located adjacent to the terminal and airport office) combined.

FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5360-13 Planning and Design Guidelines for Airport Terminal Facilities indicates that between 1 space per 500 to 1 space per 700 enplanements is a general rule of thumb for estimating parking requirements for airports. Estimations using that guidance would equate to 160 to 224 spaces for the 112,000 enplanements in 2013 and 340 to 476 spaces for the 238,200 enplanements in 2018. FAA AC 150/5360-9 Planning and Design of Airport Terminal Facilities at Non-Hub Locations, Figure 6-2 indicates 340 to 440 parking spaces would be required to meet the need for the total 238,200 estimated enplanements in 2018.

There are currently six parking areas near the terminal as follows:

1. SE lot with 70 spaces dedicated to Precision and Aviation Technical Services (ATS) parking.
2. Adjacent to the existing C1/C2 terminal building with 30 spaces dedicated to airport staff and Precision parking.
3. Main lot with 177 spaces.
4. North lot with 102 spaces.
5. C4 lot with 35 spaces.

Of these six lots, only the last four can be used for air carrier passenger vehicle parking, enabling space for 364 cars, or 1 space per 308 enplanements in 2013 and 1 space per 654 enplanements.
in 2018. Therefore, the available parking stalls are expected to meet the requirements for parking.

3-8 Increase in rental cars/rental car agencies

Comments were received about the use of rental cars or the increase in rental car agencies as a result of the proposed actions. Enterprise Rent-A-Car currently provides service at Paine Field to general aviation users of the Airport out of Building Number C84. Enterprise currently rotates cars to Paine Field from their downtown Everett lot as needed. No additional proposals or letters of interest from rental car agencies have been received to date. However, it is possible that additional rental car agencies might consider providing service at Paine Field if commercial service is initiated. If additional rental car facilities would be constructed, a review would be conducted at that time to determine if a modification to the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) would be needed, thereby triggering a federal action, which in turn would require NEPA compliance. Until a proposal for additional rental car space is received, such increases are not reasonably foreseeable.

3-9 Public transportation options should be considered

Comments suggested that more analysis of public transportation options, including bus service and light rail service, should be included in the alternatives chapter.

Local public transportation is technically not an alternative to regional air service. Improvements to local public transportation may, however, facilitate improved access to other airports like Bellingham or Sea-Tac. This alternative is addressed on page B.4 of the EA within the section “Use of Other Area Airports.” This alternative is also represented by the No Action Alternative because with the No Action Alternative, passengers wishing to travel by air are required to use other area airports and either use public transportation or private surface vehicle travel. With or without the proposed actions, neither the FAA nor the County can require passengers to access Paine Field or other airports using public transportation.

3-10 What is the capacity of the airport?

Some comments requested consideration of the maximum operational capacity of the airfield in the EA.

The capacity of the airfield system was analyzed and disclosed in the 2002 Airport Master Plan in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5060-5, Airport Capacity and Delay. The Annual Service Volume (ASV) is a reasonable estimate of an airport’s annual capacity (defined as the level of annual aircraft operations that would result in an average annual aircraft delay of approximately one to four minutes). According to the Master Plan, under current policies and practices, the Airport has an ASV of approximately 367,000 operations. In 2008, the Airport recorded approximately 143,722 annual operations, or approximately 39 percent of the calculated capacity. Given the dramatic decrease in general aviation activity at the Airport in 2010, the Final EA forecast (Appendix G) indicates the Airport only reaching 122,127 total operations by 2018 or approximately 33 percent of annual capacity. Consideration or analysis of
367,000 annual operations is not considered appropriate because neither the County nor the FAA has received any indication of interest to provide passenger service beyond that proposed by Allegiant Air and Horizon Air. Consequently, analysis of environmental impacts resulting from commercial operations and enplanement levels that are not reasonably foreseeable is considered speculative.

3-11 What is the capacity of the terminal?

Some comments requested consideration in the EA of the maximum operational capacity of the proposed modular terminal building expansion.

The capacity of the proposed terminal expansion was estimated and disclosed in Appendix K of the Draft EA, as described in General Response 1-11. Two estimates of terminal capacity were completed, the maximum capacity of the terminal and the realistic capacity of the terminal. The maximum capacity estimate was based on the capacity of the terminal’s gates and a range of departures per gate. Using a number of standard industry assumptions, the capacity range was determined to be between 252,000 to 401,600 annual enplaned passengers. In other words, 401,600 annual passengers boarding aircraft is considered the maximum theoretical capacity of the proposed modular terminal expansion. A more realistic capacity considers the mix of aircraft which might actually serve the Airport based on predicted fleet mix. In consideration of the mix of commercial service aircraft expected to use the facility, the realistic capacity of the modular terminal expansion was estimated at 294,000 annual enplanements.

To respond to comments concerning this issue, an analysis was added to the Final EA (in Appendix P) to examine the probable environmental effects associated with the maximum theoretical terminal capacity. See also General Response 3-15.

3-12 What is the relationship of the two terminals?

Some comments mentioned the two separate terminals shown in Figure B2 of the Draft EA and some of the comments suggested that the capacity of both terminals need to be disclosed. The base map used in Figure B2 of the Draft EA was the existing, FAA conditionally approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP) for Paine Field. Because the conditionally approved ALP included the recommendations of the Airport Master Plan, it showed a possible future passenger terminal. That terminal is conditionally approved because it would still require a NEPA review, separate from this EA. The Airport Master Plan forecasts indicated that a level of commercial service and enplanements might occur at Paine Field, at a level greater than what could be accommodated by the existing terminal building. Consequently, during the Airport Master Plan process, area and space were reserved for a future terminal and vehicle parking facilities to accommodate that commercial service activity. See also General Response 3-5.

Following receipt of requests from Horizon Air and Allegiant Air to initiate commercial service, the County decided that a terminal facility similar to the Airport Master Plan/ALP terminal was not warranted. An alternative to the Airport Master Plan terminal building was to provide a modular expansion of the existing terminal building. This is further described on Pages B.2 through B.6 of the EA.
Two terminals would not be constructed to accommodate the proposed service at Paine Field. Rather, the modular terminal expansion of the existing terminal would be constructed instead of the future passenger terminal considered during the Master Plan process and subsequently shown on the ALP.

3-13 What is a Class I Airport? Explanation of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 139

Some comments requested clarification on the term Class I airport and an explanation of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 139.

The FAA is required by 14 CFR Part 139 to issue airport operating certificates to airports that:

- Serve scheduled and unscheduled air carrier aircraft with more than 30 seats;
- Serve scheduled air carrier operations in aircraft with more than 9 seats but less than 31 seats; and
- The FAA Administrator requires an airport to have a certificate.

In 2004, the FAA revised FAR Part 139 to create four classes of operating certificates. Prior to this revision, certificated airports could have either a full or a limited operating certificate. Paine Field has had a full operating certificate since 1974. The certificate was revised in 2005 as a Class IV certificate because at that time there were no scheduled large air carrier operations at the Airport. Part 139 does not apply to airports at which air carrier passenger operations are conducted only because the Airport has been designated as an alternate airport. Airport Operating Certificates (AOC) serve to ensure safety in air transportation. To obtain a certificate, an airport operator must agree to certain operational and safety standards and provide for such things as firefighting and rescue equipment. These requirements vary depending on the size of the airport and the type of flights available.

Class I airports include airports serving all types of scheduled operations of air carrier aircraft designed for at least 31 passenger seats (large air carrier aircraft). These airports currently hold an AOC and may serve any air carrier operations covered under Part 139. Accordingly, the operators of these airports must comply with all Part 139 requirements. The operating certificate at Paine Field would be changed to a Class I Airport as part of the proposed Federal actions assessed in the EA.

Class II airports include airports that currently hold a Limited AOC (or airports that have maintained an AOC after loss of scheduled large air carrier aircraft service) are either Class II airports or Class IV airports. Class II airports are those airports that serve scheduled operations of small air carrier aircraft and unscheduled operations of large air carrier aircraft. Class II airports are not permitted to serve scheduled large air carrier operations.

Class III airports are airports that serve only scheduled operations of small air carrier aircraft. As specified in the authorizing statute, airport certification requirements are not applicable to certain airports in the State of Alaska.
Class IV are airports that currently hold a Limited AOC (or airports that have maintained an AOC after loss of scheduled large air carrier aircraft service) are either Class II or Class IV airports. Class IV airports are those airports that serve only unscheduled operations of large air carrier aircraft. Air carrier operations are so infrequent at these airports that in the past, FAA only required them to comply with some Part 139 requirements. This continues to be the case, but new operational requirements have been added along with modifications to the Airport certification process and other administrative changes. The proposed actions in the EA include an approval to the FAR Part 139 operating certificate for Paine Field reclassifying the Airport from its existing classification as a Class IV airport to a Class I airport.

The change to a Class I airport would enable Paine Field to have scheduled air carrier aircraft operations at the Airport and Horizon and Allegiant could potentially increase operations beyond the projected number. However, if carriers other than Horizon and Allegiant would want to start service at Paine Field, additional environmental review would be required. For additional information on what other actions would require additional environmental review, please see General Response 3-14.

**3-14 What actions will require additional environmental review?**

Some comments asked if this would “open the door” entirely to unconstrained commercial air service actions and what would require additional environmental review prior to implementation. Such review could be one of the following levels of Federal environmental review:

- Categorical Exclusion (CatEx)
- Environmental Assessment (EA)
- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Federal actions that may require further environmental review include:

- An operations specifications amendment request by another airline to begin service to Paine Field.
- An operations specification amendment to add a new aircraft type by an existing airline.
- Additional city destinations not currently covered by Horizon’s or Allegiant’s operations specifications.
- FAA funding for a new or expanded terminal building beyond that proposed in this EA or other airport facility development

Additional service by either Horizon Air or Allegiant Air to the cities included in their request letters in Appendix A of the EA or service to other cities included in the airlines’ approved operations specifications would not constitute a Federal action and would not likely require additional environmental review unless FAA funding of further terminal expansion was required to accommodate that service or a new aircraft type was proposed.
ISSUE 4. ALTERNATIVES

4-1 Alternative airports should be used

Some comments requested that other airports, such as Sea-Tac Airport, be used in lieu of Paine Field. The airlines’ use of another airport other than Paine Field was examined as part of the Alternatives Analysis in Chapter B of the EA.

The use of other area airports by both Horizon Air and Allegiant Air in place of Paine Field is reflected in the No Action Alternative because Horizon Air already offers scheduled commercial air service at Sea-Tac Airport, approximately 30 miles south of Paine Field, and Bellingham International Airport, located approximately 74 miles north of Paine Field. Allegiant Air offers scheduled commercial air service currently at Bellingham International Airport. There has been no indication from these airlines that, should the proposed actions not be implemented, they would initiate service to any other area airport beyond those used today. Further, Snohomish County is not aware of any airport in the area with sufficient runway length that is specifically marketing itself to receive air carrier service other than the airports that Horizon and Allegiant are already operating as reflected in the No Action Alternative. Therefore, this alternative is not prudent and feasible, nor would it meet the purpose as described in Chapter A of the EA. The FAA cannot require airlines to choose one airport over another and therefore, this is not a viable alternative to the Proposed Action.

4-2 What is the relationship of the Proposed Project to WSDOT’s Long-Term Air Transportation Study (LATS)

Some comments asked about the relationship of the airline proposals and the EA to the recently completed study by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) known as the Long-Term Air Transportation Study (LATS). LATS was a strategic planning effort based on the first comprehensive review of the aviation system in the State of Washington in over two decades. The result of the study was a set of realistic recommendations to address the state’s future aviation needs. One of the identified future aviation needs was additional airside and landside capacity for scheduled commercial air service. LATS recommended consideration of other airports in the Puget Sound Area with the potential to absorb future commercial capacity including Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field, Olympia Regional Airport, King County International Airport/Boeing Field, and Bremerton National Airport. However, the report qualified the recommendation that these airports could provide additional capacity by stating that the provision of commercial service at these airports is dependent on the interest of the airlines.

The planning process for the LATS included several regional public meetings in July 2008 and March 2009. Concern was expressed at these meetings and in written comments about the potential impacts of commercial service at Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field and at Olympia Regional Airport. Participants encouraged the Aviation Planning Council to explore non-aviation alternatives to relieve capacity for in-state travel and alternatives to airport expansion or new airport constructions. The purpose of the proposed actions at Paine Field is not to increase capacity or to provide regional capacity relief. Rather the purpose of the Federal action by the FAA is to evaluate the requests from both Horizon Air and Allegiant Air for the
4-3 What is the demand for this proposal and how does it fit with regional planning?

Some comments questioned whether regional demand was sufficient to support commercial service at Paine Field. Other comments suggested that additional regional planning and analysis of the regional demand for air service should be conducted.

The decision to initiate commercial service at an airport is a business decision by the airlines. Other than to ensure safety, neither the Airport Sponsor nor the Federal government controls where, when, and how airlines provide service. Should demand prove to be lower than that projected by the airlines, the airlines would likely choose to reduce the number of flights or cease service at Paine Field.

The purpose and need as identified in this EA is not to address the concerns related to regional demand/capacity. Rather the EA addresses the responsibility of the FAA and County in responding to the request of two carriers to begin service at the Airport. Per Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and FAA guidance, alternatives considered in NEPA process must address the underlying purpose or need.

In this case, the EA has considered the possible use of other airports (See General Response 4-1). However, as noted, if the carriers who are seeking to use Paine Field wished to serve other area airports they are not currently serving, they would make the request to those airports. These two airlines have identified demand for commercial air service at Paine Field and have consequently proposed to initiate service to accommodate that demand. In accordance with Federal grant assurances, the County has limited discretion to deny an airline request to operate at Paine Field. Since additional analysis on regional demand does not meet the purpose and need identified in this EA, it is not warranted.

For comments regarding the capacity at other airports, please see General Response 4-4.

4-4 Relationship between capacity at other airports and Paine Field

Some comments question the relationship between unused capacity at other airports and the proposed service at Paine Field. Comments suggested that expanded airline service at Sea-Tac Airport is a better alternative than the introduction of commercial service at Paine Field.

In regard to the recent "capacity" improvements at Sea-Tac, the third runway was not constructed to relieve or otherwise accommodate projected demand at Paine Field. The use of the third runway is separate from the purpose and need for the proposed action considered in this EA. The proposed Federal actions that are the subject of this EA respond to requests from two specific airlines to initiate service at Paine Field.
Regarding the “demand” for operations at Paine Field, the airlines’ use of another airport other than Paine Field was examined as part of the Chapter B, Alternatives Analysis, in the EA. As described in General Response 1-1, the FAA and Snohomish County cannot require an airline to serve a specific airport nor can they restrict an airline from a specific airport if the airport is a public use airport and the proposed aircraft can safely operate at that airport, regardless of which airport has more unused capacity.

4-5 Other modes of transportation may be better alternatives

Some comments suggested that either high speed rail, bus service, or other modes of transportation would be a better alternative to initiating commercial air service at Paine Field.

Use of public transit is discussed in General Response 3-9 and local public transportation is technically not an alternative to regional air service. Other modes of transportation were not considered in the alternatives analysis as they do not meet the purpose and need for the proposed Federal actions; the decision to take different forms or modes of transportation rests with the passenger, and under the current Federal regulatory process, neither the FAA or the County can require passengers to drive or take other surface modes (train or bus).

4-6 What does the term “Preferred Alternative” mean?

Some comments asked about the use of the term "Preferred Alternative."

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) defines the term Preferred Alternative as “the alternative which the agency believes would fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical, and other factors.” While the Draft EA was prepared by the Airport Sponsor, it was closely coordinated with the FAA to ensure that the selection of the preferred alternative would address the FAA’s responsibilities under NEPA. The other alternatives reviewed in Chapter B of the EA were determined not reasonable as they did not meet the purpose and need. The Draft EA identified the draft Preferred Alternative so that the public and agencies would have an opportunity to comment upon that selection. A final confirmation of the Preferred Alternative will be made if the FAA accepts and signs the Final EA. The Preferred Alternative is also referred to as the Proposed Action, the project or the proposed project in the EA.

---

ISSUE 5, AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT/EXISTING CONDITIONS

5-1 Existing aircraft noise concerns

Some comments discussed the level of existing noise and its impact on quality of life. As stated on page C.16 of the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA), existing aircraft related noise exposure was defined in the EA through the use of noise exposure maps or contours prepared with the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA’s) Integrated Noise Model (INM), version 7.0a. The INM is a state-of-the-art, FAA approved software program used to model the noise exposure levels from aircraft operations and engine testing and produce contours of equal noise energy. These contours are presented using the 65 Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) noise contour metric where 65 DNL represents significant aircraft noise levels.

DNL metric measures the overall aircraft noise experienced during an entire (24-hour) day. DNL calculations account for the sound exposure level of aircraft, the number of aircraft operations and a penalty for nighttime operations. In the DNL scale, each aircraft operation occurring between the hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. includes a sound level penalty to account for the higher sensitivity to noise in the nighttime and the expected further decrease in background noise levels that typically occur at night. DNL provides a numerical description of the weighted 24-hour cumulative noise energy level using the A-weighted decibel scale, typically over a period of a year.

Because DNL is a cumulative metric, while areas can receive single event noise levels above 65 dB, it is the average of these noise levels over the course of a year that provides for the 65 DNL contour. Although the FAA recognizes that noise occurs outside of these contours, the 65 DNL contour has been federally accepted at the level at which residential and other noise sensitive land uses are non-compatible with aircraft noise. Because the existing 65 DNL noise contour, shown on Figure C6, page C.18 of the EA, does not encompass any noise sensitive land uses (homes, schools, churches, etc.) the existing land use in the vicinity of the Airport is considered compatible with aircraft operations and aircraft generated noise under the federal guidelines.

See General Response 7-6 regarding the existing and future noise impacts.

5-2 Current curfew is broken

Some comments stated that the Airport currently operates under a noise curfew and that the curfew is already broken.

The County has a voluntary noise abatement program that discourages touch-and-go flights and repetitive training flights by jet, turboprop, and large propeller aircraft and requires air carrier aircraft with more than 30 passenger seats between 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. to receive prior permission from the Airport Director. The voluntary noise abatement program does not prevent aircraft from operating at the Airport and is not a mandatory noise curfew as suggested by some comments. The program requests those aircraft to have prior permission during those hours. Other aircraft are still allowed to depart/arrive at the Airport during those times without the request of prior permission. See also General Response 7-11.
5-3 Aircraft currently fly low and very close to houses

Some comments mentioned that aircraft already fly very low, and close to houses.

The height of aircraft on final approach to a runway or departure from a runway is controlled by the FAA. The standard traffic pattern altitude for small aircraft is 1,600 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL) while the traffic pattern altitude for large aircraft is 2,000 feet MSL. An airfield traffic pattern is a standard path followed by aircraft on takeoff or landing while maintaining visual contact with the airfield. Aircraft typically begin descending from pattern altitude in the downwind leg of the pattern when landing and on a 3-degree approach slope for the final leg of the pattern.

According to Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 91.119, Minimum safe altitudes; in general, there are minimum standards for operations of fixed wing aircraft (excluding when necessary for takeoff/landing). Over congested areas, an altitude of 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within a horizontal radius of 2,000 feet is required, except for under take-off and landing procedures. Complaints on low-flying aircraft may be filed with the FAA, Office of Flight Standards, which monitors aircraft operations. Once the facts have been recorded, an FAA aviation safety inspector attempts to identify the offending aircraft operator. For more information on low flying aircraft complaints, please visit the following website: http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/field_offices/fsdo/

5-4 Existing Traffic

Some comments indicated that existing surface traffic in the area is already very bad and that additional traffic analysis should be included in the EA.

The surface traffic analysis was based upon the existing level of traffic compared to the future levels under the Preferred Alternative. Local jurisdictions establish thresholds which determine if a road segment or intersection is operating at an acceptable level or at a deficient level of service (see General Response 8-1). Currently all roads analyzed are operating at acceptable levels of service. However, there are currently two intersections that operate at deficient levels of service and a total of four intersections that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service in the future whether or not the proposed action is implemented. These four intersections are SR-525 at Beverly Park Road (WSDOT Intersection), SR-99 at Airport Road (City of Everett Intersection), the I-5 northbound ramps at 128th Street SW/SR-96 (WSDOT intersection), and SR-525 at 84th Street SW (City of Mukilteo intersection). The City of Everett has identified that capacity improvements for single-occupant vehicles to the intersection of SR-99 at Airport Road are not practical due to the existing land configuration and lack of right-of-way. The project’s impacts to the WSDOT intersections will be mitigated through the WSDOT mitigation fees in accordance with the interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and WSDOT. The City of Mukilteo intersection would operate at an acceptable level of service with optimized timings, which may occur as part of the normal maintenance of the signal. However, the traffic mitigation fees that will be paid to the City of Mukilteo will mitigate the impacts of the proposed action.
5-5 Study Areas

Some comments questioned the boundaries used for evaluation of various resource areas in the EA and stated that expanded study areas should have been considered. Also, some comments stated that the area identified for various resource evaluations for the EA should be the same as the Airport Influence Area, as designated in the Snohomish County 2025 Comprehensive Plan.

As stated in General Response 1-8, the purpose of the EA is to analyze potential environmental impacts from the proposed Federal actions in accordance with NEPA and the associated FAA Orders. These Orders include guidance for study methodologies to identify project-related effects and thresholds of significance, which result in determining resource study areas for each environmental resource category. The analysis in the EA follows those methodologies, significance thresholds, and other guidance for determining the boundaries of resource study areas as described in the EA.

The scope of each environmental resource category is slightly different and consequently, not all study areas for these resource categories are identical. For instance, two resource study areas were examined for historic/cultural resources. The first resource study area includes the direct impact area that is limited to the ground that would be affected during construction where artifacts might be located. Therefore, the study area for that resource category is limited to the direct construction impact area where the terminal footprint is proposed. However, impact on historic properties was also examined within the context of environmental affects that would occur off airport, such as aircraft noise, outside the construction footprint. Federal guidance states that noise above a 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) level is not compatible with land uses such as certain historic properties, schools, and residences.

The EA does not state that noise would not occur outside the 65 DNL contour, but rather presents the area of significant noise exposure as defined by the 65 DNL and area that would be incompatible with various land uses. Changes in the noise environment would occur outside this contour with or without the proposed actions; however, the 65 DNL contour is the federally accepted threshold of the beginning of significant aircraft noise levels and therefore is the contour used to disclose any significant impacts.

Similar to historic/cultural and noise resources, study areas were also established separately for air quality, water quality, and wildlife resources among others. For instance, the resource study area for air quality was based upon the Central Puget Sound Region airshed. Likewise, water quality impacts are considered over potentially affected watersheds, and wildlife habit impact areas are considered for the species potentially affected.

The Airport Influence Area, shown on Figure C1 of the EA, is designated in the Snohomish County 2025 Comprehensive Plan as “property within the environs of the Airport where land uses are either influenced by, or would influence the operation of the Airport in a positive or negative manner.” (See also General Response 7-14). The study area boundaries for the EA resource categories are those where the proposed actions would exert a change and where the context and intensity of the impact should be identified. Therefore, the resource areas for the EA were established following that guidance in accordance with the agency's guidance on the
individual environmental discipline. The Airport Influence Area does not coincide with the guidance regarding identifying study areas for resource evaluation.

### 5-6 Sources of existing air pollution

Some comments requested a description of existing pollution sources compared with the airport pollution sources. A number of documents identify the likely sources of emissions at airports, which typically represent the following:

- Aircraft and auxiliary power units (APU) on the aircraft
- Ground support equipment (GSE) - the vehicles that service the aircraft
- Ground access vehicles, roadways, and parking lots - the vehicles that transport passengers, employees, and goods and services that use the airport on the area roadway system
- Stationary sources - such as generators, heating and cooling systems, etc.
- Fire training
- Maintenance and construction activity

Other sources of pollution not associated with the airport and its operations are not the subject of the EA.

Information provided by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency indicates that airport-related emissions are less than 5 percent of total Puget Sound air emissions. Surface vehicle emissions within the Puget Sound Region are the single largest source of emissions.
ISSUE 6. GENERAL PROJECT EFFECTS

6-1 Significance of Project Effects

Some comments disputed that the project-related effects would not rise to the level of the significant thresholds; comments indicated that the project would generate significant adverse effects.

As stated in General Response 1-8, the EA was prepared according to NEPA and associated FAA guidance. The Draft and Final EA identify all anticipated project-related effects associated with the proposed actions. However, while there would be project-related effects, these effects are not expected to exceed the significance thresholds identified in Appendix A of FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1. Therefore, because these effects are not significant under NEPA, no mitigation measures are required.

6-2 How is significance defined?

Some comments suggested that either the term significance is ambiguous or that it is not well defined in the Draft EA.

FAA Order 5050.4B paragraph 9s provides the following definition:

s. Significant impact threshold. The impact level or “threshold” that the responsible FAA official uses to determine if the environmental effects of a proposed action or its reasonable alternatives would cause significant environmental effects. If FAA has established a threshold for a resource, the responsible FAA official must use that threshold to determine impact severity and context.

Note: For convenience, Table 7-1 of Chapter 7 of this Order provides the verbatim text of significant impacts in FAA Order 1050.1E, Appendix A, for many environmental resources. The Table also presents information about those thresholds to help analyze airport-related environmental impacts.

FAA defined thresholds of significance for each environmental resource category are described and explained in Appendix A of FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1. The thresholds of significance are described in Chapter D of the EA.

6-3 What are the project benefits?

Some comments questioned what the benefits of the proposed projects are and whether or not the cost outweighed the benefits.

It is important to note the purpose of the EA is not to assess the cost/benefit of the proposed actions. The effects that would be beneficial to the area are of a socio-economic nature, which are discussed in Chapter D, Environmental Consequences. The Proposed Action is not expected to significantly change the socioeconomic environment around the Airport. It would temporarily increase jobs during the construction phase and would increase use of local goods and services. There would also be a slight increase in business both at the Airport and in the vicinity of Airport Road from the increase in vehicle traffic. However, no major shifts in public service demand are expected. Overall, there would not be a significant change in the socioeconomic environment around the Airport. It is true that the airlines would likely benefit from the proposed project.
6-4 What are the quality of life impacts?

Some comments mentioned that their quality of life would be impacted due to changes in noise, air quality, and potential decreases in property value.

“Quality of life” is not a category that is specifically called out in NEPA or FAA guidance. However, the concept of quality of life is tied into several environmental resource categories addressed in NEPA documents, including noise, water quality, air quality, children’s health and safety, etc. While the proposed actions are not expected to generate significant adverse effects, there will be project-related effects. In accordance with the requirements of NEPA, the purpose of the EA is to assess and disclose the environmental impacts of the proposed action and make a determination as to the significance of the impact(s). While some of the environmental resource categories would have project-related environmental effects, as is noted in General Response 6-1, these effects would not exceed FAA defined thresholds of significance.

6-5 Are there any growth inducing or indirect effects?

Some comments asked about the secondary impacts or indirect effects of the project that could induce additional growth.

Secondary (induced) impacts are described on page D.32 of the EA. Major development projects can potentially influence induced or secondary impacts on the surrounding community. Some of these induced impacts could include the relocation of people or a substantial change to traffic patterns in the area. The analysis in the Draft and Final EA considered the induced effects of the proposed actions. Minor traffic changes are anticipated to the roadway systems in the vicinity of the Airport as presented in the Surface Transportation Section (Page D.34 of the EA) and in the Traffic Impact Analysis Report found in Appendix F, and further described in General Response 9-2. However, these traffic changes are not expected to induce growth or otherwise significantly impact the community.

The proposed actions are not considered a major development project. Due to the low number of project related commercial aircraft operations and enplanements, shifting in patterns of population movement and growth or changes in public service demands are not likely. No significant secondary impacts are expected as the result of the proposed Federal actions.

6-6 The document does not refer to “pollution”

Some comments questioned where the EA analyzed pollution impacts since the document did not refer to the word pollution.

“Pollution” is not a term used in the EA because pollution is an overarching word that refers to several separate resource categories within an EA. Pollution, by definition, could be a contamination of air, water, or soil by substances that are harmful to living organisms.4 Within

the EA, the air quality, noise, water quality, hazardous materials, and fish, wildlife and plants analysis, all address with different aspects of potential pollution. Therefore, per FAA Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1E, Change 1, impacts are examined based on those specific environmental resource categories, and not “pollution” as a whole. As stated in each of the sections within Chapter D, Environmental Consequences, based on federal thresholds of significance there are no expected significant environmental impacts to water quality, air quality, or noise and no significant impacts relating to hazardous materials or fish, wildlife and plants. Therefore, there are no significant impacts related to the broader category of pollution that encompasses all of the resource categories that relate to pollution.
ISSUE 7, NOISE AND LAND USE

7-1 Use of DNL

Some comments asked, “why is the Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) used as the basis for the noise analysis within the EA.”

DNL is the standard required metric for quantifying aircraft noise exposure. As a result of the 1979 Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act (ASNA), Congress required the FAA to select a single metric to standardize the evaluation of aircraft noise. In response to ASNA, through Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150 Noise Compatibility Planning, FAA formally adopted DNL as its primary metric for evaluating aircraft noise to ensure consistency across the country. FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1, Paragraph A14.1, states “For aviation noise analysis, the FAA has determined that the cumulative noise energy exposure of individuals to noise resulting from aviation activities must be established in terms of yearly day/night average sound level (DNL) as FAA’s primary metric.”

DNL is the 24-hour average sound level in A-weighted decibels (dBA). This average is derived from all aircraft operations during a 24-hour period that represents an airport’s average annual operational day. DNL reflects the inclusion of a penalty to each aircraft operation occurring during nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). This penalty attempts to compensate for people’s heightened sensitivity to noise during this period. Significant project-related effects are defined as impacts to noise sensitive land uses at or above the 65 DNL that experience a project-related increase of at least 1.5 DNL.

DNL contours were prepared with the FAA's Integrated Noise Model (INM), version 7.0a. The INM is a state-of-the-art, FAA approved software program used to model the noise exposure levels from aircraft operations and engine testing and produce contours of equal noise energy. These contours are presented using the 65 DNL noise contour metric where 65 DNL represents significant aircraft noise levels, and project-related significant impacts are identified based on a project-caused increase of 1.5 DNL within the 65 DNL contour for noise sensitive land uses.

Although the FAA recognizes that noise occurs outside of these contours, the 65 DNL contour has been federally accepted as the level at which residential and other noise sensitive land uses are non-compatible with aircraft noise. Because the existing 65 DNL noise contour shown on Figure C6, page C.18 of the EA, does not encompass noise sensitive land uses (homes, schools, churches, etc.), the existing land use in the vicinity of the Airport is considered compatible with aircraft operations and aircraft generated noise under the federal guidelines.

The compatibility of various land uses with noise above 65 DNL has been based on scientific research concerning public reaction to noise exposure. The Schultz curve, predicts approximately 14 percent of the exposed population would be highly annoyed with exposure to the 65 DNL. At 60 DNL, this rate of annoyance decreases to approximately 8 percent of the population would be highly annoyed. For more information on additional requests for noise
analysis, please see General Response 7-2, and for more information on perception of noise and general noise methods, please see General Response 7-3.

7-2 Noise Measurements and Supplemental Metrics requested

Some comments requested that noise measurements be conducted and that alternative noise metrics (including change in decibel) be used for the analysis. As described in General Response 7-1, the analysis of aircraft noise exposure was prepared in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Orders. Those orders require the use of noise exposure contours using the FAA’s Integrated Noise Model (INM) showing the area affected by 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) and greater noise levels. While alternative metrics can be informative, they are often associated with further understanding the effects associated with 65 DNL and greater sound levels when noise sensitive land uses are located within the 65 DNL noise contour. While FAA guidance indicates that the use of supplemental metrics such as Lmax and Leq is warranted in special circumstances such as areas of natural quiet or sleep disturbances, the FAA has determined that in this case, use of supplemental metrics is not warranted. For more information on noise perception, please see General Response 7-3. Therefore the standard DNL metric and 65 DNL threshold would be used to determine significance of the potential impacts on noise sensitive land uses.

Noise measurements, commonly referred to as noise monitoring, is a process used to confirm and verify the accuracy of the modeled contours. Noise monitoring is not a process used to test public reaction to a proposed action.

7-3 Noise analysis methodology

Some comments were received on the noise analysis questioning the use of the INM model, and the validity of the analysis. Other comments suggested that the analysis did not include additional noise sources such as engine run-up noise.

The noise methods used in the EA comply with the FAA environmental orders concerning aircraft noise. The noise contours were developed using the Integrated Noise Model (INM) 7.0a, which was the most current INM model at the time the report was created. The operational inputs were based on the FAA approved forecasts in Appendix G.

The INM model included aircraft engine run-ups that take place on the Boeing ramp on the northeast quadrant of the Airport. The “bubbling out” of the noise contour in the south central part of the Airport and to the northeast near the Boeing ramp is a result of aircraft run-ups from Boeing operations and Aviation Technical Services (ATS) operations. Because these noise events can be quite loud, they have a substantial effect on the contour, pushing the contour out to the east. However, the proposed actions are not expected to increase or change these aircraft run-ups. Taxiing operations are not included in the noise model as the INM does not model taxiing noise because it is believed to be overshadowed by landing and takeoff noise.
7-4 Flight tracks should be shown

Some comments requested that the flight tracks be shown on maps in the EA and asked if any changes would occur to the flight tracks as a result of the proposed Federal actions. In response to this request, the flight tracks are included in Figure C6 of the Final EA. Flight tracks are not expected to change with implementation of the proposed actions.

The Integrated Noise Model (INM) uses multiple input variables such as flight track data along with fleet mix, number of operations, etc. to produce noise contours. The flight track data from the Part 150 Study was used in preparing the noise contours for the Draft and Final EA. Data from the Part 150 included both flight track location and flight track use by type of aircraft. There would not be any change to the flight tracks as a result of the Proposed Action.

7-5 Proposed commercial fleet mix

Some comments were about the type of aircraft proposed for commercial service. Some comments suggested that the Allegiant MD83 aircraft should not be allowed to operate at Paine Field because of the noise levels that it generates.

The fleet mix used in evaluating the proposed actions in the EA was based upon communications with both Horizon and Allegiant. Horizon plans on using the Q400 for the proposed service at Paine Field and Allegiant plans on using the MD83. The Integrated Noise Model (INM) noise contours were completed based on these aircraft types and therefore the contours take into account the relative “noisiness” of each aircraft. Horizon also listed the CRJ 700 as a substitution aircraft for scheduling conflicts, so 1% of the Horizon traffic was modeled for that aircraft. Both turboprops and jets already operate at Paine Field.

In the early 1980s, the FAA began issuing rules and regulations that control aircraft noise at the source, the aircraft fuselage and engines. These aircraft noise standards established by the federal government must be met by aircraft manufacturers through newly-designed engines and aircraft. The government established timetables for airlines to comply with these noise standards, commonly known as Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3, and Stage 4 (in the international area these stages are referred to as Chapter 1 through 4).

Full compliance with Stage 2 standards was established in January 1, 1988 (Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 36). Subsequent to this timeframe, Congress passed the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 [ANCA], PL 101-508, 104 Stat. 1388, which established two broad directives for the FAA. The first directive established a method to review aircraft noise and airport use or access restrictions imposed by airport proprietors, and the second was to institute a program to phase-out Stage 2 aircraft over 75,000 pounds by December 31, 1999. In early 2000, the International Civil Aviation Organization established the Stage 4 requirements that require newly manufactured aircraft engines to meet Stage 4 levels by December 31, 2006.
To implement ANCA, the FAA amended FAR Part 91 and issued a new FAR Part 161. Part 91 addresses the phase-out of large Stage 2 aircraft and the phase-in of quieter Stage 3 aircraft. FAR Part 161 was promulgated as a stringent review and approval process for implementing use or access restrictions by airport proprietors, such as curfews and caps on operations.

This is in keeping with one of the major reasons for ANCA, which was to discourage local restrictions more stringent than ANCA’s 1999 Stage 2 phase-out. Part 161 makes it more difficult for airports or any others to implement use or access restrictions, especially those associated with Stage 3 aircraft. These difficulties are so significant that to date there has been only one Part 161 plan approved by the FAA. This plan was approved for Naples Airport in Florida for restricting Stage 2 smaller aircraft (under 75,000 pounds). Worth noting, airport/aircraft use restrictions in place at airports before the passage of ANCA were “grandfathered” and therefore allowed to remain in place as long as the airports did not modify the restrictions making them more stringent. Airports and state and local governments are preempted from regulating the operations of aircraft, with one exception. They may exclude aircraft from an airport for noise reasons as long as the exclusion is reasonable and nondiscriminatory. In addition, it must comply with the provisions of the ANCA, through FAR Part 161, and it must not regulate military aircraft. In 2005, the FAA adopted a new noise standard for jet airplanes that ensures the latest available noise reduction technology be incorporated into new designs. This noise standard, Stage 4, applies to any person submitting an application for a new airplane type design on after January 1, 2006.

The Q400 is a Stage 4 aircraft and the MD 83 is a Stage 3 aircraft. Therefore they meet all noise regulations related to aircraft stages.

**7-6 What are the existing and future noise impacts?**

Some comments stated that the existing noise is already intolerable, and mentioned that the proposed project would only make the problem worse and open the floodgates for even more noise. The comments also indicated that the analysis was flawed and did not represent the true change in noise.

The analysis of aircraft noise exposure in the EA was prepared in compliance with FAA Orders 1050.1E, Change 1 and 5050.4B. Those orders require the use of noise exposure contours using the FAA’s Integrated Noise Model (INM) showing the area affected by 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) and greater noise levels.

The FAA and the County have taken steps over the years to assess existing levels of aircraft noise and develop noise abatement procedures to reduce the impacts on residential and other noise sensitive areas. As a result, under current conditions (without aircraft operating in commercial service at Paine Field) there are currently no noise sensitive uses exposed to 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) noise levels at Paine Field. This existing 65 DNL noise contour is shown in Figure C6, page C.18 of the EA. The 65 DNL does not encompass any noise sensitive land uses (homes, schools, churches, etc.). Therefore, as described in **General Response 5-1**, the existing land use in the vicinity of the Airport is considered compatible with aircraft operations and aircraft generated noise according to Federal guidelines.
With the proposed actions, a slight change in noise would occur increasing the 65 DNL contour by approximately 17 acres in 2018. As seen starting on page D.21 of the Final EA, the proposed actions and their associated projects would not result in noise sensitive uses within the 65 DNL noise exposure contour. Because no significant noise impacts would occur to sensitive land uses within the FAA defined thresholds of significance (65 DNL contour), no mitigation is required. For more information on the use of DNL please see General Response 7-1 and for more information regarding noise perception compared to this significance analysis, please see General Response 7-3.

7-7 Noise impacts on schools

Some comments stated that there will be impacts on schools from increased noise as a result of the Proposed Action.

As stated in General Response 7-1, the noise and land use impact analysis presented in the document were prepared in accordance with Federal guidelines and showed that while aircraft noise would change slightly with the proposed project (increasing the 65 DNL contour by approximately 17 acres in 2018), there would continue to be no noise sensitive uses exposed to 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) or greater noise levels. No schools would be exposed to 65 DNL or greater noise levels with or without the proposed actions. Part 150 Land Use Compatibility Guidelines indicate that schools are compatible with aircraft noise levels less than 65 DNL. For comments regarding the use of additional noise metrics in the analysis, please see General Response 7-2.

7-8 Where are the schools located on the noise map?

Some comments requested that the locations of the schools be included in the EA.

In response to these comments, the locations of the schools have been placed on the noise exposure maps for both existing and future base case and with project scenarios in the Final EA. Please see Figures C4, and D1 through D6 of the Final EA. As described in General Response 7-2, use of the Lmax or Leq metric would not be warranted in this case. See General Response 7-7 for information regarding the noise impacts on schools.

7-9 What are the health effects of noise?

Some comments were received questioning the impacts of noise on public health. According to various studies and scientific research, noise can have varying effects on people. From these effects, criteria have been established to help protect the public health and safety and prevent disruption of certain human activities. These criteria are based on effects of noise on people, such as hearing loss (not a factor with typical community noise), communication interference, sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance.

The health effects were taken into account when the FAA was required by Congress, through the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act (ASNA) of 1985, to select one metric for describing aircraft noise levels. As stated in General Response 7-1, the FAA selected the use of the Day-Night Noise Level (DNL), which is required for use in FAA NEPA documents. The DNL
reflects the Schultz curve, which predicts that approximately 14 percent of the exposed population would be highly annoyed with exposure to the 65 DNL. This annoyance level has been correlated to health effects due to stress; hearing loss would not be expected at sound levels experienced off-airport in the vicinity of Paine Field. The Proposed Action would not subject any noise sensitive land uses to exposure of 65 DNL or greater; therefore, no significant project-related noise impacts are expected.

As stated above, noise is known to have adverse effects on people and these effects have helped establish criteria to protect the public health and safety and prevent disruption of certain human activities. These criteria are based on effects of noise on people, including hearing loss, communication interference, sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance. Each of these potential noise impacts is briefly discussed in the following points:

- **Hearing Loss** is generally not a concern in community/aircraft noise situations, even when close to a major airport or a freeway. The potential for noise induced hearing loss is more commonly associated with occupational noise exposure in heavy industry; very noisy work environments with long-term, sometimes close-proximity exposure; or, certain very loud recreational activities such as target shooting, motorcycle, or car racing, etc. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) identifies a noise exposure limit of 90 dBA for eight hours per day to protect from hearing loss (higher limits are allowed for shorter duration exposures). Noise levels in neighborhoods near airports, even in very noisy neighborhoods, do not exceed the OSHA standards and are not sufficiently loud to cause hearing loss.

- **Communication Interference** is one of the primary concerns with aircraft noise. Communication interference includes interference with hearing, speech, or other forms of communication such as watching television and talking on the telephone. Normal conversational speech produces sound levels in the range of 60 to 65 dBA, and any noise in this range or louder may interfere with the ability of another individual to hear or understand what is spoken. There are specific methods for describing speech interference as a function of the distance between speaker, listener, and voice level. The following figure entitled *QUALITY OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION IN RELATION TO THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE TALKER AND THE LISTENER*\(^5\) shows the relationship between the quality of speech communication and various noise levels.

---

\(^5\) **Source:** *Noise Effects Handbook, EPA*
QUALITY OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION IN RELATION TO THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE TALKER AND THE LISTENER

- Sleep Interference, particularly during nighttime hours, is one of the major causes of annoyance due to noise. Noise may make it difficult to fall asleep, create momentary disturbances of natural sleep patterns by causing shifts from deep to lighter stages, and may cause awakenings that a person may not be able to recall.

Research has shown that once a person is asleep in their own home, it is much more unlikely that they will be awakened by a noise. Some of this research has been criticized because it has been conducted in areas where subjects had become accustomed to aircraft noise. On the other hand, some of the earlier laboratory sleep studies have been criticized because of the extremely small sample sizes of most laboratory studies and because the laboratory was not necessarily a representative sleep environment.

An English study assessed the effects of nighttime aircraft noise on sleep in 400 people (211 women and 189 men; 20-70 years of age; one per household) living at eight sites adjacent to four U.K. airports, with different levels of night flying. The main finding was that only a minority of aircraft noise events affected sleep, and, for most subjects, that domestic and other non-aircraft factors had much greater effects. As shown in the following figure entitled CAUSES OF REPORTED AWAKENINGS⁶, aircraft noise is a minor contributor among a host of other factors that lead to awakening response.

---

⁶ Source: Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN), 1997
Likewise, the Federal Interagency Committee On Noise (FICON) in a 1992 document recommended that sleep disturbance be assessed based on laboratory studies of sleep disturbance. This review was updated in June 1997, when the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN) replaced the FICON recommendation with an updated curve based on the more recent in-home sleep disturbance studies. The FICAN recommended consideration of the "maximum percent of the exposed population expected to be behaviorally awakened," or the "maximum awakened."

The FICAN recommendation is shown in the following figure entitled "RECOMMENDED SLEEP DISTURBANCE DOSE-RESPONSE RELATIONSHIP" along with a more common statistical curve. The differences indicate, for example, a 10% awakening rate at a level of approximately 100 dB SEL, while the "maximum awakened" curve prescribed by FICAN shows the 10% awakening rate being reached at 80 dB SEL. (The full FICAN report can be found on the internet at www.fican.org). Sleep interference continues to be a major concern to the public and an area of debate among researchers.
Physiological Responses reflect measurable changes in pulse rate, blood pressure, etc. Generally, physiological responses reflect a reaction to a loud short-term noise, such as a rifle shot or a very loud jet over flight. While such effects can be induced and observed, the extent to which these physiological responses cause harm is not known.

Annoyance is the most difficult of all noise responses to describe. Annoyance is an individual characteristic and can vary widely from person to person. What one person considers tolerable may be unbearable to another of equal hearing capability. The level of annoyance also depends on the characteristics of the noise (e.g., loudness, frequency, time, and duration), and how much activity interference (e.g., speech interference and sleep interference) results from the noise. However, the level of annoyance is also a function of the attitude of the receiver. Personal sensitivity to noise varies widely. It has been estimated that two to 10 percent of the population are highly susceptible to annoyance from noise not of their own making, while approximately 20 percent are unaffected by noise. Attitudes are affected by the relationship between the listener and the noise source (Is it your dog barking or the neighbor's dog?). Whether one believes that someone is trying to abate the noise will also affect their level of annoyance.
7-10 What potential exists for a project related increase in vibrations?

Some comments stated that aircraft noise associated with Paine Field causes vibrations in homes and some of the comments stated that these homes are located outside of the 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) contour. Some comments stated objections to the potential vibrations that could result from additional aircraft activity as a result of the Proposed Action.

As shown on Figure C6 of the EA, there are no homes or other noise sensitive land uses located within the 65 DNL or greater noise exposure contour. Residences in the vicinity of Paine Field are subject to vibration associated with existing aircraft. The vibrations are caused by waves of energy emitted from both aircraft engines and the physical airframe of the aircraft as they pass through the air. Vibration, sufficient to cause structural damage, typically only occurs in areas of close proximity to the runway end, usually with areas exposed to 80 DNL and greater sound levels. As 80 DNL conditions do not occur outside the immediate confines of the runway ends at Paine Field, no adverse vibration effects sufficient to result in damage or hazards would be expected.

7-11 Call for noise curfew/activity restrictions

Some comments called for a noise curfew, or for activity restrictions or other measures to mitigate the impacts of the proposed project and general noise at the Airport.

Because there are no noise sensitive land uses within the 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) and there are no project-related effects that rise to the level of being significant, no mitigation measures are required. See General Response 1-5.

In terms of restrictions or curfews, the Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA) of 1990 restricted local Airport Sponsor’s ability to impose a curfew or restrict activity at a public use airport. Restrictions or required curfews can put an unreasonable burden on interstate commerce (which is an area of regulation reserved for the Federal government), and also results in discriminatory regulation that violates the tenets of the constitution. Therefore, these types of restrictions cannot be put into place at a public use airport. However, in 1997, the Airport enacted a voluntary noise abatement procedure for large commercial aircraft with more than 30 passengers from 9 p.m. to 7 a.m., where aircraft cannot land or take off without receiving prior permission from the Airport. This procedure is voluntary since ANCA makes it impossible to impose a required curfew or activity restriction and it also serves as a safety measure to inform pilots of potential head to head conflicts when the tower is closed. See also General Responses 2-1 and 5-2.

---

7-12 How are the potential noise impacts compatible with surrounding residential land uses?

Some comments questioned how the potential project-related aircraft noise impacts can be compatible with surrounding residential land uses.

The FAA selected the use of the Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) noise metric, which is required for use in FAA NEPA documents. See General Response 7-1.

In accordance with the land use compatibility guidelines as defined in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 150, certain land uses are compatible with various noise exposure levels. Most notably, residences, schools, churches, and other noise sensitive uses are compatible with noise levels less than 65 DNL (See Figure D7 in the Final EA). As shown in the Draft and Final EA, no noise sensitive uses would be affected by 65 DNL or greater noise levels. However, please see General Response 7-3 regarding people’s perception of noise.

7-13 What is the effect of the proposed project on parks?

Some comments stated that the proposed actions would have an impact on parks in the community.

Figure D7 of the EA shows land uses, including parks, relative to various levels of aircraft noise. Recreational uses of all kinds are compatible with noise below 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL). While there would be a project-related increase in noise to several parks in the airport vicinity, because no parks or recreation facilities are located in areas with noise exposure above 65 DNL, FAA land use compatibility guidelines indicate that the existing and future noise exposure with the proposed actions would be compatible with the anticipated noise. Therefore, no significant project-related impact to these parks is expected. For more information on noise see General Response 7-1.

7-14 What is the Airport Influence Area?

Some comments stated that the Airport Influence Area was designated by the local government to be an area appropriate for residential development, and that because of this designation, local officials had promised that commercial service would not occur at Paine Field.

The Airport Influence Area is defined in the Snohomish County General Policy Plan as “the property within the environs of the airport where land uses are either influenced by, or will influence, the operation of the airport in a positive or negative manner.” As described in General Response 5-5, the Airport Influence Area does not relate to the EA thresholds of significance or project area boundaries. The Airport Influence Area includes the Land areas within the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 conical and approach surfaces within three miles from the ends of the Airport’s runways. The Airport Influence Area was not a consideration of the Mediated Role Determination.
ISSUE 8. TRAFFIC

8-1 Traffic analysis

Some comments were received questioning the validity of the surface traffic impact analysis.

The traffic impact analysis for the proposed action (“the project”) was performed in accordance with Snohomish County’s requirements for new developments and the interlocal agreements between Snohomish County and WSDOT and the City of Mukilteo. Snohomish County does not have an interlocal agreement with the City of Everett and therefore the City of Everett’s SEPA traffic impact analysis requirements for developments were used when determining the scope of analysis required for the trips generated by the project impacting City of Everett intersections. Reviewing jurisdictions generally require impacts to be analyzed during the typical PM peak-hour (within the 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM time period) and sometimes the AM peak-hour (within the 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM time period). Snohomish County, WSDOT, the City of Mukilteo and the City of Everett do not require analysis of impacts during Boeing shift-changes, peak ferry times, during holidays or other non-typical peak times. In addition, the daily count data along 128th Street SW (the closest Snohomish County critical arterial unit) shows that the 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM traffic volumes are the highest volumes during the day. Snohomish County and the surrounding jurisdictions do not have a weekend or holiday peak analysis requirement for this area since the standard weekday commuter peaks typically have higher traffic volumes than weekends in the study area and seasonal peaks are only for 2-3 months of the year.

The exact schedule for the flights is not currently known. Therefore, to analyze the highest impact scenario it was assumed that the peak trip generation of the project would occur during the existing weekday commuter peaks (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM). This analysis timeframe was scoped with Snohomish County during the traffic scoping meeting held on September 17, 2009. During the scoping process the distribution of trips and intersections/arterials that were required to be analyzed were also determined.

The peak trip generation of the project assumes that during a 60-minute period the following trips will occur:

- One Horizon Air turn, all passengers arriving and departing
- One Allegiant Air turn, all passengers arriving and departing
- A quarter of the 17 employees will arrive and a quarter of the 17 employees will leave

These Paine Field trip generation assumptions were compared to the operations at Bellingham International Airport, which serves Horizon Air and Allegiant Air. It was found that the time between a full turn for Horizon Air and Allegiant Air at Bellingham is closer to two hours. Therefore, the assumption that all of the Paine Field trips will occur during one hour is conservatively high.

The trip generation calculations for the proposed action were also compared to the analysis performed by The Transpo Group for the Bellingham International Airport, dated November 2009. The Bellingham International Airport analysis shows that the existing 1,100 daily
enplanements, which equates to approximately 385,000 annual enplanements, generates 131 PM peak-hour trips. In comparison, the proposed action is anticipated to have 238,200 annual enplanements in 2018, approximately 40% fewer enplanements than the existing annual enplanements at Bellingham International Airport. However, the anticipated peak-hour trip generation for the proposed action is 212 PM peak-hour trips, which are 60% more trips from 40% fewer enplanements. The trip generation calculations performed for the proposed action are also similar to the maximum peak-hour trip generation calculations that were calculated by Hirsh Associates in their analysis. The three comparisons of the peak-hour trip generation of the project show that the trip generation is conservatively high.

All of the trips generated by the proposed action (i.e. trips to and from the new terminal) were assumed to be new trips to the road system for the purposes of performing the level of service analysis. This assumption that all trips are new, despite the fact that it is likely that the project will divert some existing trips to Paine Field from Sea-Tac International Airport and Bellingham International Airport that are presently traveling along the local road system, represents the highest impact scenario. The diversion of trips on a microscopic scale, intersection by intersection, is nearly impossible to determine. However, the diversion of trips can be calculated on a macroscopic level, the level at which the VMT analysis was performed, since the macroscopic level analysis is performed over a large area and is not based on turning movement volumes at specific intersections. A diversion of trips has therefore not been included in the level of service analysis for the traffic impact analysis. This assumption means that all of the trips generated to the project are new to the analyzed intersections and arterials, which represents the highest estimate of the impacts of the project.

The analysis of the impacts of the development are based on the Snohomish County and City of Everett standards for all developments and the interlocal agreements between Snohomish County and WSDOT and the City of Mukilteo and City of Everett standards for all developments. WSDOT, the City of Mukilteo and the City of Everett evaluate impacts of a development based on the operation of intersections. Snohomish County evaluates the impacts of a development based on the operation of arterial segments. The level of service criteria for WSDOT, City of Mukilteo and City of Everett intersections is summarized in Table 1, which is consistent with Table 1 of the traffic impact analysis.
Table 1: Level of Service Criteria for Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Expected Delay</th>
<th>Intersection Control Delay (Seconds per Vehicle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsignalized Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Little/No Delay</td>
<td>≤10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Short Delays</td>
<td>&gt;10 and ≤15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Average Delays</td>
<td>&gt;15 and ≤25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Long Delays</td>
<td>&gt;25 and ≤35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Very Long Delays</td>
<td>&gt;35 and ≤50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Extreme Delays</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Mukilteo and the City of Everett have a level of service threshold of LOS D for the operation of their intersections. WSDOT has a level of service threshold of LOS D for intersections along SR-525 and SR-526 and a threshold of LOS E for I-5 interchange ramps.


LOS A: Free-flow traffic conditions, with minimal delay to stopped vehicles (no vehicle is delayed longer than one cycle at signalized intersection).

LOS B: Generally stable traffic flow conditions.

LOS C: Occasional back-ups may develop, but delay to vehicles is short term and still tolerable.

LOS D: During short periods of the peak hour, delays to approaching vehicles may be substantial but are tolerable during times of less demand (i.e. vehicles delayed one cycle or less at signal).

LOS E: Intersections operate at or near capacity, with long queues developing on all approaches and long delays.

LOS F: Jammed conditions on all approaches with excessively long delays and vehicles unable to move at times.

9 When demand volume exceeds the capacity of the lane, extreme delays will be encountered with queuing which may cause severe congestion affecting other traffic movements in the intersection.
The level of service criteria for Snohomish County arterials is summarized in Table 2, which is consistent with Table 2 of the traffic impact analysis.

### Table 2: Level of Service Criteria for Arterials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Expected Delay</th>
<th>Average Arterial Speed (miles per hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban, Category II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Little/No Delay</td>
<td>&gt; 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Short Delays</td>
<td>&gt; 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Average Delays</td>
<td>&gt; 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Long Delays</td>
<td>&gt; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Very Long Delays</td>
<td>&gt; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Extreme Delays</td>
<td>≤ 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Snohomish County has a level of service threshold of LOS E for the operation of their arterials. There are two arterials that are Urban Category II arterials:

- Arterial Unit #227 – Beverly Park Road, SR-525 to Airport Way
- Arterial Unit #231 – Airport Road, 106th Street SW to Kasch Park Road

The only Urban Category III arterial impacted by the project is:

- Arterial Unit #228 – Airport Road/128th Street SW, SR-99 to I-5 Southbound Ramps

The analysis of the Snohomish County arterials is based on a model that has been calibrated to field collected data to ensure that the model accurately represents the existing operation of the arterial and can accurately predict the operation with the additional traffic.

It should be noted that Arterial Unit #223 was analyzed as part of the traffic impact analysis in the Draft EA, but not the Final EA. This arterial was no longer a critical arterial unit at the time of the traffic impact analysis included in the Final EA.

A scoping meeting was held with Snohomish County staff on September 17, 2009 and a scoping memorandum was received from WSDOT. Scoping discussions were held with City of Everett staff and a scoping request was made to the City of Mukilteo, but a response from the City of Mukilteo was never received. These scoping discussions were performed to, in part, determine the scope of analysis required for the project. The interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and WSDOT sets a threshold of 10 total PM peak-hour trips for analysis of WSDOT intersections. The following WSDOT intersections, designated by their associated study intersection numbers, are impacted with 10 or more PM peak-hour development trips and were analyzed as part of the traffic impact analysis:
4. SR-525 at Beverly Park Road
12. I-5 Southbound Ramps at 128th Street SW
17. I-5 Northbound Ramps at 128th Street SW
20. Airport Road at SR-526 Westbound Ramps

Additional WSDOT intersections were not analyzed since the either did not meet the threshold of 10 PM peak-hour trips or were not requested by WSDOT for analysis during the scoping process. A review letter from Lorena Eng of WSDOT, dated January 20, 2010, agreed with the analysis of impacts to WSDOT intersection.

The interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and the City of Mukilteo requires arterial intersections impacted with 10 or more directional PM peak-hour trips to be analyzed. The only City of Mukilteo intersections meeting this criteria that will be impacted by 10 or more directional PM peak hour trips from the project, designated by their associated study intersection numbers, are:

21. SR-526/Paine Field Boulevard at 84th Street SW
22. 44th Avenue W at 84th Street SW
23. SR-525 at 84th Street SW

The Traffic Impact Analysis included these intersections.

Snohomish County and the City of Everett do not have an interlocal agreement. However, impacts to City of Everett intersections have been analyzed following the City of Everett SEPA impact threshold of 50 PM peak-hour trips. The intersection of the SR-526 westbound ramps at Evergreen Way which is a City of Everett intersection, was also analyzed at the request of WSDOT even though it is not impacted with 50 PM peak-hour trips. The following City of Everett intersections, designated by their associated study intersection numbers, were analyzed as part of the traffic impact analysis:

5. Beverly Park Road at Airport Road
6. SR-99 at Airport Road
18. Airport Road at 112th Street SW
19. Airport Road at Casino Road
24. SR-526 Westbound Ramps at Evergreen Way

The project does not impact any other City of Everett intersections with 50 or more PM peak-hour trips. A review letter, dated February 3, 2010, from Allan Giffen, the SEPA Responsible Official of the City of Everett, agreed with the analysis of impacts to City of Everett intersection. The traffic impact analysis determined that the project’s impacts to these arterials and intersections would decrease the travel speed on the arterials and add delay to the intersections. However, the analysis showed that the project will not have a significant impact on the surrounding roadways since the project will not cause any of the arterials or intersections to change from an acceptable level of service without the project to an unacceptable level of service with the project. This increase in delay is not anticipated to significantly affect emergency vehicles that will use the major roadways in the site vicinity, especially since Snohomish County
provides pre-emptive operation for emergency vehicles. The increase in delay is also not anticipated to significantly change the existing travel patterns since the project will not cause any arterials or intersections to operate at a deficient level of service.

The project will add trips to one City of Everett intersection, SR-99 at Airport Road, one City of Mukilteo intersection, SR-525 at 84th Street SW, and two WSDOT intersections, SR-525 at Beverly Park Road and 128th Street SW at the I-5 northbound ramps, which will operate at LOS F without the addition of the project and will meet the respective impact thresholds for the jurisdiction. The City of Everett did not require mitigation for impacts to this intersection since capacity improvements for single-occupant vehicles are not practical. The City of Everett supported the recently implemented Swift bus rapid transit as its strategy for multi-modal transportation improvements to this corridor and is in the process of evaluating the entire Evergreen Way corridor in this area for comprehensive transportation enhancements. The project will be contributing mitigation fees as part of the WSDOT traffic mitigation fees to aid in funding improvements to the I-5/128th Street SW interchange, per the interlocal agreement and WSDOT comments and the intersection of SR-525 at Beverly Park Road is at its ultimate configuration. The City of Mukilteo intersection of SR-525 at Beverly Park Road is anticipated to operate at a deficient level of service under the 2018 with project conditions and the existing signal timings. However, the intersection is anticipated to operate at an acceptable level of service under the 2018 with project conditions if the signal timings are optimized. Traffic mitigation fees are proposed to be paid to the City of Mukilteo that will help mitigate the impacts to City of Mukilteo roadways.

The calculated peak-hour trip generation for the Paine Field project, which is used for all of the impact analysis in the traffic impact analysis, has been shown to be consistent with the trips generated at Bellingham International Airport for a Horizon Air and Allegiant Air arrival and departure over approximately 2 hours. The peak-hour trip generation of the project is therefore conservatively high since it has been assumed that all of the trips will occur in 1 hour, as opposed to 2 hours. This assumption is also consistent with the analysis in the Hirsh Associates report (Appendix K of the Draft EA and Final EA). The peak-hour trip generation is also higher than the peak-hour trip generation that would be calculated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation data.

8-2 Why weren’t diverted trips accounted for?

Some comments questioned why the analysis did not account for diverted trips.

Diversions are expected. However, it is not possible to determine on an intersection-by-intersection basis the diverted traffic. Evaluating diversions would require knowing, on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood and street-by-street basis, how many passengers are likely to use Paine Field instead of Sea-Tac International Airport or Bellingham International Airport. The FAA determined that such micro level scale location information was not available and thus, the impact analysis should focus on a conservative evaluation. For these reasons a diversion of trips (reduction in trips) was not applied to the microscopic analysis that is required for the traffic impact analysis. Therefore, a conservative analysis of the impacts of the project was used.
9-1  What is the impact upon property values?

Some comments expressed concern that the proposed actions would have a negative impact on property values in the area.

A limited number of studies have attempted to measure the impact of aircraft noise on property values. No specific studies of the impact of noise at Paine Field on real property values have been conducted. Studies conducted at other airports have concluded that airport noise has only a slight impact on property values within the 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) or greater noise contour. Additionally, comparison of older studies to more recent studies indicates that the impact was greater in the 1960’s, when jet aircraft first entered the fleet, than in the 1980’s or 1990’s. This presumably is the result of stabilization of real estate markets following an initial adjustment to noisier jets, and of noise reduction in more modern Stage 3 planes.

An FAA summary report on aviation noise effects states:

“Studies have shown that aircraft noise does decrease the value of residential property located around airports. Although there are many socio-economic factors which must be considered because they may negatively affect property values themselves, all research conducted in this area found negative effects from aviation noise, with effects ranging from 0.6 to 2.3 percent decrease in property value per decibel increase of cumulative noise exposure ... The studies can be divided into two groups and some conclusions drawn. The first group of estimates ... was based on 1960 data (and included New York, Los Angeles and Dallas) and suggests a range of 1.8 to 2.3 percent decrease in value per decibel (DNL). The second group of estimates, covering the period from 1967 to 1970, suggests a mean of 0.8 percent devaluation per decibel change in DNL... The bottom line is that noise has been shown to decrease the value of property by only a small amount -- approximately 1 percent decrease per decibel (DNL). At a minimum, the depreciation of a home due to aircraft noise is equal to the cost of moving to a new residence. Because there are many other factors that affect the price and desirability of a residence, the annoyance of aircraft noise remains just one of the considerations that affect the market value of a home.”

One of the difficulties in evaluating the effect of aircraft noise on property values is the application of findings from one location to another. The Effect of Airport Noise on Housing Values, a report prepared in 1994 by Booz-Allen & Hamilton for the FAA, outlined a viable method of examining the effects of airport noise on housing values at the national level by using an approach referred to as the "neighborhood pair model." A series of studies conducted at Baltimore-Washington International, Los Angeles International, and New York LaGuardia and Kennedy International Airports determined that the neighborhood pair model can be used to establish the boundaries of the effect that airport noise has on housing values at a given airport. However, Booz-Allen recommended that their approach not be used at this time to determine property values.

---

In the Summary and Conclusions section of the report, it was stated "the magnitude of this impact [of noise on property values] cannot be estimated at the national level at this time, since the results varied across a wide range for the Airports studied, and only a small sample of airports was considered."

9-2 Indirect/induced traffic effects

Some comments questioned the evaluation of indirect and induced impacts, specifically relative to traffic.

The evaluation of indirect and induced impacts was conducted in accordance with FAA Orders 1050.1E Change 1 and 5050.4B. Major development projects can potentially influence induced or secondary impacts on the surrounding community. Some of these induced impacts could include relocation of people or a substantial change to traffic patterns in the area. Minor traffic changes are anticipated to the roadway systems in the vicinity of the Airport as presented in the Surface Transportation section of the EA (Page D.34) and in the Traffic Impact Analysis Report found in Appendix F. Growth induced impacts are addressed in General Response 6-6, job impacts and socioeconomic impacts are addressed in General Response 9-3.

9-3 Socioeconomic Impacts

Some comments generally questioned what socioeconomic impacts would occur as a result of the proposed actions. Other comments questioned what impacts the proposed actions would have on the community, specifically in terms of jobs.

According to FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1, a socioeconomic impact is significant if it requires extensive relocation, with insufficient replacement housing available, extensive relocation of community business that would cause severe economic hardship for affected communities, disruption of local traffic patterns that substantially reduce the Levels of Service (LOS) of roads serving the airport and its surrounding communities, or a substantial loss in community tax base. As stated in the Final EA, an increase in the number of jobs and use of local goods and services as a result of the Proposed Action can be expected. The proposed actions would specifically generate additional jobs, payroll, and expenditures in the airport vicinity. It is estimated that 6 to 10 airline jobs would be created. However, some of these employees (such as fuel service providers) may be existing Fixed Base Operator (FBO) contracted employees. It is also estimated that up to 17 new Transportation Security Administration (TSA), rental car, and maintenance jobs would be permanently created at the Airport. There was concern from some commenters that these jobs created would be “lower-paying jobs,” and this issue is addressed in General Response 9-7.

Because the Proposed Action would not require relocation of businesses or residences, there would be no significant change in either the tax base or the economic vitality of the area. No significant impacts on property values are expected and therefore, no induced impacts resulting from a negative change in the tax base are expected. There would be a slight change in traffic as described in General Responses 8-1 and 9-2, but this impact would not be significant.
9-4 **E.O. 13045 Children’s Health and Safety impact analysis**

Some comments stated that children’s health and safety were not analyzed in the EA.

The analysis of impacts to children’s health and safety was prepared in accordance with FAA Orders 1050.1E Change 1 and 5050.4B. Per Executive Order 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks* Federal agencies:

(a) shall make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children; and

(b) shall ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks

The analysis of children’s health and safety was included in the EA and can be found on page D.32 of the Final EA. In response to comments, the locations of schools were added to the noise contour figures in the EA ([General Response 7-8](#)). There are no anticipated significant noise impacts on schools ([General Response 7-7](#) and see Figures D1 through D6 of the Final EA) and there are no other general effects on schools regarding air quality, water quality or other resources which could affect the health of children or impact schools. Because there are no significant adverse impacts (including noise) to any population groups or neighborhoods according to FAA defined thresholds of significance, there are no significant adverse impacts or disproportionate impacts to children’s health or safety.

9-5 **Environmental Justice**

Some comments stated that the EA did not address environmental justice or special population issues.

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* directs federal agencies to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its actions on minority populations and low-income populations. The effects of the proposed actions were addressed in the Draft and Final EA in the section titled *Socioeconomic Environment, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks*.

There are no significant impacts to any population group or neighborhoods based on the 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) noise contour and the FAA’s threshold of project-related significance; consequently, there can be no disproportionate adverse effects to special population groups, minority populations or low-income populations. The “project area” in the EA either refers to the actual construction footprint of the modular terminal and/or the 65 DNL noise contour. While there are special population groups in the surrounding community, there are no special population groups or neighborhoods located within the direct impact area (construction footprint) or within the 65 DNL noise contour (the indirect impact area); therefore there would not be any significant direct or indirect impacts on special population groups or neighborhoods. No land acquisition is associated with the Proposed Action and the only off-airport effects of the Proposed Action are in the areas of surface transportation and noise. No significant impacts are
expected and no improvements are required for the roadway system as a result of the increased traffic attributable to the Proposed Action and the 65 DNL noise contour remains primarily on airport property and does not encompass any residential development.

9-6 What is the impact of the project on crime?

Some comments stated that the proposed actions will increase crime in the community.

There is no known published research that would indicate a correlation between the initiation of commercial air service or conduct of commercial aviation and local crime or prostitution. Therefore, it is not possible to evaluate such conditions relative to the proposed actions.

9-7 Project will bring in lower income people and low paying jobs

Some comments stated that the proposed actions will bring in lower income people and low paying jobs that would have a negative impact on the community.

The proposed actions are not expected to alter population patterns in the airport area, as the actions are not expected to result in residential or business displacements or result in a material change in employment patterns. The jobs that would be created as a result of the Proposed Action are expected to have a positive impact on the local community. See also General Response 9-3 on the number of created jobs resulting from the proposed actions. No negative socioeconomic impacts are expected to result from jobs, which would help stimulate the economy. Also see General Response 9-1 concerning perceived loss in property values and General Response 9-4 regarding general socioeconomic impacts.

9-8 What are the health and quality of life effects associated with the project?

Some comments stated that the proposed actions will have an adverse effect on health and quality of life.

“Health” is not a category that is specifically called out in NEPA or FAA NEPA guidance. However, each of the environmental resource categories addressed in the EA can be related back to health effect. For example, in the area of air quality, the national ambient air quality standards are established by the USEPA to protect public health and welfare. Thus, the air quality evaluation considers the effects of the proposed actions relative to these standards. Similarly, FAA’s consideration of aircraft noise exposure ensures the protection of public health and also the compatibility of land uses with various sound levels. Each section in Chapter D of the EA discusses the environmental resources. As noted, in accordance with FAA NEPA guidance, the project-related effects of the proposed actions are not expected to exceed the FAA’s thresholds of significance, and thus, no significant health-related effects are expected.
ISSUE 10, AIR QUALITY/EMISSIONS

10-1  Greenhouse gas/climate change

Some comments requested that the EA address project-related greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.

In response to these comments and in close coordination with the Puget Sound Clear Air Agency, the FAA included the following discussion in the Final EA:

In January 2012, the FAA issued FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1 Guidance Memo #3 titled "Considering Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA): Interim Guidance". This section addresses the effects of the proposed actions at Paine Field in accordance with the FAA guidance.

Of growing concern is the impact of proposed projects on climate change. Greenhouse gases are those that trap heat in the earth's atmosphere. Both naturally occurring and anthropogenic (man-made) greenhouse gases include water vapor (H$_2$O), carbon dioxide (CO$_2$), methane (CH$_4$), nitrous oxide (N$_2$O), and ozone (O$_3$).

Research has shown that there is a direct link between fuel combustion and greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, sources that require fuel or power at an airport are the primary sources that would generate greenhouse gases. Aircraft are probably the most often cited air pollutant source, but they produce the same types of emissions as cars. Aircraft jet engines, like many other vehicle engines, produce CO$_2$, water vapor, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, oxides of sulfur, unburned or partially combusted hydrocarbons [also known as volatile organic compounds (VOCs)], particulates, and other trace compounds.

According to most international reviews, aviation emissions comprise a small but potentially important percentage of human-made greenhouse gases and other emissions that contribute to global warming. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) estimates that global aircraft emissions account for about 3.5% of the total quantity of greenhouse gas from human activities. In terms of relative U.S. contribution, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) reports that aviation accounts “for about 3% of total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from human sources” compared with other industrial sources, including the remainder of the transportation sector (23%).

---

12 All greenhouse gas inventories measure carbon dioxide emissions, but beyond carbon dioxide different inventories include different greenhouse gases (GHGs).
13 Several classes of halogenated substances that contain fluorine, chlorine, or bromine are also greenhouse gases, but they are, for the most part, solely a product of industrial activities. For example, chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) are halocarbons that contain chlorine, while halocarbons that contain bromine are referred to as bromofluorocarbons (i.e., halons) or sulfur (sulfur hexafluoride: SF$_6$).
and industry (41%). The 2012 USEPA nationwide inventory of greenhouse gas emissions, notes that aviation-related emissions represented about 2.1% of emissions. That report also found "Across all categories of aviation, CO2 emissions decreased by 20.6 percent (36.9 Tg) between 1990 and 2010." 

The scientific community is developing areas of further study to enable them to more precisely estimate aviation’s effects on the global atmosphere. The FAA is currently leading and participating in several efforts intended to clarify the role that commercial aviation plays in greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. The most comprehensive and multi-year program geared towards quantifying climate change effects of aviation is the Aviation Climate Change Research Initiative (ACCRI) funded by FAA and NASA. ACCRI will reduce key scientific uncertainties in quantifying aviation-related climate impacts and provide timely scientific input to inform policy-making decisions. FAA also funds Project 12 of the Partnership for Air Transportation Noise & Emissions Reduction (PARTNER) Center of Excellence research initiative to quantify the effects of aircraft exhaust and contrails on global and U.S. climate and atmospheric composition.

Aviation activity levels and airport development projects have the potential to both affect climate change and be affected by climate change. Changes to generation and/or use of natural resources such as air quality and energy supply can potentially affect climate change (e.g., by increasing the amount of greenhouse gases emitted), but projects can also be impacted by climate change (e.g., rising sea levels). At this point, there is no consistent scientific indication of when and how the climate will change.

Research has shown that there is a direct link between fuel combustion and greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, sources that require power/fuel at an airport are the primary sources that would generate greenhouse gases. Aircraft are probably the most often cited air pollutant source, but they produce the same types of emissions as cars. Based on FAA data, operations activity at Snohomish County Airport, relative to aviation throughout the United States, represents less than 1% of U.S. aviation activity. Therefore, assuming that greenhouse gases occur in proportion to the level of activity, greenhouse gas emissions associated with existing and future aviation activity at the Airport would be expected to represent less than 0.03% of U.S.-based greenhouse gases. Therefore, emissions of greenhouse gases from this project are not expected to be significant.

As discussed above, changes to resource categories such as air quality and natural resources and energy supply can potentially affect climate change (e.g., by increasing the amount of greenhouse gases emitted), but projects can also be impacted by climate change (e.g., rising sea levels). At this point, there is no consistent scientific indication of when and how the climate will change.

---

16 Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2010, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Report EPA 430-R-12-001, April 15, 2012; page 3-13/
The EA adequately addresses FAA guidance and requirements for Air Quality and Climate Change. There is no FAA requirement for GHG quantitative evaluation. At this time a full airport and project-related greenhouse gas inventory has not been prepared. However, parts of the information are available, and others will be generated when the County prepares its Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) documentation. The following data is available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>CO2 Operational Emissions (Tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>17,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Service Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Access Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2013*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>23,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Service Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Access Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>23,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Service Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Access Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>23,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Service Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Access Vehicles</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BridgeNet Consulting Services, July 2012 Using EDMS 5.1.3; Surface emissions: Synergy Consultants, July 2012. Note that EDMS is not able to quantify CO2 emissions from GSE and CO2 emissions for ground access vehicles assumes no diverted trips. GAV calculated assuming average MPG of 22.5 and 19.56 lbs of CO2 per gallon fuel. * Project-related emissions for 2013 are conservative and assume a full year of operations in addition to construction of the proposed terminal.
10-2 Air quality conformity

Some comments stated that the EA did not address general conformity or fully address air quality impacts.

The General Conformity Regulation requirements of the Clean Air Act (40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 93) are very clear. Any actions of the federal government must be shown to conform with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the area. In undertaking a conformity analysis, the conformity regulations identify the steps of the process, which first starts with a determination of whether or not the regulation applies, through the preparation of an applicability analysis. If the total project-related emissions are less than the de-minimis threshold for the pollution, a conformity determination is not required. The Draft and Final EA contain that applicability analysis. Because the Puget Sound Region is in attainment for all pollutants, but is subject to a maintenance plan for carbon monoxide, the conformity analysis is only required for that pollutant. The de-minimis threshold for a carbon monoxide maintenance area is 100 tons of project-related emissions per year. (40 CFR Part 93.153(b)(2). The air quality modeling indicated that the proposed project would not trigger the de-minimis threshold (i.e. the project would produce less than 100 tons of project-related emissions per year).

In response to questions and comments about the emissions being low because the evaluation only focused on the proposal by two carriers, it is important to understand the basis by which NEPA documents are prepared. Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA requires that NEPA documents address impacts that are "reasonably foreseeable".

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order 5050.4B Paragraph 9q defines reasonably foreseeable as:

> An action on or off-airport that a proponent would likely complete and that has been developed with enough specificity to provide meaningful information to a decision maker and the interested public. Use the following table to help determine if an action is reasonably foreseeable.4

4 (footnote 4: Paragraph 905.c(1) and (2) provide definitions of “connected actions” and “similar actions,” respectively)

Similar to the requirements of NEPA, the General Conformity Regulations also contain a related definition. 40 CFR 93.153 defines "reasonably foreseeable emissions" as:

> ... are projected future indirect emissions that are identified at the time the conformity determination is made; the location of such emissions is known and the emissions are quantifiable, as described and documented by the Federal agency based on its own information and after reviewing any information presented to the Federal agency.

While the action of constructing a new modular terminal is reasonably foreseeable, and thus is ripe for consideration in the EA, how and when activity levels may change beyond that
predicted by the two proposing airlines is not foreseeable. Such information is required to evaluate the environmental effect. To disclose the effects of activity at the maximum capacity of the proposed terminal, the Final EA includes Appendix P. It is important to note that some commenters indicated that the proposing carriers may increase their activity to that capacity level, or that additional carriers may choose to operate at Snohomish County Airport. The results of the impact evaluation would differ based on the fleet mix assumptions and activity assumptions of the carriers operating. Appendix P describes one such scenario. Without a clear understanding of the carriers that would be operating in a specific timeframe, the impacts on air quality could not be identified, as emissions vary based on aircraft type and the associated engines. For these reasons, the FAA determined that such conditions are not reasonably foreseeable and therefore will not be modeled or assessed in this EA.

10-3 Outdated model: EDMS

Some comments indicated concern with the modeling process and use of an outdated model in the EA to assess air quality conditions.

At the time the analysis was initiated, it was conducted using the most recent version of the model required by the FAA for use in NEPA documents – the FAA’s Emissions Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS). This is the same model used by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) in preparing inventories for airports that are represented in the maintenance plan/State Implementation Plan (SIP). FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1 Appendix A.2.2 notes: "In conducting air quality analysis for purposes of complying with NEPA or conformity, the FAA requires use of the Emissions and Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS) model for aviation sources (aircraft, auxiliary power units, and ground support equipment)."

The emissions inventory presented in the Draft EA was prepared using FAA's EDMS version 5.1. Preparation of the Draft EA was initiated in early 2009. At that time, Version 5.1 was the most recent version of EDMS offered by FAA. Subsequently, the FAA issued Version 5.1.3. As noted on the FAA's web site, Version 5.1.3 corrected several output reports associated with the FAA's Voluntary Airport Low Emission (VALE) grant program, which is not related to analysis used in this EA. However, because a new forecast was prepared the most recent version of the EDMS was used.

FAA Order 1050.1E Appendix A.2 states:

2.4c. Modeling Requirements. The EDMS is FAA’s required methodology for performing air quality analysis modeling for aviation sources. EDMS also offers the capability to model other airport emission sources that are not aviation-specific, such as power plants, fuel storage tanks, and ground access vehicles. (underline added)

2.4d. Except for air toxics or where advance written approval has been granted to use an equivalent methodology and computer model by the FAA Office of Environment and Energy, the air quality analyses for aviation emission sources from airport and FAA proposed projects conducted to satisfy NEPA, general conformity, and 49 USC 47106(c) requirements under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (as amended) must be
prepared using the most recent EDMS model available at the start of the environmental analysis process. In the event that EDMS is updated after the environmental analysis process is underway, the updated version of EDMS may be used to provide additional disclosure concerning air quality but use is not required. (Underline added)

Although the consultant had already completed the emissions inventory modeling, due to public comments, the EDMS model was re-run with the most recent version of the model, EDMS 5.1.3. The quality modeling results presented in the Final EA reflect the analysis using the most recent version of the model.

EDMS was accepted as an U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) “Preferred Guideline” model in 1993 under Title 40 CFR part 51 Appendix W. In 2005 the FAA and EPA recognized that EDMS employs a suite of standalone compliance models already listed in the “Preferred Guideline” such as MOBILE6.2, NONROAD, AERMOD, AERMET, and AERMAP. Consequently, EDMS was relocated to section 6.2.4 “Modeling Guidance for Other Governmental Programs” in 40CFR51 Appendix W to coincide with FAA’s policy that EDMS is the required model to assess airport emissions.

**10-4 Would there be an increase in fuel dump/fuel smell/residue?**

Some comments stated that there would be added fuel dump, smell and residue as a result of the proposed project. Rarely does fuel dumping actually occur. If an aircraft needs to jettison fuel, it is in an emergency situation. Most aircraft have the capability of taking off with more weight than they can safely land with. This means that in an emergency situation after takeoff, the aircraft would need to reduce its weight to make a safe return landing. Depending on the nature of the emergency, the pilot has two options, either jettison fuel or fly in a holding pattern until enough fuel has been burned to reduce the weight to below the maximum certified gross landing weight. According to federal directive 7110.65T paragraph 9-4-1 through 9-4-4, aircraft may dump fuel as necessary in a declared emergency state. There are no restrictions as to where the aircraft may or may not dump fuel. However, each airspace area has a recommended, pre-designated fuel dumping area for instances where fuel needs to be dumped if time permits. 7110.65T states controllers are to "assign an altitude at least 2,000 feet above the highest obstacle within 5 miles of the route or pattern being flown." For the Central Puget Sound Region, this is typically over Puget Sound at an altitude of above 5,000 feet to allow time for the fuel to evaporate before reaching the ground, and to prevent non-evaporated fuel from reaching populated areas. Because any fuel release is irregular and restricted to emergency conditions, impacts to human or natural habitats would be minimal and rare.

It is important to note that not all aircraft even have the capability to jettison fuel. Some are designed and stressed to be able to takeoff and land with the same weight, so fuel jettisoning is not necessary. Boeing information indicates that fuel dumping is not available on the MD80 aircraft as this aircraft is designed with a high landing weight.

Citizens also noted that soot or particles are deposited on their property due to aircraft flights. The FAA has conducted soot analysis at many airports across the country with the uniform result that samples collected on and near the airport bore little chemical resemblance to either unburned
jet fuel or soot from jet exhaust. Instead, the collected material was found to be chemically similar to general urban pollution, particles from burning heavy fuels, and motor vehicle exhaust.

Odors from aircraft typically have more of an oily smell versus an odor like one would experience when fueling an auto. The pollutants that comprise this type of smell are accounted for in the air pollutant assessment presented in the Environmental Assessment (EA) for precursor pollutants -- pollutant levels where the standards exist to protect human health and welfare.

There are many different types of odorous hydrocarbon compounds in jet exhaust which may be responsible for periodic “odor episodes”. Typically, the most reactive or “volatile” hydrocarbons have the most potential to cause odor (i.e., cause a detectable odor at a lower concentration). The principal odor-causing hydrocarbon species in jet exhaust are the aromatic (fuel-related) and oxygenated (partially burned) hydrocarbons. Hydrocarbon emission rates are greatest during the low-power idle and taxi modes of the Landing-Take-Off (LTO) cycle, when the engines are not operating as efficiently. During takeoff and climbout, for example, hydrocarbon emissions are greatly reduced since the engines operate with greater efficiency.

The most recent study concerning odors from jet engine exhaust was conducted at Boston’s Logan Airport (“Identification of Odorous Compounds From Jet Engine Exhaust at Boston’s Logan Airport”, December, 1992). Based on air monitoring at Boston Logan, three compounds - acetaldehyde, formaldehyde, and naphthalene - were present on a consistent basis above their respective odor recognition thresholds. Each of these compounds could be generated by the incomplete combustion of jet fuel. The odor impact depends on wind speed and direction, turbulence, and distance between the source and nearby residents. The odor recognition characteristics of these compounds is generally characterized as follows: Acetaldehyde is described as sweet, “apple ripened” and pungent; Formaldehyde is described as odor like hay, straw-like, and pungent; Naphthalene is described as having odor like tar, creosote, and mothballs.

As noted by the Boston study, the results were based on the minimum detectable limits because overall concentrations for these compounds were generally small. Additionally, no specific source or activity was identified as the primary source of these compounds. Moreover, the Boston study notes that motor vehicle exhaust also contains many of these same compounds. No conclusion was drawn as to the source, concentration, or potential impact to human health.

The air quality modeling within the EA covers many of the pollutants that relate either directly or indirectly to fuel “smells,” and covers all the pollutants regulated federally that relate to human health. Since the project does not trigger any federal thresholds of significance for air quality for these pollutants, there are no significant impacts relating to the air quality.

**10-5 Question regarding the analysis of PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$**

Some comments stated that particulate matter needed to be rigorously analyzed in the EA. The EA considered emissions of particulate matter within the evaluation capabilities of the models that are required for use (Emissions Dispersion Modeling System – EDMS). The inventory presented in the EA considered the two particulate matters for which there are national ambient
air quality standards (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$). The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has designated the Snohomish County as attainment for both PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$.

The EPA, Washington State Department of Ecology, and the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) conduct measurements throughout the State for purposes of monitoring compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The closest air quality monitoring station to Paine Field is located in Marysville (7th Ave) about 10 miles north of the Airport, and Lynnwood (on 212th) about 9 miles south of the Airport. Two other sites also measure concentrations in Snohomish County – Darrington (Fir Street) and Woodinville. Both of these monitoring sites measure PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations. The 2007 Air Quality Data Summary Report$^{17}$ by the PSCAA states:

The agency, along with partners, continued to monitor the region’s air quality in 2007. Over the last decade, criteria air pollutant concentrations for some pollutants have fallen well below levels of concern in our jurisdiction. For example, levels of carbon monoxide, a pollutant that the region was formerly in nonattainment for, have fallen to levels so low that the Washington State Department of Ecology discontinued many of the monitors in 2006 in order to focus its monitoring resources on higher priority pollutants.

The same is true for the criteria pollutants sulfur dioxide, lead, and nitrogen dioxide. While the area enjoys improving air quality, we are facing new challenges. After more than a decade of attaining all federal standards, the agency faces nonattainment, potentially in multiple areas, for PM$_{2.5}$ and ozone. This is due to recent revisions to the national fine particulate and ozone standards to better protect public health....

... sites in Snohomish and King Counties are close to the daily fine particle federal standard. ... While efforts to reduce fine particulate emissions will be tailored to different areas, they generally target wood smoke emissions reductions, as the highest PM$_{2.5}$ levels occur in heating months when wood stoves and fireplaces contribute the majority of PM$_{2.5}$. (Page 3)

Relative to particulate emissions, the PSCAA has noted that “Concentrations at the Marysville and Darrington monitors, both in Snohomish County, are on the brink of violating the new daily standard” (35 μg/m3 which was adopted in 2006). Daily PM$_{2.5}$ measurements in Snohomish County have shown that measurements at Lynnwood have not exceeded the federal standard since measurements began in 2002, but measurements at Maryville equaled or exceeded the standards between 2001 and 2007, except in 2006. Relative to the annual PM$_{2.5}$ standard, measurements at the two Snohomish County sites have been below the standard between 2001 and 2007. PSCAA notes that the primary contributor to PM emissions is from residential wood stoves and fireplaces.

---

The air quality modeling within the EA covers the analysis for both PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. Since the project does not trigger any federal thresholds of significance for air quality for these pollutants, there are no significant impacts relating to the air quality under NEPA.

10-6 Toxics/HAPS

Some comments addressed hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) and their potential increase due to the proposed project. FAA guidance states:

e. Airport-related hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has identified roughly 25 individual HAPs that are associated with emissions from aircraft and airport ground service equipment (GSE). However, EPA does not specify aircraft and airports in the definitions and categories of HAP sources in Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) (“Hazardous Air Pollutants”). Nor has EPA established standards for HAPs. When compared with existing urban backgrounds, air quality monitoring studies near several large airports have not shown that increased HAP levels occur near those facilities. In fact, only a small percentage of an urban area’s overall air pollution is attributable to airport emissions. Nevertheless, due to the emission levels of unburned hydrocarbons and particulates near airports, EPA’s National Air Toxic Program notes that airports are complex facilities that emit HAPs.

Therefore, to comply with NEPA’s disclosure requirements, FAA reports HAPs emissions in its environmental documents for information purposes only. FAA does not use that information to assess human health risks. The responsible FAA official should consider whether 40 CFR Section 1502.22, which addresses incomplete and unavailable information, applies to HAPS emissions for major airport development projects.

(1) For major projects normally requiring an EIS (e.g., new airport, new runway, major runway extension), the responsible FAA official should decide, in consultation with Federal, State, and local air quality agencies whether it is appropriate to conduct a HAPs emission inventory. This is, especially so when the action would occur in areas that are classified as nonattainment or maintenance for O$_3$ or particulate matter (PM).

(2) As needed, consult APP-400 to determine the HAPs FAA will analyze and the methodology FAA will use to conduct that analysis.

In 2003, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) completed a toxics evaluation for the Puget Sound region. Relative to airports, the following was concluded:

Emissions from the two airports (Sea-Tac and Boeing Field) could impact the Sea-Tac and Georgetown monitors. However, the results do not reflect significantly higher pollutant levels at these locations when compared with other sites. In fact, SeaTac potential risks appear slightly lower than Beacon Hill. It is possible that the airport emissions do not significantly impact the monitors because the emissions are diluted over the area. It is also possible that the pollutants of concern at the airport are not those included in the monitoring study.
Because of this information, the FAA did not feel that the evaluation of HAPs would be warranted.
ISSUE 11, OTHER RESOURCE CATEGORIES

11-1 What is the impact on wildlife?

Some comments stated that there would be impacts on wildlife as a result of the proposed actions.

Potential action-related impacts to wildlife as a result of the Proposed Action were assessed in Chapter D of the EA in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1. There are no endangered, threatened, or special status species or habitat in the study area. The area of direct effect is located entirely on airport property and consists of pre-disturbed ground that does not contain any native habitats. No natural habitats would be impacted by the construction activities. Concerns were raised over the project study area of potential effect with respect to wildlife, suggesting that wildlife outside of airport property and construction area could be impacted, especially with respect to areas within the flight pattern from aircraft activities or noise.

Public observations of special status species were located outside the project area. Because the area of construction consists of pre-disturbed ground on airport property, and because flight paths would not change, it was determined that no substantial impacts to wildlife would occur to species outside the construction area. Additionally, no significant impacts are expected with respect to air quality, noise, wetlands or water quality that would affect surrounding habitats on or off airport property that would warrant examining a larger biotic project area or require a large-scale survey. No habitats would be affected, and according to FAA Orders, no additional coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is required.

Although there are documented special status species, such as the Bald Eagle and Spotted Owl within Snohomish County, the Proposed Action is not expected to alter any important natural habitat of any kind. According to FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1, for federally listed species, a significant impact would occur if, “a proposed action would likely jeopardize a species’ continued existence or destroy or adversely affect a species’ critical habitat.” Since the Proposed Action would not destroy any natural habitat, and there are no significant indirect impacts from changes in noise, air quality, wetlands, or water quality, there are no expected significant impacts to Federally-listed species. For non-listed species, FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1, states that the FAA should “consider scientific literature on and information from agencies having expertise on addressing the affected species. Consider information on: project effects on population dynamics; sustainability; reproduction rates; natural and artificial mortality (aircraft strikes); and the minimum population size needed to maintain the affected population.” As stated above, while there would be an increase in the number of flights, the additional aircraft operations would use the same flight paths that are currently used today. Therefore, there are no significant impacts to fish, wildlife or plants as a result of the Proposed Action.

Additionally, the Airport discourages the siting of land uses (such as ponds) that are wildlife (specifically bird) attractants through a provision within the Snohomish County 2025 Comprehensive Plan’s designated Airport Influence Area. This applies directly to the area on the Airport and immediately surrounding the Airport due to the safety risks of bird strikes. This provision does not pertain to the natural features outside this direct area, such as the ravines,
bluffs, and hillsides within a larger area around the Airport. It is merely a pre-existing means to prevent aircraft/wildlife safety issues. The Airport regulates wildlife through its Wildlife Hazard Management Plan, which pertains to wildlife on airport property. No changes in this policy would occur as the result of the Proposed Action and the continued management of wildlife on airport property would not change. The Airport has no authority over the preservation of open spaces within the County, and can only manage wildlife and wildlife attractants within airport property. Additionally, the Proposed Action would not result in the removal of any trees.

11-2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act and ESA threshold of effect were not considered

Some comments stated that the EA did not address the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the Endangered Species Act.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) was not specifically discussed in the Draft EA as the proposed actions will not affect migratory birds. As outlined in FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1, MBTA prohibits private parties (and depending on the judicial circuit, federal agencies), from “intentionally taking a migratory bird, their eggs, or nest. Take is defined as ‘pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect’ (50 CFR 10.21). The MBTA prohibits taking, selling or other activities that would harm migratory birds, their eggs or nests unless the Secretary of the Interior authorizes such activities under a special permit.”

Because there are no migratory birds known to be located within the construction area, no migratory birds would be intentionally taken or impacted as a result of the Proposed Action. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts to migratory birds under the MBTA and coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is not required.

The endangered, threatened, and special status species impacts are described in Chapter D, Environmental Consequences. FAA Orders 1050.1E, Change 1 and 5050.4B require FAA to make an affect determination for Federally-listed species. If the FAA determines that the Proposed Action may affect a Federally-listed species or critical habitat, then further consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is required. If the FAA determines that the Proposed Action would not affect a Federally-listed species or critical habitat, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is not required.

Based on regular on-airport surveys, there are no endangered, threatened, or special status species that are known to be permanent residents in the project area, the area where the proposed terminal would be completed. There is also no known habitat of importance to any special status species within the project area. Of all the species listed during the weekly surveys, only two special status species were observed (the Bald Eagle and Peregrine Falcon). The Peregrine Falcon was observed only once since 2001 and the Bald Eagle observations are infrequent.

According to FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1, for federally listed species, a significant impact would occur if, “a proposed action would likely jeopardize a species’ continued existence or destroy or adversely affect a species’ critical habitat.” The area of direct effect is located entirely on airport property and consists of pre-disturbed ground that does not contain any native habitats. No natural habitats would be impacted by the construction activities. Concerns were raised over
the project area of potential effect with relation to special status species, suggesting that wildlife outside of the airport property and construction area could be impacted, especially with respect to areas within the flight pattern from aircraft activities, noise, air pollution or water quality impacts that could occur outside of the area of direct impact. Public observations of special status species such as the Spotted Owl were located entirely outside the project area. Because the area of construction is within pre-disturbed ground on airport property and the additional aircraft operations would use the same flight paths that are currently used today, it was determined that no significant impacts to wildlife would occur to species outside the construction area.

11-3 What is the potential for additional bird strikes?

Some comments expressed concern over the safety of commercial service operations in an area with birds and the potential for additional bird strikes.

The Airport discourages the siting of land uses (such as ponds) that are wildlife (specifically bird) attractants through a provision within the Snohomish County 2025 Comprehensive Plan’s designated Airport Influence Area. This applies directly to the area on the Airport and immediately surrounding the Airport due to the safety risks of bird strikes. This provision does not pertain to the natural features outside this direct area, such as the ravines, bluffs, and hillsides within a larger area around the Airport. It is merely a pre-existing means to prevent aircraft/wildlife safety issues.

The Airport attempts to control wildlife through its Wildlife Hazard Management Plan, which pertains to wildlife on-airport property that could be a risk to aircraft safety. Snohomish County contracts with the United States Department of Agriculture to manage wildlife on airport property. While there would be an increase in the number of flights as a result of the Proposed Action, the additional aircraft would use the same flight paths that are currently used today. The Proposed Action is not expected to increase bird strikes at the Airport.

11-4 Effect on culture of local community

Concerns were raised on the change in local community culture as the result of the Proposed Action and that the EA “disregarded the culture of the local community.”

Following FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1 guidance, impacts to local communities are generally analyzed based on the significance of noise impacts or required relocations that could fracture a community or otherwise disrupt the community physically or economically. Aircraft noise already exists from current operations, although no noise sensitive uses are located in significant aircraft noise exposed areas. The proposed actions are not expected to generate significant aircraft noise exposure (See General Response 7-6). No homes, businesses or other community resources would need to be relocated (See General Response 9-4). Additionally, no historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological sites are located within the project’s area of potential effect (APE). No significant health effects are anticipated (See General Response 9-9). No significant impacts on children’s health of safety or schools are anticipated (General Response...
9-5). Therefore, no significant impact on the local community or cultural values is expected as a result of the Proposed Action.

11-5  What are the health impacts compared to safety?

Some comments expressed concern with health and safety of the community relating to the proposed addition of commercial service at Paine Field.

The continuing mission of the FAA is to provide the safest, most efficient aerospace system in world. Air carriers and airports must meet various safety certifications and operating requirements required by the FAA. Both Horizon Air and Allegiant Air currently meet FAA safety certification requirements and air worthiness standards for their respective fleets.

As stated in General Response 9-9, because no significant adverse impacts were identified, there are no predicted significant impacts to human safety, or health as a result of the Proposed Action. Safety is further described in General Response 11-6.

11-6  Safety: No mention of accident history or airline safety

Some comments were received on the safety of initiating commercial service at Paine Field, specifically about the lack of discussion in the EA on accident history of the airlines or overall airline safety.

The continuing mission of the FAA is to provide the safest, most efficient aerospace system in world. Air carriers and airports must meet various safety certifications and operating requirements required by the FAA. Both Horizon Air and Allegiant Air are in good standing and meet current safety certification requirements and air worthiness standards for their respective fleets. Paine Field meets all applicable FAA standards.

11-7  Security: terrorist attack

Some comments questioned the security of adding commercial service to Paine Field, citing the fact that commercial service aircraft have been used for terrorist activity.

The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) protects the nation’s transportation systems to ensure freedom of movement for people and commerce. Security screening (including both passenger and baggage screening) associated with the proposed commercial service would be conducted by TSA using all required technology and equipment. For more information on general safety issues, please see General Response 11-6.

11-8  Cumulative impacts

Some comments suggested that the overall cumulative impacts of the proposed Federal actions were not adequately assessed in the Draft EA, while others suggested that the future timeframe for the assessment of impacts (2016) was not appropriate and that an additional outlier year should be considered in the cumulative impacts analysis.
Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations state that cumulative impacts represent the “…impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over time.” The cumulative impacts assessment, which was prepared in accordance with CEQ regulations and FAA Order 1050.1E Change 1 and Order 5050.4B, is described in the Final EA in Chapter D, Environmental Consequences starting on page D.40. The cumulative impacts section in the Final EA describes past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects on and adjacent to the Airport that have the potential for cumulative impacts when considered with the proposed actions. The analysis in the Final EA has been refined to address the comments received, and states that based on Federal significance thresholds, there would be no significant cumulative impacts.

In regard to the future timeframe for the assessment of impacts (2016), as stated above, CEQ regulations state that future actions being considered for cumulative impact analysis must be “reasonably foreseeable.” As mentioned in General Response 3-5, the aviation activity forecasts and analysis years from the Draft EA were updated prior to the publication of the Final EA. In the Final EA, 2008 remains the base year or existing year while 2013 was considered the initial year of commercial airline service and 2018 was considered the future year for applicable environmental consequence analysis.

Passenger service growth rates beyond 2018 (if any) cannot be accurately predicted at this time and are therefore not reasonably foreseeable. Accordingly, projects beyond 2018 are not appropriate for consideration in the cumulative impacts analysis. Also see General Response 3-5 for additional discussion on the selection of 2018 as the future year of analysis for the proposed actions.

11-9 How does this project compare to the commercial operations at Bellingham Airport?

Some comments suggested that the initiation of commercial service at Bellingham Airport was a good parallel example of what they envision occurring at Paine Field.

In response to comments about the potential parallel between commercial service at Bellingham Airport and Paine Field, consideration was given to the characteristics of the two airports. Because of the proximity of Bellingham Airport to the City of Bellingham and Vancouver British Columbia as well as the distance from Sea-Tac Airport, Bellingham Airport serves a much broader and larger market than would be served by Paine Field. The lower cost and relative convenience for British Columbia residents clearing customs at the border instead of at Vancouver International Airport is also a factor in the popularity of flying to U.S. destinations from Bellingham Airport.

If commercial service is initiated at Paine Field, the airlines will be serving a completely different market. Given the existing service at both Sea-Tac and Bellingham airports, the service
at Paine Field would likely draw traffic from primarily Snohomish County and those closest to the airport. Growth in traffic beyond that predicted by the carriers proposing the service is not reasonably foreseeable. See General Response 3-5.

11-10 Water quality impacts

Some comments related to the potential for water quality impacts as a result of the Proposed Action.

Water quality considerations related to airport development and operation often include increased surface runoff, erosion, and pollution from fuel, oil, solvents and deicing fluids and potential impacts from decreased water quality on fish, wildlife, plants, and humans. Potential pollution could come from petroleum products spilled on the surface and carried through drainage channels off of the Airport. State and Federal laws and regulations have been established that include standards for above ground and underground storage tanks, leak detection and overflow protection.

Paine Field currently operates under a Master Drainage Plan which includes stormwater detention and water quality requirements. According to the Master Drainage Plan, all runoff from the Airport is detained for stream protection standards as set forth in the 1992 Department of Ecology (DOE) Manual and the Snohomish County Addendum to that manual. The Airport also operates under Permit #SO3000428C issued to Snohomish County under the State of Washington’s Industrial Stormwater General Permit.

Only a small amount of additional impervious area (approximately 1,000 square feet) is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action, as described in the water quality section starting on page D.37 of the Final EA. Commercial aircraft maintenance and washing activities are not expected as a result of the Proposed Action. All commercial aircraft requiring deicing would use the approved deicing pad located at Taxiway “A1”. This deicing pad drains to the Boeing Company sanitary sewer system and outfalls to the City of Everett Treatment Plant, not to groundwater or other bodies of water. The de-icing run-off would be treated at the treatment plant. The closest known aquifer is located approximately 220-feet below the Airport and infiltration or other impacts to this aquifer are considered unlikely. Therefore, there are no expected water quality impacts resulting from the Proposed Action.

Concerns were raised over the dumping of aircraft fuel before landing and its potential to impact water quality. Dumping of fuel is a rare practice that generally only occurs during emergency situations. Aircraft at lower altitudes often show a “trail,” that some people assume is a fuel dump. However, these vapor trails (contrails) are created due to moisture in the air and are not evidence of fuel dumping. Therefore, there are no expected water quality impacts related to the rare practice of fuel dumping.

11-11 Light pollution

Some comments stated that the project could increase light pollution.
According to the FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, due to relatively low levels of light intensity from airport lighting compared to background levels associated with airport development actions, light emissions impacts are unlikely to have an adverse impact on human activity or the use or characteristics of the protected properties. The metric for measuring impacts is generally a comparison between existing background lighting/visual impacts compared with the change proposed from the project. The Proposed Action includes only minor lighting improvements associated with the modular terminal expansion as well as minor lighting improvements for the commercial aircraft parking apron. No additional runway lighting would be required. Generally, airfield lighting is the most visual aspect of an airport. Because the additional terminal lighting meets with the general background lighting environment within the developed area, and because the existing Boeing aircraft parking ramp includes lighting, the minor lighting improvements associated with the terminal are not expected to result in a significant impact.

### 11-12 Wetlands

Some comments questioned impacts on wetlands.

As stated in the EA on page D.38, according to the Airport’s Master Drainage Plan, there are two large wetland areas, one wetland mitigation bank and a number of small wetlands located on airport property. Wetlands on Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field property have been impacted by fill, clearing and/or surrounding land use over the past several years. However, no wetlands were identified that could be potentially impacted by the proposed project.

Additionally, as stated in **General Response 11-10**, no significant water quality impacts are expected. Because increased stormwater and deicing practices would not exceed the capacity of the stormwater detention systems and permits, no water quality impacts are expected and therefore, no indirect wetland impacts are expected.