

**Here are comments from the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission members in April 2020 in response to the “What is our Preferred Strategy” survey monkey. Below are comments for the following strategies:**

**Combine these strategies to meet near-term capacity needs from existing airports while conducting the processes necessary for a large new airport:**

Even if we take advantage of expanding existing airports to meet short-term and intermediate term forecast demand, we still need to consider that the land use incompatibilities that encroach on these facilities will likely make it exceedingly difficult to expand and operate therefore, it would be irresponsible to not have a long -term replacement airport for SEA given the need to secure land as well as appropriate land use protection measures as well as ground transportation infrastructure, etc. such as was done for the new Denver airport.

A new large capacity airport is likely to take considerable time to identify and gain agreement and acceptance from a sponsor, plan, clear environmental conditions, get designed, funded, and constructed. The air service demand will require a flexible solution with existing capacity during the time that a large facility that can meet future demand is constructed.

Developing one large airport (Ideally in the South Portion of the Puget Sound Region) not only alleviates current congestion but also minimizes pollution associated with extended ground travel to existing airports. It allows the region to benefit and compete for domestic/International business. With consideration of how much demand and emerging technologies can change in 20 years while constructing a multiple airport system, solving for the current need while expanding and improving existing airports should be considered as well. Good example is Paine field, which limits air cargo companies from using it due to the noise restrictions. If those restrictions were lifted then the air cargo industry would be able to use the airport during the times needed, which are mostly PM and early AM hours.

Especially in light of the current environment, a combined approach allows for the greatest flexibility in taking advantage of existing facilities to ensure maximum utilization while still being mindful of long-term needs that will require new facilities.

I believe this gives us the best short and long-term capacity for future planning. We have some excellent facilities already, and enhancing and supporting their ability to serve these markets would help us achieve multiple objectives of the CACC.

We need to go back to the legislature with an array of options. The world has changed a lot since our last meeting. May need to re-boot a bit.

I strongly believe that our mission is to provide the legislature a recommendation for the large Sea-Tac-sized airport. That is job #1 (at least based on my reading of the enabling legislation). I selected the "combined" option - but only based upon the fact that there is agreement with job #1, and we are not vulnerable to "reverse-scope-creep" with job #1

being diluted by lesser options. I know this is likely a silly way to utilize President Kennedy's famous quote - but I feel we stick with job #1 "not because [it] are easy, but because [it is] hard."

A large SeaTac sized airport would take 20-30 years. We cannot wait that long for additional capacity for both freight and passenger services.

Given the future projections, I don't think 2 or 3 airports can be expanded or improved enough to solve the problem. However, improvements in surface transportation would be needed to maintain access for both passengers and freight.

It will fill immediate needs sooner.

It will take 20 years to develop a second "Sea-Tac" sized facility. We should continue to expand commercial and freight service at Sea-Tac, Paine Field and Boeing Field. Policy should be set to relocate all GA activities from Boeing Field and Paine Field, freeing up space for commercial and freight operations, while respecting the critical role manufacturing plays at these facilities. Today, over 1,000 GA aviation planes (mostly single engine Cessna's) are parked at Paine Field and Boeing Field. This is clearly not the highest and best use of these assets. All GA at Paine Field could easily be accommodated at Arlington Municipal. These near-term efforts would compliment the lengthy process to establish a large new airport between Tacoma and Olympia.

Thinking 20+ years out, we need capacity in the short and long-term; hard to believe we would need another large airport, but if strategically located, say in the NE suburbs of Seattle, future population growth could be accommodated.

I believe a combined strategy is the most resilient path to take given that there are many unknowns associated with the long-term impacts to demand due to COVID-19 and future requirements to protect our environment. It also makes allowances for adding to capacity in the near term while making plans for the development of a green field site, which will likely be over 20 years in the making.

We need a near-term solution and a long-term solution. By improving one or more airports sooner, we can address the capacity shortage, and at the same time develop the long-term, large airport solution.

**Expand and/or improve one or more existing airports, to provide commercial and freight service:**

Economically this seems more feasible to capitalize on existing regional infrastructure. This would also diversify secondary impacts to the multi-modal aspects associated with supporting airports. This also seems like it would be easier and more acceptable to local communities that would benefit from modest expansion at their local/regional facility. At the end of the day, this may be the first step in the process to sighting another SeaTac sized airport 40 years down the road.

This approach would satisfy the short and long term aviation needs of the airport, while relying less on Sea Tac for the continue growth.

I feel that selecting an existing airport in the south sound and upgrading it to meet commercial requirements we can "take some pressure" off of SeaTac and distribute the passenger/cargo volume more evenly. Such as O'Hare and Midway, JFK and LaGuardia or Dallas/Ft Worth and Love Field.

I believe with need a system approach to serve the future needs of the region.

It will make a difference in airspace congestion while allowing for growth. if we just build one new airport we will be in the same place we are now in just a few years. Aviation depends on redundancy for safety so let's look at using it for our airport system.

1. Developing a large Sea-Tac-sized airport implies a greenfield design. I am not convinced that such a site exists within the primary western Washington target area - not unless you the region south of Olympia (i.e., Toledo/Chehalis) is considered and travel time constraints can be overcome. 2. The combined strategies approach also carries disadvantages: Once you make the investment in meeting near-term capacity needs from existing airports, what happens to those significant investments once a new large airport is created? Are those investments simply disassembled and lost? Once that switch is turned on as a stop-gap measure, it will be difficult to turn it off completely in favor of a totally new airport. Perhaps not the wisest use of dollars. Thus this option of the three is the last choice.

That would be the quickest way to meet the immediate and future aviation needs of the state.