



**Land Use & Economic
Development
Committee Agenda**
Mukilteo City Hall - 11930 Cyrus
Way

Tuesday, February 23, 2021

5:30 PM-7:00 PM

Zoom Virtual Meeting

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88053408734?pwd=Y002Y3FEaIFPSXhOTXJlRStqdjIPQT09&from=addon>

By Phone:

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 880 5340 8734

Passcode: 151298

CALL TO ORDER - 5:30 PM

Meeting Objectives:

1. Economic Recovery
2. Public Noticing
3. Review of 2020 LU&ED Committee Work
4. Set Committee Meeting Dates/Time

ADJOURNMENT - 7:00 PM

Next Meeting Date/Time: To be Determined

-
- For accessibility information and for accommodation requests, please call the ADA Coordinator at (425) 263-8005 (or TRS (800) 833-6384 or dial 711), or visit <https://mukilteowa.gov/departments/executive/ada-program/>.

LAND USE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA REPORT	
SUBJECT TITLE: Public Notice	FOR AGENDA OF: February 23, 2021
Contact Staff: Lauren Balisky, Planning Manager	EXHIBITS: 1. February 1, 2021 City Council AB (AB2021-12)
Department Director: David Osaki	

RECOMMENDATION

Committee members should identify useful information they would like to be brought back for future discussion.

SUMMARY

At its February 1, 2021 meeting, the City Council held a Public Hearing on a code amendment related to public noticing of land use actions (**see Exhibit 1**). That code amendment would have, if passed, expanded the required mailing radius for noticing surrounding property owners of land use actions (from 300 feet to 600 feet).

The City Council action was not to pass the code amendment. However, in doing so, the City Council expressed an interest in using the Council committee process to evaluate alternative improvements to public noticing.

BACKGROUND

Various land use and construction applications require public notice under the Mukilteo Municipal Code. Over time, certain methods have become less effective than in the past (e.g. legal notice in the newspaper).

While the City is unable to change certain noticing required by State law, the City does have flexibility in implementing public noticing above and beyond those requirements.

To provide the LU&ED Committee with an indication of the volume of public noticing, Table 1 identifies the number of land use applications, by permit type, submitted in 2019-2020 and the types of notice required of each permit type.

In 2019 and 2020, the City received 46 land use applications that require some form of public notice and issued 88 land use and construction notices. As was indicated at the City Council's February 1, 2021 public hearing, a single permit application may require more than one public notice. Also, depending on the permit type and the time it takes to process the permit, the notices may be issued over a series of years.

Table 2: Notice Types Required for Applications Submitted 2019-2020

Application Type ¹	Applications Rec'd 2019-2020	Notice of Application	Notice of Environmental Decision ²	Notice of Public Hearing	Notice of Decision
Accessory Dwelling Unit	1	X			X
Appeal	1			X	X
Binding Site Plan	2	X			X
Code Amendment	10	X	X	X ³	X
Comprehensive Plan Amendment, w/ or w/o Rezone	3	X	X	X ³	X
Conditional Use Permit	3	X		X	X
Development Agreement	2	X	X	X	X
Essential Public Facility	1	X	X	X	X
Noise Variance	7	X			X
Project Permit Review	9	X	X		X
Reasonable Use Permit	2	X	X	X	X
Shoreline Substantial Development Permit	1	X	X		X
Short Plat	2	X			X
Subdivision	1	X	X	X	X
Wireless Communication Facility	1	X		X	X

The technical requirements for public notice are found in Mukilteo Municipal Code (MMC) Chapter 17.13 - Land Use and Development Review Procedures.

ALTERNATIVES

None. For discussion.

¹ This list does not represent all land use application types, just the applications received in 2019-2020 that have some form of public notice required.

² A Notice of Environmental Decision is only required when the proposal is not exempt from State Environmental Policy Act Review. For some environmental decisions, this may be combined with the Notice of Application.

³ Requires a Public Hearing with both the Planning Commission and City Council.

Exhibit 1

MUKILTEO CITY COUNCIL AGENDA BILL 2021-12	
SUBJECT TITLE: Public Hearing - Public Notice Code Amendment (2018 Docket)	Meeting Date: February 1, 2021
Staff Lead: Lauren Balisky, Planning Manager	Exhibits: 1. PowerPoint Presentation 2. Draft Ordinance No. 1430 - Public Notice Code Amendment 2-A Findings of Facts and Conclusions 3. SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS), December 6, 2019 4. SEPA Checklist 5. September 17, 2020, Planning Commission Minutes 6. Public Comments (Combined)
Department Director: David Osaki, Community Development Director	
Estimated Time: 40 Minutes	
Previous Review: March 19, 2018 Council Meeting (AB 2018-32)	

RECOMMENDATION:

Council **MOTION** to not pass Ordinance No. 1430 (see **Exhibit 2**), as recommended by the Planning Commission, and retain the current Mukilteo Municipal Code (MMC) distance standard for mailing of public notices.

SUMMARY:

In 2018, the Mukilteo City Council approved several items for further detailed review as part of the 2018 Final Docket. This public hearing is to take testimony on a code amendment approved by the City Council as part of the 2018 Final Docket process. The code amendment request was submitted by Mr. Sherwood Sage of the Hilltop Neighborhood Association. Two other requests by Mr. Sage (planned industrial design standards and landscaping code) continue to be in-work and under review by staff.

The request before Council with his ordinance seeks to amend the Mukilteo Municipal Code and expand the City's radius requirements for the mailing of land use permit public notices to surrounding property owners from 300 feet to 600 feet.

After review and public process described below, the Planning Commission recommended that the City not expand the notice requirements, for reasons that included:

- Cost of additional noticing, for the City and/or applicants;
- Existing availability of notices in a variety of alternate locations and formats (see page 3);
- Concerns about whether the amendment was necessary, given the increased size of on-site public notice signs and that Mukilteo already provides a larger mailed notice area than other jurisdictions.

PUBLIC NOTICE CODE AMENDMENT ANALYSIS:

Information and analysis about the Public Notice Code Amendment is as follows:

Current Practice

The City's land use public notice process is codified in [MMC 17.13.050](#). This sets the minimum requirements for how the City provides notice on land use actions.

Minimum requirements for noticing of a land use action is provided in multiple forms, including:

- US mail, for site-specific applications;
- Legal ad in the *Everett Herald*;
- Public notice posted on site (i.e. public notice board), for site-specific actions;
- Posting at notice locations throughout the City (City Hall, Post Office, Rosehill Community Center, Rite Aid/QFC); and
- Notice to interested or impacted internal departments and external agencies.

The City also provides notice in the following additional ways:

- On the City's website on the [Land Use Action Notices](#) webpage;
- Email notices to "parties of interest" (*individuals who have previously requested notice about general topics or specific projects*); and
- For projects (mainly items not related to a single property permit, such as the Housing Action Plan or Comprehensive Plan) that staff anticipate may be of greater public interest than usual, staff have also:
 - Created a separate, project-specific webpage;
 - Held open houses and/or neighborhood meetings;
 - Mailed and emailed notice of planning commission and council meetings;
 - Placed ads in the *Mukilteo Beacon*;
 - Hung banners at the City community event banner locations.

Further, public notices may be provided multiple times for the same project permit depending on the type of permit application, including:

- Notice of Application, for when an application is submitted;
- Notice of Environmental Decision, if one is required (this is sometimes combined with the Notice of Application);
- Notice of Public Hearing, for any upcoming public hearing if one is required, whether that is with the Hearing Examiner, Planning Commission, and/or City Council; and

- Notice of Decision, which identifies whether or not a project has been approved, project requirements, special project conditions and avenues for appeal.

For site-specific project applications, public notice is mailed to the owner and taxpayer of record for each parcel within 380 feet of the subject site, as measured from the exterior lot lines of the property proposed for development. While MMC 17.13.050(G) - Table 5 - currently only requires a distance of 300 feet; staff routinely uses a 380-foot distance. This helps ensure that potentially impacted properties separated from a development site by features such as a street also receive notice.

Public Notice and Financial Impacts

In analyzing the proposed public notice code amendment proposal, staff evaluated financial impacts and also the additional public awareness (i.e. additional property owners who would receive a mailed public notice) that might, on average, be achieved.

Costs for mailing notices are covered by land use fees paid by property developers as part of a permit application. If noticing requirements were increased, that additional cost would be borne by the City until an update to the fee schedule was completed.

Staff evaluated 52 project-permit related public notices mailed between January 1, 2018 and May 15, 2019 to determine how many additional properties would, on average, have received public notice were the proposed 600 foot mailing radius be in effect.

The City currently uses a service called Click2Mail to print, label and mail its notices. Notices are currently provided on 4.5-inch by 6-inch postcards. Staff reran public noticing for each of the 52 projects to estimate the cost for the Code required 300 foot mailing radius and for the proposed 600 foot mailing radius. These estimates were then compared against the actual cost and notice quantities of the 380 foot mailing distance the City actually uses.

While not specifically part of the docket request, staff took this opportunity to do additional mailing notice analysis related to the size of the City's mailed notice. Based on past feedback from the public (e.g. small font size, postcard looks like junk mail, etc.) staff also included in the analysis an estimate of costs for increasing the current 4.5-inch by 6-inch postcard size to 5-inch by 8-inch. This would allow for additional information, larger font, and potentially graphics.

The table on the next page summarizes the results of this analysis:

	300 ft. Radius (current MMC)	380 ft. Radius (current practice)	600 ft. Radius (proposed)
Average No. of Notices Per Mailing	160	181	301
Average Additional Properties Notified Over Current MMC 300 ft. Radius Requirement	-	21	141
Average % Increase of Properties Notified Over Current MMC 300 ft. Radius Requirement	-	13%	88%
Current Mailing Size: 4.5" x 6" Postcards			
Average Cost of Notices Per Mailing	\$85.71	\$112.52	\$160.95
Average Additional Cost for Properties Over Current MMC 300 ft. Radius Requirement	-	\$26.81	\$75.25
Alternative Mailing Size: 5" x 8" Postcards			
Average Cost of Notices Per Mailing	\$112.59	\$127.80	\$209.99
Average Additional Cost for Increased Size	\$26.88	\$15.28	\$49.09
Average Additional Cost for Properties Notified Over Current MMC 300 ft. Radius Requirement	-	\$15.21	\$97.40

If the 600-foot radius requirement were in effect for the 52 project-permit related public notices mailed between January 1, 2018 and May 15, 2019, the additional cost would have been approximately **\$3,913** for the current postcard size and **\$5,065** for mailing a larger postcard size. This cost would be borne by the City until the fee schedule is updated, and then would be paid by permit applicants as part of their land use fees.

Also, during the January 1, 2018 and May 15, 2019 time period, the City mailed 16 routine informational notices that are not included in the calculation above. Informational notices are typically for items like construction notices to affected properties and where notice is only required to the adjacent property owner.

Comparison to Neighboring Jurisdictions

Staff compared Mukilteo's public notice radius requirement with neighboring Snohomish County cities. The following table presents the results of that comparison.

City	Notice Radius	Above or Below Mukilteo 300 ft. Standard	Notes
Everett	150 ft.	↓	
Edmonds	300 ft.	=	
Lynnwood	300 ft.	=	Current practice is 600 ft.
Marysville	300 ft.	=	
Mountlake Terrace	300 ft.	=	
Mukilteo	300 ft.	=	Current practice is 380 ft.
Snohomish	300 ft.	=	
Stanwood	300 ft.	=	
Arlington	500 ft.	↑	
Bothell	500 ft.	↑	
Monroe	500 ft.	↑	

PUBLIC NOTICE CODE AMENDMENT – PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS/PUBLIC COMMENT:

The proposed code amendment was subject to the following public review/notice processes.

Notice of Proposed Ordinance

The City issued a Notice of Proposed Ordinance on October 11, 2019. A Notice of Proposed Ordinance is the City's initial notification to the public and agencies of a proposed Code Amendment.

This notice was sent to the applicant, agencies, parties of interest, Planning Commissioners, the Everett Herald, and posted at City public notice locations and on the City's website. The comment period ended on October 25, 2019.

The following comments were received during this period:

- Snohomish County Public Works expressed no impacts to County roads.
- Mr. Sherwood Sage, the applicant for the proposed code amendment and primary contact for the association, expressed that the notification area should be based on the size of any project and those that it affects.
- Mukilteo School District had no comment.

Washington State Growth Management Act – State Agency Review

Pursuant to Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 36.70A.106, a Notice of Intent to Adopt the proposed ordinance was sent to the Washington State Department of Commerce for State agency review on October 9, 2019. The 60-day review period ended on December 8, 2019. No State agency comments were received during the 60 day review period.

Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

Pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), the City of Mukilteo was designated as the lead agency for environmental review of the proposed code amendment.

A Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was issued pursuant to Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-340(2) on December 6, 2019 (see **Exhibits 3 and 4**). This notice was sent to the applicant, agencies, parties of interest, Planning Commission, the Everett Herald, and posted City notice locations and on the City's website.

The SEPA public comment period ended on December 20, 2019, and the appeal period ended on January 3, 2020. No comments or appeals of the SEPA determination were received.

August 27, 2020 Hilltop Neighborhood Association Open House

At the request of the Hilltop Neighborhood Association, Planning Manager Balisky and Senior Planner Ritter met with members of the neighborhood to discuss various issues, including how Planned Industrial (PI) zoning regulations function and public noticing. Two (2) members of the public attended.

September 17, 2020 Planning Commission Public Hearing

Notice of the September 17, 2020 Planning Commission Public Hearing was issued on September 4, 2020. There was no verbal testimony from the general public. Written public comment submitted in advance of the Planning Commission public hearing included:

- Mr. Sherwood Sage expressed appreciation that the standard notice sign used by the City has been increased in size and visibility since the Pacific Seafood application. He reiterated that the notification area should not be one size fits all.
- Mr. Donald Woods expressed support for Mr. Sage.

Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission passed a motion recommending denial of the draft Ordinance No. 1430 to the City Council (see **Exhibit 5** for Planning Commission minutes).

Among the reasons for the Planning Commission recommendation were¹:

- Cost of additional noticing, for the City and/or applicants;
- Availability of notices in a variety of alternate locations and formats;
- Concerns about whether the amendment was necessary, given the increased size of on-site public notice signs and that Mukilteo already provides a larger mailed notice area than other jurisdictions.

February 1, 2021 City Council Public Hearing

A Notice of Public Hearing for the February 1, 2021 City Council public hearing was issued on January 22, 2021. This notice was sent to the applicant, agencies, parties of interest, Planning Commission, the Everett Herald, and posted City notice locations and on the City's website.

ALTERNATIVES:

As alternatives to the recommended motion:

- A. Council may, by **MOTION**, approve Ordinance No. 1430 adopting an amendment to the public noticing requirements in Chapter 17.13 of the Mukilteo Municipal Code and adopt the Findings of Fact and Conclusions as presented in **Exhibit 1**.
- B. Council may, by **MOTION**, continue the public hearing if further information is required and/or to accept additional public testimony.

¹ Commissioner comments and deliberation began at approximately 1:28:45 in the September 17, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting recording, available online at: https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=4&clip_id=896

LAND USE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA REPORT	
SUBJECT TITLE: Review of 2020 LU&ED Committee Discussion Items	FOR AGENDA OF: February 23, 2021
Contact Staff: David Osaki, Community Development Director	EXHIBITS: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. January 5, 2021 Land Use & Economic Development Committee Meeting Notes 2. Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission (CACC) - Dec. 2020 Phase 1 Report
Department Director: David Osaki	

SUMMARY

The 2020 Land Use & Economic Development (LU&ED) Committee met in January 2021 to identify topics for the incoming 2021 LU&ED Committee to consider to maintain LU&ED Committee continuity from 2020 into 2021.

The January 5, 2021(LU&ED) Committee meeting notes, which summarizes the LU&ED Committee's discussion on this topic, are attached as **Exhibit 1**.

BACKGROUND

Highlights from the 2020 LU&ED Committee's work that relate to what the 2021 LU&ED Committee might consider in 2021 include:

Economic Recovery

The 2020 LU&ED Committee requested that economic recovery be a standing agenda topic as businesses and residents dealt with COVID-19 impacts and effects. In response to this, Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Barnes was invited to attend LU&ED Committee meetings. President and CEO Barnes consistently attended LU&ED Committee meetings throughout 2020 and provided insight on the status of the Chamber and business community.

State Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission (CACC)

In 2020, the LU&ED Committee discussed work being done by the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission (CACC) under guidance from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Aviation Division.

The CACC's December 2020 Phase 1 report is attached as **Exhibit 2**. To date, the CACC developed a preliminary list of six (6) existing airports with the potential to meet some of the projected demand for future air passenger service, air cargo, or general aviation.

These six airports are:

- 1) Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field
- 2) Arlington Municipal Airport
- 3) Bremerton National Airport
- 4) Sanderson Field (Shelton)

- 5) Tacoma Narrows Airport (Gig Harbor), and
- 6) Ed Carlson Memorial Field-South Lewis County Airport.

At the time, the CACC is looking to address near-term aviation demand by expanding capacity at two or more airports while the work to locate a new airport continues.

The CACC is currently scheduled to make a recommendation to the State legislature by January 1, 2022 on a single preferred location for a primary aviation airport (addressing passenger and cargo) that would be completed and functional by 2040. The CACC is, however, recommending to the Legislature that this deadline be extended to 2024.

Paine Field Master Plan Update

County Councilmember Megan Dunn attended the December 2020 LU&ED Committee meeting to discuss commercial aviation, especially as it relates to Paine Field.

County Councilmember Megan Dunn briefed the LU&ED Committee on the current Paine Field Master Plan update process that has just started and that is expected to take two years to complete. *County Councilperson Dunn mentioned inviting the LU&ED Committee to a future County Council meeting to discuss airport planning.*

2020 LU&ED Committee Suggestions for 2021

As for 2021 topics, annexation was mentioned by all LU&ED Committee members. Impacts to the economy (which was mentioned as having a relationship to annexation) and digitization/social media/technology learning curves (for businesses) were also mentioned.

ALTERNATIVES

None



Land Use & Economic Development Committee

Tuesday, January 5, 2021

4:00 PM - 5:30 PM

(MEETING HELD VIA ZOOM)

Meeting Notes

Committee Attendees

Present: Council Vice President Champion (Committee Chair), Council President Kneller,
Councilmember Marine

Other Attendees

Kandace Barnes, President and CEO, Mukilteo Chamber of Commerce
Mayor Gregerson
City Administrator Powers
Community Development Director Osaki

1. Economic Recovery

Kandace Barnes, Mukilteo Chamber of Commerce President and CEO, presented information about a Chamber of Commerce strategic planning effort. The effort was funded with a CARES grant awarded to the Chamber of Commerce at the end of November 2020. The grant required that the funds be expended in an abbreviated time frame, by the end of 2020.

The Chamber strategic planning effort addressed topics such as assessing the value the Chamber brings to its members and what services the Chamber can provide. The strategic plan also evaluated ways the Chamber could more effectively partner with the City to support business resiliency. This could, for example, include coordinating the Chamber and City websites to address a range of business needs.

The strategic planning work was conducted by David Toyer with Toyer Strategic Advisors, a local firm located in Snohomish County. Council Vice President Champion mentioned that he had a conversation with Mr. Toyer.

Mukilteo Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Barnes indicated that the strategic planning report is just now complete, but has not yet been presented to the Chamber Board.

Councilmember Marine asked if there is an organization that could serve as a conduit for collecting and distributing funds to support businesses. In response to a question from Councilmember Marine, Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Barnes indicated that the Chamber of Commerce has a 503(c)(6) status. She added that she may have more to share on this topic at a future LU&ED Committee meeting.

Mukilteo Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Barnes indicated that she was aware of the January 25, 2021 City Council special meeting where Council goals and priorities will be discussed. She asked if it would be possible to provide the City Council with a list

of ideas for consideration. Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Barnes will get that information to the Mayor in advance of the January 25, 2021 special meeting.

2. Review of 2020 LU&ED Commission Discussion Items

Director Osaki mentioned that the Land Use & Economic Development (LU&ED) Committee expressed a desire to meet in January 2021 to identify topics for the 2021 LU&ED Committee to consider. The purpose would be to help the 2021 LU&ED Committee maintain continuity from 2020 into 2021. The 2021 City Council committee assignments are currently scheduled to take place January 25, 2021.

Certain items Director Osaki mentioned about the Committee's 2020 work included:

- The LU&ED Committee met nine (9) times from March 2020 to December 2020. The April meeting was cancelled as the City responded to COVID-19 issues.
- The LU&ED Committee requested that economic recovery be a standing agenda topic as businesses and residents dealt with COVID-19 impacts and effects.
- In response to the LU&ED Committee's invitation, Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Barnes consistently attended LU&ED Committee meetings throughout 2020. The LU&ED Committee forged a strong relationship with the Chamber.
- The LU&ED Committee suggested that the City coordinate and host small business meetings to promote dialogue and idea sharing amongst businesses. This led to a September 1, 2020 Small Business Town Hall meeting hosted by Mayor Gregerson, Congressperson Rick Larsen, and Association of Washington Business (AWB) Vice President Gary Chandler.
- As an aside, Director Osaki mentioned how the Chamber of Commerce business survey showed that many businesses expressed a need for more knowledge in using social media to support their business. Director Osaki mentioned that several CARES grant applications proposed use of grant funds to improve their social media presence.
- In November 2020, the LU&ED Committee reviewed proposed ferry terminal related agreements and a proposed easement in advance of their scheduled December 2020 City Council action. Staff appreciated this process where the Committee was able to review materials in advance of when action would occur before the full council.
- In 2020, the LU&ED Committee discussed work being done by the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission (CACC) under guidance from the Washington State Department of Transportation Aviation Division. The CACC is to make a recommendation to the State legislature by January 1, 2022 on a single preferred location for a primary aviation airport (addressing passenger and cargo) that would be completed and functional by 2040. The Commission's deadline might

get extended to 2024, but the CACC's work will continue during 2021. The 2021 LU&ED Committee may wish to monitor this issue.

- County Councilmember Megan Dunn attended a LU&ED Committee meeting to discuss commercial aviation, especially as it relates to Paine Field. She also briefed the LU&ED Committee on the current Paine Field Master Plan update process that has just started and that is expected to take two years to complete. Councilperson Dunn mentioned inviting the LU&ED Committee to a future County Council meeting to discuss airport planning.

There was general discussion about whether the LU&ED Committee format was valuable to staff and to the members of the LU&ED Committee. The general consensus was yes. There was discussion about how the LU&ED Committee process could be made better.

As for topics for 2021, annexation was mentioned by all LU&ED Committee members. Impacts to the economy (which was mentioned as having a relationship to annexation) and digitization/social media/technology learning curves were also mentioned.

Next Meeting: TBD - Subject to January 25, 2021 LU&ED Committee member assignments



Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission 2020 Report

DECEMBER 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In response to growing concerns about Washington State's long-term ability to meet projected air transportation demand, Substitute Senate Bill 5370 directed WSDOT in July 2019 to administer and staff a new State Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission ("Commission") to develop recommendations for meeting Washington's long-range commercial aviation facility needs, including a new primary commercial aviation facility.

After conducting two in-person meetings, two virtual meetings and three workbook sessions the Commission recommends four (4) near-term and two (2) long-term recommendations as part of the overall strategy to address air transportation demand.

The four near-term recommendations are:

1. Provide the Legislature with a preliminary list of six (6) potential sites to consider for a future major airport.
2. Propose a phased implementation to meet near-term demand at two to three existing airports.
3. Adopt legislation to adjust the timeline of the CACC from 2022 to 2024.
4. Authorize the continuation of the revolving airport loan program and the Community Aviation Revitalization Board.

The two long-term recommendations are:

1. Advance the development and use of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF) as a bridging strategy while more advanced aircraft capable of significant emissions and noise reduction are developed.
2. Support WSDOT's role in advancing aviation technology, including continuing the work of the Electric Aircraft Working Group (EAWG).

The adoption of the package of the near-term and long-term recommendations will enable the Commission to make more informed recommendations for implementation.

The Commission intends to narrow the field of options to meet forecasted demand through a multi-pronged and resilient strategy as detailed below in Section V.

A critical next step is to engage the larger public to gain their input into how the state should address Washington's future air transportation demand.

I. Charge to the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission

In response to growing concerns about Washington State's long-term ability to meet projected air transportation demand, Substitute Senate Bill 5370 directed WSDOT in July 2019 to administer and staff a new State Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission ("Commission") to develop recommendations for meeting Washington's long-range commercial aviation facility needs, including a new primary commercial aviation facility.

Current modeling projects that demand at Seattle Tacoma International Airport (Sea-Tac), Washington's primary commercial airport, will exceed capacity by 2027. For example, PSRC's recent *2050 Forecasts for Aviation Demand* states that, "regional demand for enplanements (passengers boarding for departure) is expected to grow from 24.0 million in 2018 to between 49.3 million and 55.6 million by 2050." In gross terms, this equates to a need to either construct another Sea-Tac equivalent or add enough capacity at existing airports to meet passenger demand. The Commission must also consider the growth of air cargo and general aviation over the same timeframe.

To address these demands statewide, the Commission was charged to recommend a short list of no more than six locations by January 1, 2021; identify the top two locations from that list by September 1, 2021; and identify a single preferred location for a new primary commercial aviation facility by January 1, 2022. The Commission is also charged with projecting a timeline for the development of an additional commercial

aviation facility that is completed and functional by 2040. Options for a new primary aviation facility in Washington may include expansion of an existing airport facility. Options may not include expansion of a facility within a county that has a population of more than two million people or adjacent to a military facility if it would impact operations.

The Commission, which began meeting in December 2019, is comprised of fifteen (15) voting members (one position remains unfilled) and twelve (12) non-voting members representing a range of interests that include the airline industry, freight and trucking, planning organizations, airports, legislators, the Washington State departments of commerce and transportation, members of the public and Joint Base Lewis McChord. Members of the Commission were able to meet twice in person before COVID-19 curtailed face-to-face meetings. Since that time, the Commission has met twice virtually and participated in three rounds of workbooks to provide feedback to staff between Commission meetings.

One of the Commission's first orders of business was to adopt guiding principles that commit to the values of public benefit, economic feasibility, environmental responsibility, and social equity. The Commission continues to refine its thinking about how to operationalize these principles during each phase of its decision making through ongoing discussion and consultation with speakers and subject matter experts on these topics.

The 2020 COVID-19 crisis has disrupted traditional patterns of travel and commerce and created widespread economic uncertainty. In the face of this uncertainty, the Commission has chosen to pursue a strategy that builds greater resilience into our aviation system. This strategy includes adding aviation capacity in the near-term by accommodating demand at two to three existing airports, while continuing to pursue the complex task of building a facility (new or existing) that can address the demand anticipated by year 2050 and beyond.

II. Historic and Current Context

Since the early 1990's, policy makers in Washington State have grappled with the challenge of how to best meet the public's needs for commercial passenger, air cargo and general aviation services. All aviation demand forecasts have indicated that the Puget Sound region, where most of Washington's residents and businesses are located, is nearing its capacity limits.

Over the last few decades, there have been many efforts to develop strategies that can accommodate growing demand. As the Puget Sound economy has flourished, the rate of aviation demand has increased significantly. Sea-Tac expansion has largely been able to keep pace

Guiding Principles

Very early in its process, the Commission adopted four fundamental planning principles to serve as the foundation of any recommendations it makes

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

Studies informing CACC Analysis

- *The Flight Plan Project*, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) and Port of Seattle, January 1992
- *Long-Term Air Transportation Study*, WSDOT, July 2009
- *Washington Airport Investment Study*, WSDOT, August 2014
- *NextGEN Airspace Optimization Study*, PSRC, May 2016
- *Washington State Aviation System Plan*, WSDOT, July 2017
- *Washington State Air Cargo Movement Study*, Joint Transportation Committee, December 2018
- *Sustainable Airport Master Plan Seattle-Tacoma International Airport*, Port of Seattle, May 2018
- *Washington Aviation Economic Impact Study*, WSDOT, May 2020
- *Washington Electric Aircraft Feasibility Study*, WSDOT, November 2020
- *Aviation Baseline Study*, PSRC, ongoing.

with the demand, but is ultimately constrained by its geography, small footprint (2,500 acres), ground transportation accessibility, airspace congestion, and concerns about community impacts.

To that end, the Washington State Legislature has authorized a number of initiatives to better understand and meet Washington's diverse future aviation needs, including establishing the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission. At the time the Commission was established, studies indicated the need for facilities that could accommodate demand equal to another Sea-Tac Airport. Those studies could not have anticipated the global COVID-19 pandemic.

The COVID-19 pandemic has had significant and immediate impacts on aviation demand in Washington, and its long-term impacts have yet to be determined:

- In March 2020, Sea-Tac reached 4,000 daily enplanements, or approximately 4 percent of 2019 levels for the same period. Since that time, by the end of November 2020, even with COVID-19 cases climbing, air passenger service has increased somewhat, but is still at one-third of 2019 levels.
- Air cargo operations initially slowed with the beginning of the pandemic, but now have risen to even higher levels for all cargo domestic operations. International air cargo, in terms of total tonnage, is roughly 75 percent of what it was the same time last year ending in September.
- Although business aviation as part of general aviation, generally mirrors the trend of commercial passenger service, private aircraft operations have seen increases in part due to a pilot's ability to fly alone.

Airlines now forecast that air passenger service will not return to 2019 levels before 2024. The area of greatest uncertainty relates to future business travel demand, especially as video conferencing and teleworking have become the norm for millions of people worldwide. Travel is a large expense for many businesses and the ability to reduce that cost while maintaining the same level of business operations will certainly become a consideration as safe travel returns.

The disruption of the COVID-19 pandemic extends to the pipeline of aviation jobs. Highly specialized jobs within the airlines such as pilots and aircraft maintenance personnel will require longer lead times to rebuild the workforce pipeline once demand returns. Pilot and aircraft maintenance training programs forced to reduce their operations or even close will further exacerbate the workforce supply issue.

COVID-19 may have reduced the need for additional airport capacity in Washington in the near term, but it is projected that demand will eventually return and exceed current and planned airport capacity. The hiatus in demand resulting from the global pandemic provides some breathing room to explore opportunities for how airport operations could be conducted differently in the future. Notably, re-training airport and airline workers who were furloughed as a result of the pandemic, and the loss of existing workforce to early-out retirements, will make recovery more difficult.

A 2020 BloombergNEF study finds that, as a byproduct of the pandemic, *“greenhouse gases generated as a result of the U.S. economy will drop 9.2 percent this year, the lowest level in 3 decades. The biggest drop in emissions came from transportation where emissions fell 14 percent stemming from significant reductions in air travel and automobile trips.”* Looking long term, emerging aircraft technology suggests promising opportunities for more environmentally friendly air travel. Still nascent hybrid-electric, all-electric or even hydrogen-based propulsion systems may have profound impacts on the environmental footprint of air transportation.

In the interim, the production and use of sustainable aviation fuels in Washington State can reduce harmful emissions for commercial aircraft in production today and be part of the overall effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

III. Commission Findings and Conclusions

General Considerations

Given the extensive work required to site a new airport, the Commission has concluded that the most resilient strategy for addressing Washington’s projected demand for air transportation is to pursue both a large new airport while also expanding or improving existing airports. In this way, some of the projected near-term demand for air passenger

service, air cargo operations and general aviation can be accommodated among existing airports. A large airport with Sea-Tac like capacity located within western Washington (given population growth modeling) will still be required if the state is to meet projected air service and air cargo demand. Locating a single large airport, however, requires addressing challenges such as public sentiment, size, location, multimodal transportation accessibility, sponsor interest and more.

Interest and commitment from an airport sponsor (public agency operator or owner) are key requirements for both siting a new airport and expanding existing facilities. To date, Lewis County, and Ports of Shelton, and Bremerton have expressed interest in discussing potential capacity improvements while Pierce and Thurston Counties and the Port of Olympia have indicated they are not interested in adding air service and air cargo capacity within their areas. In addition to the existing sponsors previously mentioned, other potential sponsors and various stakeholder groups received informational briefings on the work of the CACC.

Industry support is another important requirement in identifying areas with potential for capacity improvements. Proximity to the major population centers and demand for services are key factors influencing airline investments. The further an airport location is from population centers, the less desirable it is to the passenger and freight airline industries, and therefore the less likely it will be as a viable commercial airport.

The Commission must consider future general aviation needs as well as air passenger service and air cargo operations. Even though the general aviation sector is forecast to experience slower growth than other sectors, a recent survey of 37 airports shows that 850 pilots were on waiting lists with planned future hangar capacity sufficient only for 326 aircraft. There is a growing need for hangar capacity in the general aviation sector.

Site Selection Factors

Available Land: A supplemental airport would require 1,000-2,000 acres, and a replacement, or more likely a Sea-Tac equivalent sized airport could require as much as 4,600 acres.

Existing Facilities: Runway length, available land on one or both ends of the runway, adequate space to add a runway.

Environmental Constraints: Known concerns or protections for habitat and species, wetlands, weather patterns and similar topics.

Proximity to Population

Centers: Travel time calculations that demonstrate good access for citizens.

Airport Sponsor: Governance; local government commitment for both development and operation, and liaison with the public, local governments, industry, and others.

Multimodal Transportation: Access to roadways, and public transportation.

Public involvement is also critical to future siting decisions. The pandemic has made it very difficult to obtain broad public input using traditional tools. Public comments are now received through the CACC website and conveyed to Commission members. But there has not been much opportunity for thoughtful community engagement, due to social distancing requirements. In early November, approval was granted to hire a communications consultant group to assist in obtaining more robust public feedback as the Commission's work progresses.

Site Selection Factors

The Commission adopted six key site selection factors they considered to be basic minimum requirements for any site that could offer additional aviation capacity. Drawing from WSDOT and PSRC data, the Commission developed a preliminary list of six existing airports with the potential to meet some of the projected demand for air passenger service, air cargo, or general aviation. The six airports are Arlington Municipal Airport, Bremerton National Airport, Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field, Sanderson Field (Shelton), Tacoma Narrows Airport (Gig Harbor), and Ed Carlson Memorial Field-South Lewis County Airport. Olympia Regional Airport and McChord Field also possess potential for additional capacity, but both lack sponsor support.

The pandemic has pushed the aviation capacity predicament into the future. It provides a bigger window of opportunity to take on the complex undertaking of creating capacity for a multi-faceted aviation system. But the window will only be open for so long. Currently, 2019 domestic air travel levels of demand are not expected to return until 2024 or 2025. Prior to the pandemic, the trend toward higher demand for air transportation was clear. Even with the 2027 implementation of near-term projects at Sea-Tac, service will degrade once enplanements reach 59 million annual passengers.

Projections for future business travel demand are perhaps the greatest unknown. Business travel reportedly makes up 29 percent of the total airline travel and is a large expense to businesses.

IV. Near and Long-Term Commission Recommendations

The Commission recommends four (4) near-term and two (2) long-term recommendations as part of the overall strategy to address air transportation demand.

The four near-term recommendations are:

1. **Provide the Legislature with a preliminary list of six (6) potential sites to consider. This list may be subject to change as further**

information is gathered. The list should be considered preliminary for two reasons. First, the pandemic slowed the work of the Commission and limited opportunities for public input. Second, the list only includes existing airports. To meet all of the projected demand, it may be necessary to develop a new airport. It is highly likely that the preliminary list will change as more information is received and the potential for a new airport site is fully vetted. Finally, should a potential or existing airport sponsor change their position of support, the Commission will remain flexible in considering adding or removing airport options.

2. **Propose a phased implementation to meet near-term demand at two to three existing airports.** As expressed earlier, the Commission believes that near-term demand could be met by expanding capacity at two or more airports while the work to locate a new airport continues. This is viewed as the most flexible and prudent path toward meeting future aviation needs in light of the uncertainties associated with post-pandemic air transportation demand and the potential for advanced aviation technology in the years ahead.
3. **Adopt legislation to adjust the timeline of the CACC from 2022 to 2024.** This recommendation lengthens the Commission's timeline. It also makes allowances for the chair of the CACC to recess the Commission while leveraging the Aviation System Plan Update to gather additional information and conduct technical analysis for locating a new airport that will support the Commission's decision making. It would also allow the CACC to explore adding air cargo capacity at Boeing Field (currently, King County is excluded from any CACC recommendations).
4. **Authorize the continuation of the revolving airport loan program and the Community Aviation Revitalization Board (CARB).** This existing, well-received program, a means for airports to be more self-sufficient through revenue generating projects

and adding general aviation capacity, requires legislative authorization to continue its purpose beyond the current biennium. Additional funding should also be considered given the high demand for additional loans. Funding from the CARB program will help airports address general aviation demand.

The two long-term recommendations are:

5. **Advance the development and use of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF) as a bridging strategy while more advanced aircraft capable of significant emissions and noise reduction are developed.** Commercial aircraft in production today are likely to be in use for the next 20-30 years. In concert with the discussion to develop a Clean Fuel Standard, the state should consider ways to increase the production or use of SAF through a Washington State supplier. This action would help mitigate air transportation impacts on society and the environment and is consistent with the Port of Seattle goal to power each flight fueled at Seattle Tacoma International Airport (Sea-Tac) with at least a 10 percent blend of sustainable aviation fuel by 2028.
6. **Support WSDOT's role in advancing aviation technology, including continuing the work of the Electric Aircraft Working Group (EAWG).** The Electric Aircraft Feasibility Study recently completed by WSDOT concludes that electric aircraft have the potential to play a significant, affordable and environmentally friendly role in Washington's future aviation system. Current battery technology is a limiting factor for all-electric aircraft, and hybrid-electric or hydrogen fuel systems are likely required for large commercial use. Continuing the work to support the adoption of practical aerospace technology will help Washington address environmental impacts while remaining economically competitive.

Airport Master Plan Elements*

- Airfield Inventory
- Forecast of Aviation Activity
- Facility Requirements
- Alternatives Analysis
- Airport Layout Plan
- Airport Capital Improvement Plan

* Includes environmental considerations for noise impacts to communities, rare/endangered species, wildlife hazards, historic resources, natural resources, greenhouse gases, clean air quality, recycling, and sustainability.

V. The Way Ahead

The Commission intends to narrow the field of options to meet forecasted demand through a multi-pronged and resilient strategy. The Commission will apply weighted evaluation criteria to the current list of six (6) potential airports to identify existing airports that could be expanded to meet near-term demand. If the recommendations that come out of the screening are acceptable to the Commission members and legislators, WSDOT will work with the airport sponsor and the FAA to initiate an update to the airport's master plan.

The Commission also intends to utilize the upcoming Aviation System Plan update (scheduled to begin in 2022) to provide the hard data necessary to develop options for a new airport. This data will enable the Commission to make informed recommendations based on solid technical analysis. Demographic shifts will also be studied and updated in the system plan to help solidify the Commission's recommendations.

A critical component next step is to engage the larger public to gain their input as to how the state should address Washington's future air transportation demand. The Commission has heard many concerns about noise and the impacts on the environment and society. Future work will provide an opportunity for the state to call for and consider measures to reduce both noise and harmful emissions from aircraft. Some of those measures may include the potential use of Community Benefits Agreements at select airports. However, it will require an informed public and robust dialogue to develop solutions that can meet the best interests of our community over the short and long term.

A communications consultant selected in December 2020 will help to greatly expand community outreach with informational materials on the Commission's work, surveys, open houses, and more.

The adoption of near-term and long-term recommendations will enable the Commission to conduct a more informed analysis of the options before them. The Commission is likely to meet again in late winter or early spring while staff work continues. Periodic webinars are planned in the interim to address information requests from Commission members. In addition, the Commission will encourage members of the public to discuss and offer their input into how Washington should meet its future aviation needs.

APPENDIX A

CACC Members and Positions

Voting

David Fleckenstein, Chair	Representative from the Division of Aeronautics (Aviation), Dept. of Transportation
Jeffrey Brown.....	Representative of commercial service airports and ports – County with a population of two million or more
Stroud Kunkle.....	Representative of commercial service airports and ports – Port in eastern WA with a runway of at least 13,500' in length
Larry Krauter	Representative of commercial service airports and ports – Commercial service airport in eastern WA located in a county with a population of 400,000 or more
Jim Kuntz	Representative of commercial service airports and ports – Association of ports
Shane Jones	Representative from the airline industry and private sector
(No appointee).....	Representative from the airline industry and private sector
Andrea Goodpasture	Representative from the airline industry and private sector
Mark Englizian	Citizen representative from eastern Washington
Steve Edmiston.....	Citizen representative from western Washington
Spencer Hansen	Representative from the freight forwarding industry
Joseph Braham.....	Representative from the trucking industry
Arif Ghouse	Representative from a community organization which understands the impacts of a large commercial aviation facility on a community
Bryce Yadon.....	Representative from a statewide environmental organization
Robin Toth	Representative from the Department of Commerce

Non-Voting

Warren Hendrickson, Vice-Chair	Representative from the WA state Aviation Alliance (WSAA)
Robert Rodriguez.....	Representative from the Department of Defense
Senator Jim Honeyford	Senate member from the two largest caucuses in the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate
Senator Karen Keiser.....	Senate member from the two largest caucuses in the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate
Representative Tom Dent.....	House of Representatives member from the two largest caucuses, appointed by the Speaker of the House
Representative Tina Orwall	House of Representatives member from the two largest caucuses, appointed by the Speaker of the House
Robert Hodgman	Representative from the Division of Aeronautics of the Dept. of Transportation
Sabrina Minshall.....	Representative from an eastern WA metropolitan planning organization
Josh Brown.....	Representative from a western WA metropolitan planning organization
Tony Bean.....	Representative from an eastern WA regional airport
Rudy Rudolph	Representative from a western WA regional airport
Kerri Woehler	WSDOT Multi-Modal Planning

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information: This material can be made available in an alternate format by emailing the Office of Equal Opportunity at wsdotada@wsdot.wa.gov or by calling toll free, 855-362-4ADA(4232). Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may make a request by calling the Washington State Relay at 711.

Title VI Notice to Public: It is the Washington State Department of Transportation's (WSDOT) policy to assure that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin or sex, as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise discriminated against under any of its programs and activities. Any person who believes his/her Title VI protection has been violated, may file a complaint with WSDOT's Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO). For additional information regarding Title VI complaint procedures and/or information regarding our non-discrimination obligations, please contact OEO's Title VI Coordinator at (360) 705-7090.