

Questions for Presenters:

FOR SOC

1. The SOC presentation suggests that if commercial airlines start using Paine Field home values will decline 10% leading to a reduction in public revenues.
 - The cost of school impacts could be substantial. \$200 million is quoted in school noise control costs in the Highline School District
 - Commercial strip blight could occur
 - There may be associated health impacts to people affected by aircraft noise

But, we also heard a comment attributed to Dave Waggoner that there is no data showing home values will drop. Is it safe to say the representations made were based on the SeaTac experience? If that is true then how can we determine what level of concern, if any, we should have for our situation here in Snohomish County? (Mayor Ray Stephanson)

2. The Private Enterprise Coalition and Save Our Communities differed on FAA's authority to limit sponsor control of airport use. I ask that this point be clarified.
3. We looked up the Naples Airport challenge on the FAA web site. The FAA Order says they will prohibit future funding requests. Is that the end of the story? We stop certain uses or airplanes against FAA and rules and they cut off future funding? Prohibiting aircraft sounds like a last resort step and I hope we won't feel the need to go there. (Mayor Ray Stephanson)
4. From the SOC presentation, I would like the documentation that shows property values around an airport decrease as the airport grows, or that property values decrease after an airport is sited in a given area. Also there seems to be an understanding that the MRD discourages any commercial flights, however there is language that states commercial/charter airflights will be encouraged. I would like a clarification of SOC's position on that language. (Michelle Robles)
5. If the purpose of the MRD panel is to review and update the MRD documents, then how is it that the County can discriminate any uses at Paine Field? . . . My interpretation of the MRD documents lines up with Ed Level's legal opinion that the County (the owner and operator of the airport asset) may not discriminate uses. If my understanding is accurate, then the MRD panel would simply render a recommendation that the County may not discriminate uses and the panel's work would be complete. Please comment. (Tom Hoban)

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to "Questions for Presenters"

Page 1 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

6. A comment to my friends with SOC: That politicians or others have made "promises" in the past to constituents is interesting and concerning to me. But the basis of those promises is hard for me to find within the MRD documents. The MRD documents in fact support non-discrimination of uses. The Ed Level opinion is helpful in understanding this. If I am missing something, please point me to it. (Tom Hoban)
7. I am unclear as to how ANCA impacts the MRD and our work. Does it invalidate the MRD? In other words, even if we render an update of the MRD through this panel, does ANCA trump that recommendation? As I understand ANCA, it ensured Stage 1 aircraft would not fly after December 31, 1999 (which shrank the noise contours down considerably) in exchange for the FAA gaining more control over the airports in the US. That may have taken away our right to discriminate uses as well. (Tom Hoban)
8. The MRD is based on 12 findings made by the County Board of Commissioners in 1978, as stated in the MRD. What specific changes, if any, would you make to those findings? (John Shaw)
9. The MRD set forth several action steps for County Government that were designed to mitigate certain environmental effects of the airport. Have those steps been taken and have they resulted in the desired improvements to the environmental effects that the airport has on the surrounding community? Be specific. (John Shaw)
10. What documents do you feel make up the MRD? Do you feel the 1977 Paine Field Community Plan (PFCP) was the document that was the basis for writing these two documents? (Russ Keyes)
11. Do you think it would be a good idea for this group to blend these documents into a single clear document based on the information in these two documents and the PFCP? (Russ Keyes)
12. What do you believe the role of this group is as outlined in the MRD? (Russ Keyes)
13. "A deal is a deal" what is your understanding of the "Deal"?
14. Is your group's issue that passenger service should not be allowed at Paine Field regardless of the MRD documents or that any passenger service at Paine Field must stay in the bounds of the MRD? (Russ Keyes)
15. What is your understanding of the requirement in the MRD that any actions taken must be in compliance with the covenants in deeds and grants of the U.S. Government? (Russ Keyes)

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to "Questions for Presenters"

Page 2 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

16. Do you have any information on how passenger service has affected the surrounding neighborhoods in Bellingham? (Russ Keyes)
17. SOC appears to reject scheduled air passenger service at any cost. Does this mean larger carriers, such as Alaska, United or Southwest and passenger loads of greater than 100 people per flight? The MRD has language that allows for commuter and business jets of up to 10 people per flight at a fairly significant number of flights. Is this something SOC expects to change or is SOC okay with that? Also, does SOC hope to expect this panel will add language that addresses scheduled air passenger service one way or the other? (Michelle Robles)
18. Does SOC have any concerns about blending of documents and the 2006 dating of the revised document? (Michelle Robles)
19. I understand that the 65 DNL line measures where noise can become a problem for people. But it was pointed out that the figure is based on a long-term average sound level, not on single event noise. Should we be using the single event-tracking concept such as the LEQ or is DNL going to work? (Mayor Ray Stephanson)
20. One thing that didn't get mentioned in either presentation that I still hope to find out is how many and what kinds of flights would the MRD allow? Also I'd be interested in knowing how the "constrained" capacity provided for in the MRD would address the suggested market found in the Mead / Hunt study. (Mayor Ray Stephanson)
21. The MRD is based on 12 findings made by the County Board of Commissioners in 1978, as stated in the MRD. What specific changes, if any, would you make to those findings? (John Shaw)
22. The MRD set forth several action steps for County Government that were designed to mitigate certain environmental effects of the airport. Have those steps been taken and have they resulted in the desired improvements to the environmental effects that the airport has on the surrounding community? Be specific. (John Shaw)

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to "Questions for Presenters"

Page 3 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

For PEC

23. The May 18 presentations by the Private Enterprise Coalition and Save Our Communities made counter claims regarding the linkage between attracting business and jobs to the County and the presence of commercial air service. The PEC says high tech firms cluster around airports and SOC says the Paine Field marketing study was silent on this point. In their presentation SOC said there is no link between high tech locational decisions and a nearby airport. (Mayor Ray Stephanson)

The Business Travel Survey done by Mead / Hunt appeared to ask local business people for their use preferences. They did not ask outside firms, such as the high tech sector, if a local airport plays into their decision-making when searching for new sites. At this point it is not clear to me that we have an answer to the linkage question. (Mayor Ray Stephanson)

- The Mead / Hunt study was a market study – not a marketing study.
- The benefits to high-tech and larger corporations were not part of this study.
- The Mead / Hunt study was based on membership of the Chambers of Commerce of local communities – “local business people”.
The study did not include results from the larger, Hi-tech companies in Snohomish County, and can therefore be deemed conservative.
- Hi-tech companies pay high wages – and stimulate a healthy economy – supporting quality of life for present and future generations.
- Hi-tech companies often employ people who need to travel frequently – or receive visitors from far-away places.
- Hi Tech companies in Snohomish County include: Boeing, Eldec, Fluke, Intermec, Philips Medical, Panasonic, Sonosite, Verizon and others. These companies belong to the top 100 companies (in revenue) in the County.
- Companies in this list were established before the 1980ies, in other words: Before the accessibility to SeaTac became an economic burden.
- On a working day, a one-way trip to SeaTac from places in Snohomish County can take over 3 hours.
Because of their high wages, Hi-tech companies cannot afford to lose their expensive employees for this amount of time due to traffic.
Oftentimes, employees must stay overnight at SeaTac in order to make it for a morning departure. This adds unnecessary expenses and inefficiencies.
- Boeing (Corporate) fled the Puget Sound area because of traffic...

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to “Questions for Presenters”

Page 4 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

24. The Private Enterprise Coalition and Save Our Communities differed on FAA's authority to limit sponsor control of airport use. I ask that this point be clarified.

We looked up the Naples Airport challenge on the FAA web site. The FAA Order says they will prohibit future funding requests. Is that the end of the story? We stop certain uses or airplanes against FAA and rules and they cut off future funding? Prohibiting aircraft sounds like a last resort step and I hope we won't feel the need to go there. (Mayor Ray Stephanson)

- Verification with the Director of the Naples Airport revealed that this case applies to Stage 2 aircraft of less than 75,000 lb GTW – in other words: Noisy business jets.
- The FAA has a range of options to deal with airport sponsors that do not live up to grant assurances. One of the options is to deny future grants. The FAA has been quite open with the legal requirements to abide by the grant assurances and deed covenants, but they will not give a specific answer without having a complaint from an injured party (i.e. an airline that has been denied access.
- The FAA verbiage on Grant Assurances – (Airport Sponsor Obligations) – is very clear. In the Airport Sponsor Assurances (PDF) section, reference is made to:
 - o A – General, Points 1, 2 and 3.
 - o Federal Regulations: 14 CFR Part 16 – Rules of Practice For Federally Assisted Airport Proceedings.
 - o 5. Preserving Rights and Powers – section a.
 - o 6. Consistency with Local Plans.
 - o 7. Consideration of Local Interest.
 - o 19. Operation and Maintenance, sections a. and b.
 - o **22. Economic Nondiscrimination.**
 - Section a.:** “It will 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.
 - Section b.:** “In any agreement, contract, lease or other arrangement under which a right or privilege at the airport is granted to any person, firm, or corporation to conduct or to engage in any aeronautical activity for furnishing services to the public at the airport, the sponsor will insert and enforce provisions requiring the contractor to-
 - (1) furnish said services on a reasonable, and not unjustly discriminatory, basis to all users thereof, and
 - (2) charge reasonable, and not unjustly discriminatory, prices for each unit or service, provided that the contractor may be allowed to make reasonable and nondiscriminatory discounts, rebates, or other similar types of price reductions to volume purchasers.”
 - o 22. Economic Nondiscrimination, sections d. and f.

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to “Questions for Presenters”

Page 5 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

- **23. Exclusive rights.** “It will permit no exclusive right for the use of the airport by any person providing, or intending to provide, aeronautical services to the public.”
- **25. Airport Revenues.**
Section a.: All revenues generated by the airport and any local taxes on aviation fuel established after December 30, 1987, will be expended by it for the capital or operating costs of the airport; the local airport system; or other local facilities which are owned or operated by the owner or operator of the airport and which are directly and substantially related to the actual air transportation of passengers or property; or for noise mitigation purposes on or off the airport.

25. If the purpose of the MRD panel is to review and update the MRD documents, then how is it that the County can discriminate any uses at Paine Field? My interpretation of the MRD documents lines up with Ed Level's legal opinion that the County (the owner and operator of the airport asset) may not discriminate uses. If my understanding is accurate, then the MRD panel would simply render a recommendation that the County may not discriminate uses and the panel's work would be complete. Please comment.

- FAA – thru ANCA – achieved noise reduction by banning Stage 2 aircraft (and earlier) from the 48 contiguous United States in exchange for federal control over the aeronautical activities at the affected airports – including Snohomish County Airport.
- FAA – thru Grant Assurances, does not permit discrimination of aeronautical activities.
- Based on prevailing Federal and State laws, the MRD is found to be non-compliant with Federal laws.
- The 1978 MRD cannot be used to discriminate against aeronautical activities – including commercial air service – at Snohomish County Airport.

26. A comment to my friends with SOC: That politicians or others have made "promises" in the past to constituents is interesting and concerning to me. But the basis of those promises is hard for me to find within the MRD documents. The MRD documents in fact support non-discrimination of uses. The Ed Level opinion is helpful in understanding this. If I am missing something, please point me to it. (Tom Hoban)
- FAA – thru ANCA – achieved noise reduction by banning Stage 2 aircraft (and earlier) from the 48 contiguous United States in exchange for federal control over the aeronautical activities at the affected airports – including Snohomish County Airport.
 - FAA – thru Grant Assurances, does not permit discrimination of aeronautical activities.
 - Based on prevailing Federal and State laws, the MRD is found to be non-compliant with Federal laws.
 - The 1978 MRD cannot be used to discriminate against aeronautical activities – including commercial air service – at Snohomish County Airport.

27. I am unclear as to how ANCA impacts the MRD and our work. Does it invalidate the MRD? In other words, even if we render an update of the MRD through this panel, does ANCA trump that recommendation? As I understand ANCA, it ensured Stage 1 aircraft would not fly after December 31, 1999 (which shrank the noise contours down considerably) in exchange for the FAA gaining more control over the airports in the US. That may have taken away our right to discriminate uses as well. (Tom Hoban)
- FAA – through ANCA – has eliminated Stage 2 aircraft of over 75,000 lbs GTW from the 48 contiguous United States – effective December 31, 1999.
 - ANCA and Grant Assurances are both Federal mandates – and invalidate any other arrangements made in the MRD.
 - FAA – through Grant Assurances – does not permit discrimination of airport use.
 - The 1978 MRD cannot be used to discriminate against aeronautical activities – including commercial air service – at Snohomish County Airport.
 - Based on prevailing Federal and State laws, the MRD is found to be non-compliant with Federal laws.
 - Federal laws (1990 ANCA and 1999 Grant Assurances) have usurped the 1978 MRD.

28. Snohomish County Airport Underutilized County Asset (opportunity cost) (Lori Kaiser)
- a. Shouldn't the MRD be considered at all in this opportunity cost question? After all the MRD led to the development we see here today. Was it valid to ask the opportunity cost question 30 years ago with one of the options being the MRD model? In fact, isn't that what happened? Didn't the development come along as a result; along with all the money, prosperity, improved standard of living, quality of life etc.? Do you propose to undo that?
- It is not appropriate to suggest that: “the MRD led to the development we see here today.”
Development around SeaTac has grown in a similar manner despite the lack of an MRD-like agreement. Also, the properties to the west of SeaTac, which are comparable to Mukilteo and Edmonds, have enjoyed a period of dramatic development and increase of property values.
 - The MRD has not stimulated development and economic opportunities – other than “bedroom communities” mostly relying on commuter trips to King County, or becoming a retirement community.
 - With 40% of all WA jobs (outside agriculture) in King County and 50% of all WA wages made in King County, it is clear that the higher-wage jobs are in King County. That’s why over 100,000 of the 330,000 wage earners in Snohomish County commute to King County and help clog up the “arteries”. (ESD data).
 - The “development” caused by the MRD has brought money, prosperity and “standard of living” – and much of it was imported from King County by a commuter population.
It has also caused deterioration of quality of life for those who work for a living – specifically those who must survive the Nation’s 2nd worst traffic nightmare (after LA) during their daily commutes.
 - The MRD has only aggravated the traffic situation by delaying PAE from becoming the economic stimulus for the County and attract hi-paying companies to the County.
 - Continuous traffic jams affect quality of life for all people in Snohomish County by getting stuck on clogged-up King County “arteries”.
 - Opening PAE to commercial aviation will not undo the growth of money and prosperity – it will amplify it: It will stimulate it by attracting higher-paying jobs to the County for today’s wage-earners as well as the future generations.

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to “Questions for Presenters”

Page 9 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

- It is incumbent upon the County to strive and implement steps to maximize revenue of the community assets – including PAE – in the best interests of the tax payers of the County.

29. Position Snohomish County as an attractive place to do business.
- a. Is it not a good place for business right now with the huge growth rates we have seen?
 - b. Denver is an attractive place with incredible success and an airport far away from the population; the citizens there argued that being far away from the airport helps. Does the pro expansion group reject that model?
- Snohomish County is not a good place to do business when high-wage earners spend close to a workday to connect with the rest of the world through air travel.
 - One existing business has moved their Corporate HQ out of State (Boeing) quoting traffic concerns. In addition, the 787 project was subject to fierce out-of-state competition – for the same reasons.
 - Existing businesses were established in the 70-ies: Before the major arteries came to a grinding halt.
 - The Denver Airport (DEN) was moved from the Stapleton location because of congestion and weather conditions. Stapleton could not expand – because of encroaching development around the airport.
The new Denver Airport (DEN) now has 6 runways, replaces the previous airport and was built on undeveloped land – giving planners full control over future plans and infrastructure projects, providing great access, predictable travel times, no traffic jams and one of the lowest airport delays of the nation.
 - Being the mid-country hub DEN was and is, the old Stapleton location caused many weather-caused costly delays. Costly for passengers, cargo and airlines. PAE has no such weather-related problems and the PEC does not see PAE become a hub for any airline. PAE will serve as a “final destination” for businesses, families and individuals in Snohomish County.
 - Denver’s “secondary” airport is already in existence: Colorado Springs (COS), presently served by AA, DL, HP (America West), NW, UA and US.
 - Quote from Metro Denver:

2006 Economic Forecast for Metro Denver

Infrastructure projects to significantly propel economic growth in upcoming years

FasTracks is the Regional Transportation District’s \$4.7 billion, 12-year comprehensive plan for the design and construction of 119 miles of new light rail and commuter rail, 18 miles of bus rapid transit service - the largest build-out of a mass transit system in U.S. history. The project includes over 21,000 new parking spaces at rail and bus stations and expanded bus service in all areas with focused support on suburb-to-suburb travel. Planning and design work for the project is underway and actual construction is slated to begin in 2008. This project will have substantial economic, fiscal, and development impacts on the Metro Denver economy in the coming years.

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to “Questions for Presenters”

Page 11 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

30. Airport noise and ANCA and the 65 DNL Noise Contour (Lori Kaiser)
- a. How does group envision people reconciling the average over a 24 hour period with incident specific noise?
 - b. Does the pro expansion group believe that commercial service at PAE would come with PAE control over the type of aircraft used in each flight like stage 3 or 4? What stage aircraft are used in cargo operations? In regional flights? In somewhat longer range flights?
- The 65 DNL Noise Contour is based on federally established criteria based on averages – akin to accepted other “averages”, such as rain fall, traffic noise, road noise, rail noise, air quality and water quality standards etc.
 - There is no need for PAE control over the types of aircraft being used, regardless of range, origin, destination and type of operation:
 - o All aircraft operating in the 48 contiguous states are Stage 3 or Stage 4 since 2000 – as per federally mandated ANCA.
 - o This includes cargo operations – if any.
 - A recent discussion with a cargo operations veteran (FedEx, UPS and Airborne Express) revealed that a recent study by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) into the feasibility of cargo operations in and out of PAE had found the airport unsuitable because of surface traffic congestions to reach the main markets in King County...

31. Legal Opinions on the MRD (Lori Kaiser)

- a. These were not legal opinions given by the county and should not be considered at all right?

The legal opinions were given by the sitting Deputy Prosecuting Attorney of Snohomish County – in 1992 – and therefore must be considered valid.

- b. Has that group determined the MRD to be of no value?

Based on prevailing Federal and State laws, the MRD is found to be non-compliant with Federal laws.

- c. What is that group's position on the reaffirmation of the MRD so many times and the 5 cities most recently passing resolutions against pursuing scheduled commercial service at PAE. How does that group discount all of those concerns by the citizens and their elected officials?

The real issue is: Should Snohomish County encourage commercial flights to the Snohomish County Airport?

PEC's position is: Yes – in the interest of economic development, high-wage employment in the County, reduction of surface traffic congestion and associated pollution issues, improved standard of living, quality of life and prosperity for businesses, families and individuals.

The impacts of traffic congestion and the availability of economically accessible air transportation are of National, State, Regional and County-wide importance – and not to be determined by a sub-set of residents of 5 cities and their elected officials.

- d. Have they concluded that the county must seek and promote scheduled commercial air service in order to make the airport available to the public without discrimination?

The county must comply with ANCA and Grant Assurances as determined by the FAA – without discrimination.

It is the County's responsibility to maximize the economic contributions made by the airport (County asset) and the new businesses it will attract – as well as the retention of existing businesses.

It is the airlines' responsibility to schedule air service and attract the passengers.

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to "Questions for Presenters"

Page 13 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

It is the businesses and passengers responsibility to determine how they will travel – and at what cost in money and time.

- e. Does the pro expansion group believe the county can influence the role of PAE or not?

As per federal mandates set forth by the FAA, the County has no choice but to influence the role of PAE – also as per federal mandates.

- f. Does pro expansion group believe that all costs and benefits must be considered?

Yes: And they will be positive.

- 32. What documents do you feel make up the MRD? Do you feel the 1977 Paine Field Community Plan (PFCP) was the document that was the basis for writing these two documents? (Russ Keyes)

Based on subsequent documents and actions mandated by the federal government – ANCA and Grant Assurances – the question regarding the origin of the MRD is no longer relevant.

ANCA is in existence and has resulted in a dramatic reduction of aircraft noise through technology and pilot practices – by eliminating Stage 2 aircraft in the 48 contiguous United States, effective December 31, 1999.

Grant Assurances is in effect and prohibits discrimination of airport use.

- 33. Do you think it would be a good idea for this group to blend these documents into a single clear document based on the information in these two documents and the PFCP? (Russ Keyes)

While such effort may help clarify the MRD documents created over 25 years ago, the MRD never was the legal document, “agreement” or “deal” as it has been mistakenly portrayed.

Federal actions and mandates have resulted in vast improvements in technology and practices.

The same federal actions and mandates that led to these vast improvements in technology and practices imply that discrimination in airport use would violate federal laws.

Based on current federal laws, the creation of a new non-compliant MRD document should be considered non-productive.

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to “Questions for Presenters”

Page 14 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

34. What do you believe the role of this group is as outlined in the MRD? (Russ Keyes)

The role of this group is not outlined in the MRD.

The present County Executive outlined the role of this group and it is our understanding that per this outline, the role would be to review the MRD and recommend updates as appropriate.

Based on additional research, the role of this group should be to understand and implement federal mandates and how they affect the validity of the MRD.

35. “A deal is a deal” what is your understanding of the “Deal”?

The MRD is not a “deal”.

Any references to the words “agreement” and “deal” are misleading.

36. What is your understanding of the requirement in the MRD that any actions taken must be in compliance with the covenants in deeds and grants of the U.S. Government? (Russ Keyes)

It is our understanding that any actions taken with respect to Snohomish County Airport must be in compliance with the covenants in deeds and grants of the U.S. Government and that this overrides any stipulation in the MRD.

37. Do you have any information on how passenger service has affected the surrounding neighborhoods in Bellingham? (Russ Keyes)

Yes: Two answers...

(1) Areas west of SeaTac have appreciated significantly in value and continue to do so – in the face of increasing air traffic and airport expansion with a 3rd runway.

(2) A sample home in the proximity of the glide path to Runway 34 (distance 1,500 ft) at Bellingham Airport has appreciated well – over the past 10 years.



Top line: Sample home – 1,500 ft off the glide path to Runway 34 at Bellingham Airport

Bottom line: Whatcom County

Middle lines: ZIP Code and Bellingham

Source: Zillow.com

38. What reasons beyond the airport have companies given for not siting here in Snohomish County? Would companies siting here be willing to pay impact fees to improve traffic congestion around the airport?. What size of companies, number of employees and/or jobs that would have come here if we had airport access? Any additional information on the potential economic loss PEC is postulating? (Michelle Robles)

These are four (4) questions. Here are four (4) responses:

(1) Traffic congestion and travel times in the Puget Sound area – making access to SeaTac problematic and inefficient.

(2) \$ 300M was spent on infrastructure improvements around PAE – in support of the Boeing 777 expansion to accommodate 33,000 workers. There are nowhere near this many workers due to improved efficiencies at Boeing.

There is no traffic congestion around PAE – except during Boeing shift changes.

It is unlikely that companies looking to locate in WA will be willing to pay impact fees to improve traffic suggestion around PAE. It is more likely that such companies settle in King County or Pierce County because they can avoid traffic congestion of I-5 and I-405 altogether while having more direct access to SeaTac.

(3) 40% of all non-agriculture jobs in WA are in King County – paying 50% of all non-agricultural wages (ESD).

(4) Anecdotal information on lost opportunities can be provided by parties affected.

39. I understand that the 65 DNL line measures where noise can become a problem for people. But it was pointed out that the figure is based on a long-term average sound level, not on single event noise. Should we be using the single event-tracking concept such as the LEQ or is DNL going to work? (Mayor Ray Stephanson)

The 65DNL metric and threshold is the federally established and internationally accepted tool for developing land use guidelines and zoning around airports. It has been in use for many decades and is based on science and multiple analytical studies.

Use of another methodology, like one based on single event noise levels, would not create a “new” picture of the noise environment around the Snohomish County Airport. It would show that the areas around the ends of the runways are more affected by noise and the areas to the sides of the runway are less affected.

The major contributor to the noise footprint in a regional air service scenario will be the existing aircraft operations such as new wide-body aircraft and aircraft undergoing rework – and not the smaller aircraft like the Horizon CRJ or Dash 8 Q 400 or Boeing 737 new generation.

40. One thing that didn’t get mentioned in either presentation that I still hope to find out is how many and what kinds of flights would the MRD allow? Also I’d be interested in knowing how the “constrained” capacity provided for in the MRD would address the suggested market found in the Mead / Hunt study. (Mayor Ray Stephanson)

Federal laws, grant assurances and deed restrictions do not allow the County to restrict the use of the airport, thus the MRD does not have the ability to set limits or constrain aircraft operations.

The market suggested by Mead & Hunt was smaller than the “regional low” scenario adopted by the County Council in the 2002 Master Plan Update.

41. The MRD is based on 12 findings made by the County Board of Commissioners in 1978, as stated in the MRD. What specific changes, if any, would you make to those findings? (John Shaw)

Condition 1 - Public Concern NO CHANGE
There will always be "concerned citizens" whatever changes are proposed at PAE.

Condition 2 - Control of Expansion CHANGE REQUIRED
ANCA has addressed many of the environmental concerns – effective December 31, 1999 – and now limits controls exercised by local jurisdictions.

Condition 3 - Expanded need for Facilities NO CHANGE
Needs continue to increase

Condition 4 - Air Carrier/Air Cargo CHANGE REQUIRED
Needs to reflect Mead / Hunt market study, impact of ANCA, "maxing out" of SEATAC by 2023 and changed County demographics and business needs.

Condition 5 – Urbanization NO CHANGE
Growth in PAE area continues.

Condition 6 - Growth in Airport Operations CHANGE REQUIRED
Needs to reflect ANCA and benefits derived from reduced noise envelope.

Condition 7 - Boeing Rights NO CHANGE
Protecting these rights are of paramount importance.

Condition 8 - Rights of Adjacent Municipalities. CHANGE REQUIRED
Must acknowledge that PAE is a County asset so the rights of ALL County constituents must be considered.

Condition 9 - Noise Abatement CHANGE REQUIRED
Recognize benefits of ANCA, technology and pilot practices.

Condition 10 - Noise Measurement CHANGE REQUIRED
The veracity of noise measurements is technically a non-issue and the criteria used at PAE are universal to the industry.

Condition 11 - Airport Compatibility CHANGE REQUIRED
Combine with Condition 8 to reflect PAE as a County asset.

Condition 12 - New Runway CHANGE REQUIRED
The existence of this runway today renders this Condition moot.

MRD Panel

PEC Responses to "Questions for Presenters"

Page 19 of 20

June 9, 2006 (Final Edition)

42. The MRD set forth several action steps for County Government that were designed to mitigate certain environmental effects of the airport. Have those steps been taken and have they resulted in the desired improvements to the environmental effects that the airport has on the surrounding community? Be specific. (John Shaw)

These answers need to be provided by the County. Wherever applicable, references should be made to ANCA, Grant Assurances and other federal legislation.