

Questions and Concerns for comments on Airport Expansion: 8/3/18

TRANSPARENCY/INTEGRITY/PORT ACCOUNTABILITY:

PORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

1. when was it formed, who formed it and invited people - and is it specific to this expansion project? To what purpose?
2. Who is/was on it; especially as pertains to the expansion project? Were potentially impacted landowners, low income apartment representatives, and other potentially impacted parties asked to be on it?

PUBLIC INCLUSION/NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO EXPAND:

1. see #1 in category directly above.
2. Does the proposed expansion align with the Eastsound Visioning Work, and the SubArea Plan densities and land uses around the airport, as well as permitted projects to come?
3. Where is the existing Master Plan on the Port's website? May I obtain one electronically?
4. Until a few wks ago, no updates or minutes or even the current Port Commissioners' names and contact info were on the website; please explain and thank you for correcting these omissions; please keep the website up-to-date.

FINANCIALS AND THEIR IMPACTS:

FINANCIALS/GRANTS INCL. AIP GRANTS:

1. Please provide a history of monthly/annual financial reports from 1975 to now
2. What percentage of the *total grants* came from NPIAS>AIP grants?
3. What percentages of the jump from \$150K to \$1million a year would go toward airport expansion, Postal service, Dept. of Defense projects, ETC? Can the Port bank the \$1 million annual FAA entitlement to build expansion projects without Public involvement or approval?
4. Please show a pie-chart breakdown of where the monies go/how distributed.
5. How much of the monies would need to be paid back on *just* these expansion proposals from DOWL so far?
6. How will the extra costs or cost overruns on the Wetland tree removal project and the emergency access project be paid? Grants? Bonds? How?
7. If the Port, or whoever the Sponsor is, asked for these grants without Public input or consent, can't we just stop asking for the monies?
8. How much of the Port's annual operating budget is financed by the FAA -outside of AIP grants)? What other sources? State? Local? Private?
9. How much in grants has the Port already received and spent for *all the build options presented so far*? In which year was the grant for this given - or does it come from operating budget?
10. How much \$\$ do you anticipate the entire expansion projects to cost on options 1, 2, 3, and 4? If they go over-budget, who pays?

11. If the Port chooses option 1, what would be the cost to make some improvements as per grant assurances, without taking property or re-routing Mt. Baker Road?

10,000 ENPLANEMENTS PER YEAR - MEANING AND IMPACTS:

1. What strings would be attached to the 6.5-fold jump in annual monetary gifts from the FAA if we go from a Non-Primary to a Primary airport? Is this all for Operating Expenses alone, or can some or all of this be used for AIP projects?

2. Who is our Sponsor now? Would that change, if we become a Primary airport?

3. Expansion is not currently mandated. Would it be, if ORS is a Primary airport and takes the \$1 million a year FAA entitlements?

4. Port Mgr says we can't spend the \$1 mil a year if we become a primary airport; please explain and elaborate on why not?

CATEGORY B-1 TO CATEGORY B-2 AIRPORT:

1. Are we automatically *required* to become a B-2 airport if we go Primary?

2. Would that mean the Mt. Baker Road re-route is *already* a "done deal?"

3. Would the County Council take a *definitive*, position and stand with the Public's strong opposition to the Mt. Baker Road re-route through Eastsound Swale?

3. If planes up to 79' wing span and more jets *could* use the expanded B-2 category airport, how would the Port protect Lavender Hollow residents and the Christian School from the increased noise/traffic/congestion/pollution dangers, when all we have are verbal assurances?

4. Would eminent domain be easier to implement if expansion becomes mandated?

QUALITY OF LIFE/SOCIO-ECONOMIC/ENVIRONMENTAL:

(TREE)/OBSTRUCTION REMOVAL IN FORESTED WETLANDS & EXPANSION:

1. Were low-income affected people in Lavender Hollow Apts and surrounding properties' stakeholders represented, as required by EJ guidelines and other federal & state regulations? Were they properly notified and informed as to the scope of the project?

2. What is the legality of not informing the Public, if the tree removal project was a prerequisite and segue to planned expansion and the Mt. Baker Road re-route through Eastsound Swale - as documentation seems to indicate?

3. Who would foot the bill for the botched "mitigation" plan and corrections that have still not been implemented? How much more planting and maintenance of that mitigation cost taxpayers?

4. How would the Port keep deer and rabbits out of the planted areas in the mitigation? Fence? Who would water in summer, now that the tree cover is gone?

5. Is the mitigation area in the same area where the road re-route would go, taking down many more trees to the east? (Map #8 seems to show this possibility; assuming the Port can buy this land.)

6. What impact would removing many more trees have on the Eastsound Swale Wetland's ability to filter stormwater and other pollutants from our aquifers?

7. I respectfully request that no environmental assessments be done on the Mount Baker re-route until the proper mitigation of the vegetation (treed wetland) has been re-planted, monitored, and survives more than 1 year.

SAFETY ISSUES/WILDLIFE ISSUES:

1. Didn't the Vegetation Removal Project cause MORE safety issues for pilots and

wildlife? (loss of wildlife habitat, destroying forested wetland, making a seasonal canal where the creek was, attracting waterfowl to the north end?)

2. This project is in the Pacific Flyway. What are the Port's intentions to protect migratory birds and pilots - besides killing wildlife?

3. If the RPZ has existed for years, why, up til now, was it no issue, and not shown on the DOWL powerpoint document for B-1 airports; but for the B-2 airports it shows not only a 300' longer RPZ but also a 300' ROFA and 500' width as required?

4. Have all safety issues to the people and wildlife on the ground been considered and factored-in to environmental assessments? (Lavender Hollow low-income apts and the Christian School would be worst impacted by the Mt. Baker Rd. re-route; but also trail users, pedestrians, and bicyclists). Boat Owners to the North would be impacted by any northern expansion issues. Landowners to the East and West, and neighbors would all be impacted by noise pollution and potential taking of their lands.

5. Why do we need "border control" (as Tony stated in the January Sounder article), when Friday Harbor already has it, has a homeland security office, and Customs?

NOISE/VIBRATION:

1. What protection would affected residences, schools, businesses, and office space from hearing loss and other health hazards due to noise pollution increasing in intensity and duration?

2. How would allowing larger, noisier, planes affect residents, trail users, and our village - re: displacement and moving costs, hearing loss, respiratory health, disturbance, property value loss, ETC?

POLLUTION - ALL (INCL. LIGHT, NOISE, WATER/AIR POLLUTION):

(See all concerns stated already.) Light pollution destroys our rural village attributes.

TRAFFIC ISSUES:

1. Both suggested Mt. Baker Road re-routings could cause multiple traffic dangers, inconvenience, congestion, more road kill, and health hazards. How will the Port address and remedy these many impacts?

2. What happens to our walking/biking trail routes used by villagers and visitors?

3. New terminal location: How would access/egress/parking impact traffic/roads on SE corner of Mt. Baker Rd. and N. Beach Rd? How would that affect traffic on two already congested major collector roads?

JET FUEL POLLUTION:

1. How would our waters, our lands, our people, and our wildlife be protected from it?

2. Why is a jet fuel pump shown on some expansion plans - if no new jets are coming? Is it for Jet-A fuel or some other type?

SOCIO-ECONOMIC ISSUES:

1. How would this expansion fit our culture, land uses, densities, aesthetics, and safety of our people and wildlife? Who would benefit? *Who is this for?*

2. How will the Port prove to us that this project won't greatly negatively impact our UGA and community, and our tourism industry (including those who fly in on planes and walk the trails to town) as well as year-round economy?

3. How do these proposed expansion alternatives affect the Fly-in? Where will people camp? What will people use for a trail if a road goes through Eastsound Swale?

4. Isn't all this data proving "need" based on summer statistics, which dramatically drop in winter and lessen in shoulder seasons?

MARINE ACCESS: (Port Marine obligations - if any:)

1. Since Brandt's Landing is the *only* marine access to the north, what will the Port do to not take any land, access road, trees that are left, and boat slips?
2. What is the Port's obligation to building marine access to Orcas Island, and where would the Port propose to do this? How many ports are "airport only" Ports when the San Juan islands - especially Orcas - have the most shoreline of any county in the state and some of the most shoreline in the country?