

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
10/31/2017	Kathi Ciskowski	ciskokid@rockisland.com	Hi, I am a 33 year resident of Orcas and am very interested in the airport master plan process. Would you have time to meet with me the next time you are on Orcas for a short conversation?	Hi Kathi. I would be happy to meet with you during our next visit. We will actually be hosting a public open house on January 10th in the afternoon at the nearby Fire Station to explain the project and gather initial feedback and comments. Will you able to attend? If not, we can try to find a time outside of the open house to meet. Thank you, Leah	We will be gone during the month of January so won't be able to participate in that event. Darn! Kathi	Hi Kathi,I know we missed you in January but I wanted to see if you had any questions or still wanted to speak about the project.Thank you,Leah R. Henderson, C.M., ACE	Hi Leah,Thank you so much for reaching out to me. It turns out that I have spoken to you twice one on one about the project and I was at the presentation (one of the times I spoke to you) at the fire hall. It seemed like you answered my questions at the time by assuring me that there would be no larger planes flying in and the runway would not be extended. If my interpretation is incorrect, please let me know. Suddenly, the island seems to be abuzz with rumors and fears and concerns about what is happening. I am very glad you have scheduled a meeting for late July. People really need it. Best wishes, Kathi Ciskowski	

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
2/3/2018	Michel Vekved	islandchel@gmail.com	<p>Hello, I hope that this is the correct venue for my comment or inquiry. I was unable to attend the planning event in January. I am not a pilot and use the airport infrequently. I recognize how important an airport is to our island community for both activities that are leisure and urgent, personal and professional. However, I am curious about the impact of recent work to clear hazardous trees near the airport. That work has created a wetland bird sanctuary. Its rather impressive to see a number of Canadian geese, ducks and even a trumpeter swan present in the last seven days (2/1/18). Surely this is a safety issue and was not an unexpected outcome for the work that was done, so how will this be mitigated? Who pays the cost to now correct the issue that is attracting birds? I look forward to hearing from you or please direct my inquiry to the appropriate person. Thanks for your time.</p>	<p>Hello Michel, I'm responding to comments and questions that you sent a few months back regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Your comment was about how the tree-clearing project south of the runway has created an attractive area for birds. Rest assured that the birds weren't intentionally invited! The tree clearing project is in two phases. The first phase was the removal of the trees themselves. That eliminated most of the immediate safety issue, as some treetops had penetrated the approach surface by as much as 15 feet, which created a hazard to aircraft on approach to landing. (The approach surface is an imaginary surface that begins just beyond the end of the runway and slopes upward from it to the south at a gradient of 20 feet horizontally for every 1 foot vertically.)The second phase was to convert the existing wetland from a "forested wetland" to an "emergent wetland". Emergent wetland vegetation consists of species of trees and bushes that will not be so tall at maturity as to encroach into the 20:1 approach surface of the runway. When fully in place, the emergent wetland</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
2/5/2018	Margaret Manning	pegntim@gmail.com	I see the data posted but I see no discussion of what issues exist and what changes are being considered. Is that information somewhere easily accessible? I was not on island for the first workshop.	vegetation will not be attractive to birds. Due to funding and other issues, implementation of Phase 2 could not be started in time to be completed before really wet weather sets in later this year. The damage that would have resulted from heavy equipment working in the mud would not be acceptable, so the decision was made to delay Phase 2 until next spring. I hope this answers your questions. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.				
5/4/2018	Margaret Manning	pegntim@gmail.com	Please stop "improving" everything. It's not broken.	Hello Ms. Manning, I'm responding to a question that you sent a few months back regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Your question was about the accessibility of data being posted. Subsequent to your original comment, numerous documents have been posted to the Port of Orcas website and on the Master Plan page of it. The Master Plan website is located here: <a href="http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/">http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/</a> I hope this answers your question. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.				
				Your comment was received, thank you for your comment.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
6/7/2018	Charles Toxley	innkeeper@kangaroohouse.com	<p>Hi Leah, I was at the first meeting you hosted on June 5th. I was surprised to see the expansion the Port is proposing. I am particularly concerned about moving the taxiway closer to my house as we already have a significant amount of noise as planes taxi down the current taxiway. Removing hangars which help block noise and coming 15% closer to us and other people living in the North Beach neighborhood is going to increase the amount of sound coming our way. I mentioned this to Mike Stolmier (sp?) at Smuggler's Villa. Can you post the images and the rationale for suggesting these changes online? Your communications say there are documents on the Port of Orcas site, but there aren't. These images are so detailed that they need to in a format where you can zoom in and out. I am also concerned that moving Mount Baker Road south will pave the way for extending the runway some day. You, Leah, said that is not in your plans, but more than word of mouth would be needed to insure that expansion of the runway to the south was exclusively prohibited. I hope you and Tony and the board of the Port of Orcas are going to actively engage the Eastsound community (especially the North Beach residential neighborhood) in your ultimate decisions and not just gather comments from a couple of open houses before you make any concrete plans. The people who live near by will take this very seriously and up to now, they've had no idea what you were wanting to do.</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
6/8/2018	Stephanie Johnson O'Day	sjoday@rockisland.com	Dear Leah: I represent Don and Marion Gerard, owners of property adjacent to the Orcas Airport at the northwest corner. I need to speak with you as soon as possible to discuss. The Gerards were not aware of the master plan alternatives until just recently and need to be informed. I understand there was a meeting last Tuesday. When is the next meeting?	Stephanie, Thank you for reaching out in regard to the Orcas Airport Master Plan. The draft alternatives were just shared with the public last Tuesday during our public meetings. The alternatives will be published on the Airport's website for public comment the middle of this week. We will accept public comment for a period of 30 days before moving forward with the evaluation of the alternatives and determining the preferred alternative. Our next meeting will be held in September. More information about the schedule and documents can be found at the Airport's website: <a href="http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/">http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/</a> Would you like to be signed up for our contact list? All residents of the island received a postcard last fall at the project initiation asking interested parties to sign up for our email list for future communications. We send out notifications and reminders about public meetings and notices when information is published as well. I am out of the office until Tuesday morning. I will have some time in the afternoon if you'd like to speak by phone or have specific questions about the master plan or the alternatives. Formal comments can be submitted by email or through the website as well. Thank you, Leah Henderson Orcas Airport Master Plan Project Manager				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
6/13/2018	Ken Katz	katz.orcas@gmail.com	<p>Is it possible to consider not allowing the larger planes to land on Orcas, instead of making such significant changes to the roads that take the all of the heavy truck traffic to the east side of the island. Fed Ex and Kenmore Air are luxuries, not necessities. Our emplanement growth rate is paltry, and does not seem to warrant the type of expansion shown in all of the provided schematics. And, as with every major expansion on Orcas, where is the funding to maintain the expansion once it is complete. While I recognize that growth and change occurs, it is important to question it's necessity. Thanks for taking the time to read and respond. Sincerely, Ken Katz</p>	<p>Mr. Katz,I'm responding to comments that you sent recently regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. Your question was regarding whether it would be possible to not allow larger planes to land at Orcas Island so that significant changes to Mount Baker Road would not be required. The conflict between Mount Baker Road and the runway is an existing hazard, and the traffic on it poses a hazard between vehicles on the road and any aircraft landing to the north, regardless of the size of the aircraft. The conflict is caused by the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ), which is a trapezoid-shaped area on the ground that starts 200 feet beyond the end of the runway threshold and extends for another 1,000 feet (1,200 feet south of the runway threshold in this case). The purpose of the RPZ is to protect people and property on the ground. Resolving the conflict while leaving the road in its present location would require moving the runway threshold (and the RPZ) about 730 feet to the north. Since the north end of the runway is constrained by private property, the north end of the runway would not be moved. The result would be shortening the runway from 2,901 feet to 1,441 feet. A 1,441-foot runway would be much too short for most of the aircraft currently operating at Orcas Island Airport. It would also prevent me from flying to it in a little Cessna 152 that I rent, because the owner's</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				insurance restricts his planes to runways that are at least 2,500 feet long. Shortening the runway by that much would also eliminate scheduled air cargo and passenger service to the island, because their FAA charters prevent them from operating on such a short runway. It would greatly reduce tourism and have a large economic impact on the Island. Medical evacuation is very important to the island and would also be hindered if the runway were shortened significantly. Thank you for your comments. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments. Eric Strong				
6/14/2018	Mike Speece	ki7yu@hotmail.com	I am just now hearing about the Orcas airport expansion proposal. As a landowner, 4 blocks east of the strip, I am not eager to ever hear passenger jets in and out of here all day long. I especially do not want to see property on the east side of the airport encroached upon.	Thank you for your comment.				
6/18/2018	Rachel Van Pelt	rachel.m.vanpelt@gmail.com	Neither myself, nor any other Orcas resident I know, wants an expanded airport. The increased noise alone would ruin the peaceful island. People come here for peace and quiet, to experience nature and wildlife. It would be just awful. Not to mention the influx of more tourists than the island can handle, and that would ruin the experience for islanders and visitors alike. Please don't consider such a horrid idea.	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
6/20/2018	Jim Hostler	jahostler@hotmail.com	<p>Hope we can continue to accommodate weekend (+ other) folks who fly in and camp overnight, or they no now in that grass area near the helicopter landing pad.</p> <p>Would love to have 1500-2200 ft. of turf runway for us old tail dragger guys.</p>	Thank you for your comment.				Mail (emailed by L. Henderson)
6/21/2018	Charles Kangaroo House B&B	innkeeper@kangaroohouse.com	<p>Hi Leah and Tony, I have been reading up on FAA recs and procedures. Something I came across that you may already be very familiar with is the use of EMAS (Engineered Materials Arresting System) adjacent to runways when a body of water, a historic structure, or some other limitation prevents the FAA recommendations from being implemented in a Runway Safety Area. It seems to me that the FAA may consider the installation of EMAS between the Port of Orcas runway and the taxiway in its current separation distance as a mitigation compromise to provide an additional level safety in the event of an aircraft veering off the runway toward the taxiway. What do you think</p>					



Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/6/2018	Diane Boteler	dbotelermd@rockisland.com	I am very leery of any of the alternatives that relocate or close Mt. Baker Rd in it's current configuration or increase our airport's ability to allow larger planes to land. I understand that the FAA sets standards, but are those standards really appropriate for a small island airport with one end of the runway ending in the ocean? I would wager that few full time Orcas residents are in favor of increasing the footprint of the airport. I favor the least expensive and expansive alternative #1	Ms. Boteler, I'm responding to comments that you sent a couple of months ago regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. The FAA is responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the National Airspace System. Their development of airport standards comes from analysis of millions of operations at thousands of airports similar to the airport at Orcas Island. As part of the NAS, the Orcas Island Airport is required to do its best to meet airport design standards driven by the largest aircraft serving the airport with 500 or more operations per year (the design or critical aircraft). The safety standards applicable to Orcas Island Airport are for aircraft that have been operating there for many years. The proposed changes are intended to meet standards for existing aircraft. Any future development, small or big, will need to be reviewed through the environmental process prior to design or construction. This would be a separate project after the completion of the master plan and could very well alter the final design of projects for the airport. I hope this answers your questions. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/6/2018	Fred Klein	Freddythek10@gmail.com	Is there not a current waiver of the for a certain distance between centerlines of runway & parallel taxiway due to Cessna Caravan operations? Given the modest number of ops w/ the Caravan, can the waiver be extended into the future?	Mr. Klein,I'm responding to comments that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for an immediate response. We regret the delay in getting back to you.Thank you for your question regarding the possibility of obtaining a waiver for the required runway/taxiway separation distance at Orcas Island Airport (ORS). The FAA process for applying for waivers in situations like this is the submission of a Modification of Airport Design Standards (MoS). The FAA will evaluate such requests based on airport-specific information. Their analysis is based on years of experience with millions of operations at thousands of airports like Orcas Island Airport. If they conclude that operations can be conducted safely, they will grant the MoS. However, no MoS is permanent. Any MoS will be subject to review at least every five years, and there is no guarantee that the MoS will be granted next time. If we can find a way to meet the requirements of the current standards to the satisfaction of everyone involved without an MoS, that would be the best use of taxpayer funding in addition to eliminating uncertainty for future operations.I hope this answers your questions. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.				
7/7/2018	David Turnoy	davidger@centurylink.net	Hello, I am a local resident and would like to go on record against any expansion of the airport. We would like to preserve our current quality of life.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/7/2018	Paula Treneer	paulatreneer@hotmail.com	Dear Ms. Henderson, I would like to register my disagreement with the proposal to expand the airport to facilitate receipt of FAA funds and ultimately larger jets. The current degree of airplane noise is barely tolerable on summer afternoons. As a citizen who lives in Eastsound, I am opposed to any expansion which adds to the current noise level produced by aircraft landing at the airport. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/7/2018	Lisa Byers	lisabyers50@gmail.com	Dear Port of Orcas Commissioners - I am writing to ask you to adopt a plan that does not enable larger planes to land on Orcas -- a plan that my mean the Port will need to apply for a "Modification of Standard" from FAA standards, and a plan that retains our more remote, more rural, and more quirky status. I like the airport the way it is, and do not support expansion of the runway or the taxiway. Of the alternatives presented for the Runway/Taxiway, I support the "No Build" option, or at a minimum just widening the existing runway to 75'. I understand that FAA regulations set a preferred distance between the taxiway and runway, but I simply can't imagine that those preferred distances are necessary in order for planes to navigate safely. I'm sure the statistical modeling that led the FAA to set those distances is logical and reasoned. But practically? The planes that currently fly in and out of the airport have plenty of wing distance, including the Kenmore and Fed Ex planes. As for the terminal location, I wish you'd leave the terminal where it is. The idea that you would have airplanes taxi into that "SE Development" area in order to reach a new terminal seems unwarranted. That route brings more engine noise closer to residential areas and two churches. If you believe you need to relocate the terminal, then of the options presented, alternative 2 for the SE Development area seems to					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>have the least amount of negative impact on the community. And then there are the options presented for re-routing Mt. Baker Rd and Lovers Lane. In some ways this seems like the most damaging of the ideas presented. It would be incredibly expensive, and re-routing would inevitably lead to a longer runway, which would lead to larger jets. Please, please, please don't give-in to those suggestions. Leave Mt. Baker Road where it is. As you weigh the options, please think about the broader community. Of course you represent pilots and companies who use the airport, but I believe that the heart of your job is to represent the majority of us who do not have planes....the community members who may not be aware of what you are doing, but who will be negatively impacted by more planes, more noise, more people having easier access to the island. Of course you have pressure from the FAA and they have incredibly seductive financial incentives, but please don't trade away Orcas's quirky, rural, "only small planes can fly in here" character. With each incremental step that you take toward following the rules of agency regulators, I believe that you risk eroding or losing the qualities that make the island special</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/7/2018	Cathy Vierthaler	cathyvierthaler@rockisland.com	Hello, I would like to register my preference for option 1 - No Build. I do not see any reason that the Orcas Airport needs to be enlarged in any way. 1) We don't need larger planes coming in here. 2) The increase in traffic and noise would be devastating to our small community, as takeoff and landing will still be over Eastsound. 3) This is an unnecessary expenditure of public funds.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/7/2018	Tina Whitman	tina@sanjuans.org	Hi Leah, I see on the project timeline that environmental review for the Port of Orcas master planning process is slated to be complete by June 2018, but I don't see any related documents available on the website for the master plan. Can you please provide me documentation of the environmental considerations and requirements you are including and any related reports or documents that are informing that component of the process? Thank you					
7/7/2018	Nathan Brandow	outerislandx@live.com	The plan clearly ignores the importance of marine access and doesn't adequately consider the impact of the development in the neighboring marina.	Mr. Brandow, I'm responding to comments that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We are working with the marina owners and no development would occur without an environmental process and coordination and approval from the marina owners. Thank you for your comments. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/7/2018	Robert Griffith	r.griffith@hotmail.com	<p>Expansion of Eastsound airport is a terrible idea and I'm having a hard time comprehending how this made it to a "plan".</p> <p>We are year-round residents on the island. We like to consider ourselves part of the community, not tourists or temporary. How will expanding the airport help our COMMUNITY? It will probably help the economy a little during tourist season or for super rich to come up and buy some produce when they fly their JET into town for the weekend, but it's not helping 95% of the residents.</p> <p>As there are many people here with second homes (and many more seem to be moving in), they don't contribute to the every-day community and economy. Opening up for larger aircraft will bring the larger private planes &amp; private jets, increasing noise &amp; creating a not-necessary-oversized private (though public) port for people with too much money, not to mention destroying the lands currently around the airport. What is the point of this? Is there something "wrong" with our little airport? None that I or anyone I've spoken to can see.</p> <p>I do have to leave the island for work frequently, and I use the airport. If I can't get a seat or weather is bad, I take the ferry and the Airporter shuttle. Yes, it's a haul, but I read a book or talk to someone on the bus and it's a small price to pay to live here with our small, happy little airport.</p> <p>I have yet to speak to a working class person who is in favor of this plan. I have yet to speak to anyone who is in favor of this plan, actually. We do not want more land to be destroyed, more noise, more VRBOs, more unaffordable housing for working people, or simply expansion to accommodate a very small few. Please, do not move forward with your plans.</p>	<p>Mr. Griffith, I'm responding to comments that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. The FAA is responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the National Airspace System. Their development of airport standards comes from analysis of millions of operations at thousands of airports similar to the airport at Orcas Island. As part of the NAS, the Orcas Island Airport is required to do its best to meet airport design standards driven by the largest aircraft serving the airport with 500 or more operations per year (the design or critical aircraft). The safety standards applicable to Orcas Island Airport are for aircraft that have been operating there for many years. The proposed changes are intended to meet standards for existing aircraft. Any future development, small or big, will need to be reviewed through the environmental process prior to design or construction. This would be a separate project after the completion of the master plan and could very well alter the final design of projects for the airport. I hope this answers your questions. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/7/2018	Keara Axelrod	keara.a@outlook.com	<p>As a nervous flyer, and someone who is friends with several pilots, I understand the need for runways and airports to be as safe as possible.</p> <p>However, as a resident of Orcas, about two blocks from the airport, I worry greatly that any plan besides plan 1, no change, would mean rapidly and significantly increased plane traffic—including the noise, air pollution, and increased likelihood of injury and environmental destruction that goes along with it. I am also concerned that there has not been enough publicity around this issue; many of these plans would require significant reconfiguring of one of the main traffic arteries on Orcas. I somehow missed the announcement for the June 5 meeting, as did most of the island, it seems. Perhaps an extension of the deadline for comments is in order?</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration, Keara Axelrod</p>	<p>I'm responding to comments that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. The FAA is responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the National Airspace System. Their development of airport standards comes from analysis of millions of operations at thousands of airports similar to the airport at Orcas Island. As part of the NAS, the Orcas Island Airport is required to do its best to meet airport design standards driven by the largest aircraft serving the airport with 500 or more operations per year (the design or critical aircraft). The safety standards applicable to Orcas Island Airport are for aircraft that have been operating there for many years. The proposed changes are intended to meet standards for existing aircraft. Any future development, small or big, will need to be reviewed through the environmental process prior to design or construction. This would be a separate project after the completion of the master plan and could very well alter the final design of projects for the airport. The deadline for comments was extended, and hopefully you were able to attend the Port of Orcas special commission meeting on July 26th. I hope this answers your questions. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/7/2018	Evelyn Fuchser	mckin2@centurytel.net	<p>Can you get me more information. We are property owners at 162 Aviator Dr. And of cs we are easement holders to the airstrip access. Just want to know how your plans intent to affect us over her on Aviator Dr. There isnâ€™t a lot of information givin for those that do not have full information. And do you have video taped meeting information? Thanks Evelyn</p>	<p>Hello Ms. Fuchser,I'm responding to a question that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you.Your question was about the effect of any changes at the airport on property owners on Aviator Drive. The Master Plan website is located here: <a href="http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/">http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/</a> , and several development alternative have been posted there for your review if you have not had a chance to see them elsewhere. Let me know if you have any trouble with them.Most property along Aviator Drive is not affected by any of the development alternatives. Some structures closest to the runway may penetrate a Transitional Surface, which is an imaginary surface delineating airspace along the edges of the runway. However, specific details of each structure would have to be evaluated, and the mitigation of any penetrations, if they exist, would have to be determined on a case-by-case basis.I hope this answers your question. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.</p>				
7/8/2018	Domenic	domverb@yahoo.ca	<p>We Want Option A! Do Nothing.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				



Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/8/2018	Melanie Thea Patten	melaniethea@gmail.com	<p>Please enact Alternative 1: No changes to the airport at this time. Also, please consider extending the Public Comment Period. I am an Orcas land-owner and resident, and have lived full-time in San Juan County since 1971. While I appreciate that the needs and wants of air traffic are important to the island, most of the Alternative Proposals for airport expansion come at the cost of other things that are equally important to island residents. Boat moorage, peace and quiet, the wetlands environment, and quick response to all sides of the island from firefighters and police would all be negatively impacted by the proposed changes. People need to be informed so that the right decisions can be made before any changes are finalized. One of the things that bothers me about this Airport Expansion Proposal is that in spite of its potentially extreme impacts to the island, until very, very recently almost nobody I spoke to on Orcas had even heard about it. Technically, I believe that the outreach was done correctly, but in fact the public here has been taken utterly by surprise. Now, less than a week from the end of the Public Comment Period, people are finally getting the word. As far as I know, or anyone not 'In the Know' knows, there won't be any public hearings at all until after a decision has been made. I urge you to extend the Public Comment Period! The maps on the website do not have keys or legends to let</p>	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>those of us who want to know what is happening understand it. Mt. Baker Road, for instance, is drawn in a combination of blue, pink, green and white lines — but the legend does not say what the colors mean. And even after expanding the area of the map around Brandt’s Landing marina, it is impossible to tell whether Option 2 (for instance) will cut off access to the present Harbormaster’s office and all of the boats that are moored on the west side of the “Ditch.” How can the people who will be affected have meaningful input if we don’t even know what is really being proposed? I pray that the Public Comment Period will be extended — but I seriously doubt that those who will be making the decisions want this to happen, or they would have done an earlier and better job of letting us know what is hanging over our heads. And speaking of cutting off access to the west side of the marina: Brandt’s Landing is the only public marina on the north side of Orcas. I personally do not want to see any boats lose their “parking places.” Orcas already has extremely limited public shoreline access; the marinas are full and have long wait lists for boat spots, especially at Brandt’s. I do not believe that the “needs” of air traffic should be prioritized over the needs of people who want to get on the water on an island. (Note: My family has kept a small boat at Brandt’s since the 1970’s. We use it to access our cabins on</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>Waldron, and without that spot our water commute would become at least twice as long, and more difficult and dangerous to a degree which I cannot overemphasize). To my mind, the only acceptable one of the "Alternatives" proposed by the Port is Alternative One – "Leave it as it is." I have every confidence that the more radical Alternatives will be proposed again (and again, and again) but maybe the next time around the public who will be affected will be informed in time to have some ability to react. This time, the worm has been sneaked into our apple. I hope that we did not see it too late.</p>					

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/8/2018	Paul Vierthaler	paul@islandex.net	<p>Move the Heli pad to the lower flat area (old dog park area) which will open up more camping tie down areas, develop the upper dog park area. Develop the west port property for hangars and business when needed if ever. Leave the existing mid field crossing, it's safer. Widen the east taxi way to allow for big jets access. Remove the grass on the south tie down area and replace back to asphalt. Will need this area for more big jets.</p> <p>Close the existing main airport entrance and install a new main entrance along the North dog park property line. New entrance off of North Beach Road. Close all open drainage trenches and install under ground drainage. This will be much safer if a plane goes off the runway. Buy live traps to catch deer that get trapped inside the fence. The above work will most like take 40 years so you should be good with the FAA</p>	<p>Hello Mr. Vierthaler, I'm responding to comments you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. We have looked at lots of options for accommodating existing aircraft operations and planning for modest projected growth. A lot of them are ones that you mention in your comments. As you probably know, every set of options is in conflict with every other set of options, and the challenge comes in trying to meet all the requirements while optimizing all the competing interests. Not an easy task! Thanks again for your comments, and I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.</p>				
7/8/2018	Jeff McCaull	kkkbean@gmail.com	<p>Hi Leah, Please add me to the list of Orcas residents who would encourage that we pump the brakes on any expansion of the Orcas airport. I just learned about this issue yesterday from a neighbor. Others have likely expressed their concerns about the noise, decreased property values, decreased quality of life, etc. that such an expansion would produce, all for no apparent GOOD reason. I agree with all of these objections. In addition, I want to highlight the impact of an expansion on the marina at Brandt's Landing (BL). It would be INCORRECT to assume that marina-users simply want to recreate, and that if you close the marina, you will have little meaningful impact on people's lives. As you know, BL is the ONLY marina that provides quick access to the waters north of Orcas Island. The State Park rangers use it to access the State Marine Parks on Patos, Sucia and Matia Islands.</p>	<p>Hello, Mr. McCaull, I'm responding to a question that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. We understand that the Brandts Landing marina is a valuable asset to Orcas Island. There is no airport improvement alternative that includes closing the marina. In fact, we are working with the marina owners to coordinate improvements to the marina with plans for the airport. The marina would like to increase the number of boat slips and have better access to them. We think there is win-win potential in coordinating the work. I hope this answers your question. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>Emergency personnel on Orcas use BL to provide emergency services (fire and medical) to those islands and the surrounding waters. If an expansion results in a closure of BL, it would have a direct negative impact on public safety.</p> <p>I use the marina to access my home on Waldron Island, where I live, by boat. I use the marina to shop for food and fuel, seek medical care, access transportation by air and rail, etc. To put this in terms that might be easier to relate to, if the marina is closed, it would be as if someone tore up the road from your home driveway to the nearest facilities (shopping, medical, dental...); how do you manage under those conditions? Without this resource, I would have to travel at least twice as far to another marina (assuming that this would even be an option). During winter, the added distance would often make the trip to Orcas, not just inconvenient, but UNSAFE. So, please relay to whoever is making the decisions that they should consider, not just the concerns of people who want to travel to Orcas by air, but also the concerns of property owners adjacent to the airport, the concerns of (I suspect) the vast majority of Orcas residents who do NOT want to see increased air traffic, and the concerns of others who use the marina for purposes beyond simple recreation.</p> <p>Expansion of the Orcas airport would be a BAD IDEA. Alternative #1 (No Build) is the only option that makes sense at this time.</p>					

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/8/2018	Ken and Miki Brostrom	xnw@att.net	<p>Re Proposed Eastsound Airport Expansion Please consider the following comments in the determination of any future expansion of the Eastsound Airport:</p> <p>The quality of life is inversely related to the ease in getting there. North Burn The easier you make it for tourists and transients to get here, the lower the quality of life for everyone who lives here. Here is why:</p> <p>1. Noise. Expanding the Eastsound airport to accommodate larger and jet planes makes no sense. Larger planes make more noise; jets exponentially. Noise does not stop at the end of the runway and is amplified over water, increasing impacts of noise. Why destroy the peace and quiet ambiance that make Orcas, Waldron and other islands unique and desirable places, the very qualities people come here for as visitors and residents?</p> <p>2. Transportation. The idea of supplementing ferry service is specious. If ferries are overcrowded, that is a WashDOT problem, not a Port of Orcas problem. Who, exactly, is pushing for larger planes, such as 737s? There is no way Orcas Island can provide the ground facilities to accommodate large numbers of</p>	<p>Mr. and Mrs. Brostrom, I'm responding to comments that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. The FAA is responsible for the safe and efficient operation of the National Airspace System. Their development of airport standards comes from analysis of millions of operations at thousands of airports similar to the airport at Orcas Island. As part of the NAS, the Orcas Island Airport is required to do its best to meet airport design standards driven by the largest aircraft currently serving the airport with 500 or more operations per year (the design or critical aircraft). The safety standards applicable to Orcas Island Airport are for aircraft that have been operating there for many years. The proposed changes are intended to meet standards for existing aircraft. Any future development, small or big, will need to be reviewed through the environmental process prior to design or construction. This would be a separate project after the completion of the master plan and could very well alter the final design of projects for the airport. As far</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>deplaning passengers, such as ground transportation and accommodations. And consider the impacts should an accident occur: How can emergency responders possibly handle 20 or 30 or more injured persons, especially if the runway is blocked?</p> <p>3. Cost. As a pilot, I see this as a boondoggle and waste of taxpayer money. The current airport configuration will accommodate a large increase in traffic. Just because the FAA has money to spend does not mean the Port of Orcas has to find ways to get its hands on it. If FedEx is overrun with packages, it needs more space on the ground, not a bigger airport and larger, noisier planes to bring even more packages in.</p> <p>4.International Status. It is unrealistic to assume the Federal Government would station customs personnel at the Eastsound Airport when they already have nearby Bellingham and Friday Harbor offices. As a pilot, when I return from Canada I would much prefer Bellingham or Friday Harbor as a port of entry because of the nearby business districts and retail amenities. Eastsound is too far away, without ground transportation, to offer these amenities.</p> <p>5.Brandt's Landing. Water transportation is an integral element in the history of these islands and in the economy. both as essential transportation</p>	<p>as we know, no one is suggesting that the Orcas Island Airport be expanded to accommodate Boeing 737 aircraft. The runway is too short for the 737, the pavement is not strong enough to carry the weight of a 737, the airfield dimensions are too small for a 737, etc. No one has any plans to make all the upgrades required to serve a 737. All the improvements are for meeting the standards for aircraft that have been operating there for years.We understand that the Brandt's Landing marina is a valuable asset to Orcas Island. There is no airport improvement alternative that includes closing the marina. In fact, we are working with the marina owners to coordinate improvements to the marina with plans for the airport. The marina would like to increase the number of boat slips and have better access to them. We think there is win-win potential in coordinating the work.Thank you for your comments. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>the economy, both as a result of transportation between islands and as recreation. Recreational traffic is increasing, bringing tourists and their dollars. To even consider reducing or eliminating the only commercial boating facility on the north side of Orcas Island defies reason.</p> <p>6.Our Future. Yes, the qualities these islands have to offer, peace, quiet, serenity, healthy forests, clean water and beaches, are attracting “ and will continue to attract “ people for far-away and very wealthy celebrities and others with means, who have large planes and entourage they want to bring with them. Why should the citizens who live here, who are responsible for fostering and maintaining the very attributes these people come for, be required to accommodate their lifestyle at the expense of our own? Once changed, there is no going back. Once larger planes, their noise, their impacts on our very way of life become a fact of life, there is no going back, no matter how much these actions of expansion are regretted.</p> <p>In summary, keep the configuration of the Eastsound Airport as it currently is, a quality rural airport. If improvements are desired, then work to make it “ and maintain it “ as the best class B-1 airport it can possibly be, without expansion. And without putting</p>					



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			these islands on a course toward becoming the Nantucket or Hamptons of the Northwest. Respectfully Submitted, Ken and Miki Brostrom, Waldron Island					
7/8/2018	Steven Schiller	permaculture@rocketmail.com	I have reviewed the conceptual drawings for the proposed changes to the Orcas Island Airport. It beggars belief that these changes are even being considered, especially those changes that would increase the danger to our elementary and high school students that use Lovers Lane to walk to and from school and to the small children that use the facilities at the Funhouse. This expansion proposal would have a seriously detrimental impact on our town and I do not want to see it implemented in any form.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/9/2018	Joe Symons	joesymons@me.com	I write re the proposed master plan. I find the information available on this plan to be entirely inadequate. A set of engineering drawings of the airport as seen from above does not meet my definition of a plan. I have already submitted my concerns to Leah. In the context of the county's vision statement, the EPRC vision statement, and given the inadequacy of the plan information re the implications of these proposed alternatives, I urge the commissioners to choose alternative one: No change.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/9/2018	Melinda Milligan	melindamiligan@gmail.com	Please note: I support Plan 1- No build. The other alternatives do not benefit the overall community, and add undue hardship to many who live near the airport. A larger airport detracts from our rural community atmosphere. Please implement the "no build" plan.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/9/2018	Ryan Page	ryanmikepage@gmail.com	Hello, I am writing to whom it may concern that I am completely opposed to the proposed expansion of the Orcas airport and recommend the no build alternative. Can you please advise me on the best way to participate in this process moving forward?	Hi Ryan, Thank you for your comment. The best way to participate would be to attend the September 19th Public Open House and keep an eye on the Master Plan website. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire & Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them.				
7/9/2018	Greg Oaksen	gregoaksen@gmail.com	I prefer Alternative 1. Do not expand the airport footprint!	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/9/2018	Richard Clark	RichardDClarke1@gmail.com	Your plans to expand the airport is misplaced, the level of transparency of which you've provided during the planning process has been one of deception and unfulfilled promises to post documents on your website with the intention of deliberately shielding the public from your true agenda. Your efforts are misguided as are the funds as they'd be far more democratic is the funds and your energy were directed at solving the current problems with the ferry, again infrastructure, equipment and digital platforms...	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/9/2018	Jari Brenner	jari@distantshore.com	Please DO NOT expand the airport! We are at capacity now. Any further expansion would be highly detrimental to the wildlife, environment, and infrastructure of the island. Please choose Alternative 1, i.e., NO CHANGE!	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/9/2018	Lynn Baker	lynnwbakerorcas@gmail.com	<p>Hi -- In considering options for the future of the Orcas airport, please consider:</p> <p>1) It's on the low part of the island. Once Crescent Beach goes (and it's already underwater during winter storms), North Beach Road will be the only through connector across the island. We'll need to strengthen the cross-island traffic path and do all we can to keep the island whole. Actions that weaken the integrity of the low part of the island (such as clearing all those trees and leaving a ditch) hasten the end of Orcas as a single island. Please consider how the airport can help, not hurt, this long-term need.</p> <p>2) If the airport must be expanded (Class BII sounds about right), please consider how to minimize noise and smell impacts on Eastsound and residential areas.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				
7/9/2018	Ken Katz	katz.orcas@gmail.com	<p>I've commented once, but after discussing with friends and neighbors, I feel it is important to write again. There are many, many people against the expansion as laid out. Please listen to us. Thanks</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/9/2018	Robert Gambell	winniebob11@gmail.com	Stop the insanity. You've got an airport in the middle of a wetland that is in the middle of a town. The ONLY viable course is Alternative 1. The airport, if it remains where it is, cannot logically expand any more. It is insane to spend federal and local money to expand a facility that will probably be periodically submerged in 50 years. Keep things as they are, EVEN WITH ALL THE CONSTRAINTS THAT WILL BE REQUIRED. If people want a larger, more active facility it must be moved to a different, more suitable location. PLEASE use some common sense on this. The airport started out in the wrong place, in the middle of a wetland that is in the middle of a town, and this mistake should not be compounded into the future.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Suzie Thomas	suziethomas.journeys@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/10/2018	Walter Corbin	wcorbin@rockisland.com	<p>Each year there is less and less availability for plan old solitude. I came to the San Juans over 37 years ago to escape the noise, traffic and lights of the mainland. The Vision Statement at that time was affixed to the County Administration Building as a reminder to keep our County rural in nature. I have contributed thousands of dollars to do just that and have fortunately been able to put my property in a conservation easement that will keep it in meadow and woods forever. We do not need more noise in our air space. Our ferries serve as a tranquil way of arriving here. Why not leave the frantic haste on the mainland and Keep our islands as a place to engage in the slow pace of island living. There is no need to expand our airport facilities.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				
7/10/2018	Michael Johnson	mdjishere@gmail.com	<p>Please consider the following comments in the determination of any future expansion of the Eastsound Airport: My name is Michael Johnson. I live at 202 Blanchard Rd. here in Eastsound. I just reviewed the maps and proposals regarding possible future development for Eastsound airport. Like others I've talked to I only recently found out about this myself. The house I own is in a neighborhood that's just uphill and less than a quarter mile from Eastsound airport. I've lived here for the past ten years. The noise from all the aircraft starting up, taxiing around, and taking off is clearly audible from here. It is a nuisance to say the least... even as it exists now. Any of the plans proposed except for Alternative 1 pose an unwanted risk to me of the future potential for both larger types of aircraft, and for a larger volume of air traffic within close proximity to the neighborhood where I live. All of the alternatives except for Alternative 1 seem out of context with both the current size of the Eastsound community as well as that of the future considering Eastsound's limited growth restrictions. As a boat owner and past outer-</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/10/2018	Lyman Griswold	lymang314@gmail.com	island resident/land-owner who has kept boats moored at Brandt's Landing I'm also aware of the importance to the local people of this long-standing service (to generations of island families), who continue to maintain their boats, and park their vehicles and trailers there. This being the only marina on the entire north shore of Orcas makes Brandt's Landing particularly critically to local boaters (commercial and private alike). All of the alternatives proposed show encroachment upon the existing boat storage, kayak launching, and parking areas just N of, and to the W of the Brandt's Landing office area. This would be unacceptable to me. I would like to ask that the Public Comment deadline be extended, and to respectfully let you know that at this time I support Alternative 1 - No Build.					
7/10/2018	Michael Hurwicz	mhurwicz@gmail.com	I choose Alternative 1: no build.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/10/2018	Jaime Rankin	Jaime_Rankin@yahoo.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Wayne Rankin	Wayne_Rankin@hotmail.com	I accept alternative number one: "no build"!	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Errol Speed	Errolspeed@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Erica Ekrem	odelae@gmail.com	I'm a concerned community member and year-round resident since 2004. "I choose Alternative 1: no build"	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Cole Sisson	colesisson@gmail.com	Regarding the airport expansion. I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Phillip Miller	philamy@centurylink.net	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/10/2018	Carl & Sandy Burger	kayakinn@rockisland.com	This new proposal is a huge step backwards if one values Quality of Life Issues for our Emerald Isle. "They paved Paradise/put up a parking lot". How tragic, to be living the nightmare. There's a broader context which is being ignored. Wish I could quote appropriate passages from islander Joe Symons here! Thanks for the chance to comment.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Susan Osborn	Songhaus@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Charlotte Sumrall	orcaschar@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Didier Gincig	orcasdidier@gmail.com	I beg you PLEASE NO!!!	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Jill Sherman	jsherman@orcas.k12.wa.us	I live in Eastsound and often walk by the airport. It is great to have the option to fly but I think we should purposely limit it to smaller planes. Expanding would mean bigger, louder planes affecting our highest density residential areas. The airport serves a small portion of the population and to increase it's size would be more of a convenience for tourists than residents. We already have a thriving tourist economy. I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
#####	Sharon Abreu	sharmuse@gmail.com	I choose Alternative 1: no build.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Dan Crossman	levicross@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Tracey Levine	levicross@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Lesley liddle	liddlelesley@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Lorna Rhodes	rhodes.lorna3@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Tim White	timwhite@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Amy Harder	amy2harder@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Michael Riordan	mriordan137@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Ryan Morris	rmorris@startmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/10/2018	Christian Hogle	christiancopley@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build .Feels as though this is a done deal for a project that impacts many, but benefits very few. Namely the wealthy well connected. Please consider Not Building	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	philip cohn	philcohn314@yahoo.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Judy Stockwell	jigstockwell4@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Jill Bates	drjillvet@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/10/2018	Anthony Suruda	tonysuruda@gmail.com	I reviewed the condensed version of the various master plans for the airport expansion. I am a property owner in Eastsound and my home is off North Beach Road. I will be affected by additional noise from increased airport usage. I knew that when I purchased my home in 2014. I support doing the maximum feasible expansion of the airport and support facilities even if this means rerouting or closing a portion of Mt. Baker Road. Go big and get it over with. Increasing the airport facilities will boost the local economy as well as, in the long run, increase travel opportunities for locals and tourists. Complying with all FAA requirements will ensure FAA funding in the future. FWIW I am not a pilot and have never used the Orcas airport.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Harvey Himelfarb	hshimelfarb@ucdavis.edu	I strongly support alternative one: No build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Laura Hasselman	laurah@wiandermere.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Gregory Kramer	gregory@metta.org	I choose alternative one: no build. IF greater breadth of the runway is necessary for safety and legal reasons, this is okay. But EMPHATICALLY not greater length. I, and everyone I know, is against the addition noise, air traffic, and commercial interests this would open, and see expansion in length, and thus class of aircraft, as a service to the wealthy but a huge disservice to those of us who live here and participate fully in the community.	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/10/2018	Susan Malins	susan.malins@gmail.com	I favor NO CHANGE/Expansion	Thank you for your comment				
7/10/2018	Margaret M. Manning	peg@blanchardmanning.com	The only option right for the island is option 1, the no build option. Has anyone analyzed whether we qualify for an exemption? You m not sure what the FAA uses for safety standards but we'd rather see the planes allowed limited rather than causing great disruption to people's homes and businesses. The existing terminal is just fine as are the existing runway and taxi separations. The planes we currently have using them have been doing so without incident for a decade.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/10/2018	Diane Berreth	maxalice@rockisland.com	I have been a full-time resident of Eastsound for 12 years. I strongly support Option 1, No Build, for the Master Plan. Option One best reflects the needs and desires of a majority of Orcas residents. If you have doubts about my statement why not survey our island residents? If cost is a factor you could approach Madrona Voices for survey assistance. Their work with the OIHD was widely viewed as fair and objective, which I assume is your intent in your upcoming decision.	Thank you for your comment				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/10/2018	Mandy Troxel	crazylegs40@rocketmail.com	<p>In short, I choose Alternative 1: no build. At length: I have lived on Orcas for 15 years, raising my two daughters, now ages 11 and 14. As a single parent in the low income bracket, I live in the Opal Commons neighborhood between Blanchard and Seaview. Thus, my concern over the airport expansion applies not only to the quality of life for all who live on this rural island, but more directly for my own home and neighborhood. I purposely chose the Opal Commons neighborhood because of its proximity to town, and the number of young families who live in the area. Watching my children ride bikes with their friends through the neighborhood makes me nostalgic and happy. However, this neighborhood took a big hit when, despite our rallies and action, the propane tank was approved. The airport expansion, which once again would drastically effect our neighborhood, feels like a punch in the gut now that we are already struggling in the wake of the propane tank debacle. To be honest, it feels very much like this island is more often choosing profit over quality of life for our long term residents. It doesn't feel like residents are being informed or given enough time to truly weigh in on the matters that will affect our daily lives. It has me second guessing my decision to move to this neighborhood three years ago. In this amount of time we've seen large industrial buildings go up on Mt. Baker Rd. such as the marijuana production plant, then the Propane tank approval, and now the airport. As I imagine the airport expansion, I think about the air pollution that already greatly effects those of us near the airport. I think of the increased traffic on the streets where I walk my dogs and my children play. I think of the loss of the beautiful fields that I walk to in order to watch the wildlife who are thriving there. In my opinion, the amount of lives that these changes negatively affect far outnumbers those who will benefit. I can only assume that the promise of profits is speaking to those making decisions more loudly than the outcry of island residents. As a low income family, this neighborhood is one of the few options for stable housing for us here on Orcas. And, with organizations</p>	<p>Hello Ms. Troxel, Thank you for your email. I have taken the liberty of forwarding it to the Port of Orcas, the organization currently soliciting input on the proposed changes to the Orcas Island airport. The Eastsound Plan Review Committee is meeting tomorrow at 3 pm at the Fire Station in Eastsound. They are scheduled to discuss the Port's outreach program at 5:15. (I should caution you that the time is very approximate and depends on the pace of the other items on the agenda.) Respectfully, Colin</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/10/2018	Ed Suji	edsujj@rockisland.com	<p>such as OPAL and the Land Bank, I have always felt that the "feel" of Orcas -- rural, intentional and safe for all -- was being sustained for the value that it offers its residents (no matter what age or income) and for the ecological health of the island. Watching this neighborhood take hit after hit has me wondering otherwise, and it is heartbreaking. Please leave the airport as it is. An adequate facility for a small community that values quality of life over corporate profit.</p>					
7/10/2018	Mike Parnell	mparnell@rockisland.com	<p>I choose alternative 1: "no build"  Airport expansion is 100% at odds with the Vision Statement that is just adopted by the County Council. The airport is just fine as it is. The expansion plans show a huge disrespect for the wishes of the whole Orcas community and should be shelved immediately. It is simply a terribly bad idea. Forget it!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				
7/10/2018	Mike Parnell	mparnell@rockisland.com	<p>Our airport should be expanded for increased safety and services. My concerns are that no existing structures be lost or condemned and that IF Enchanted Forest road is the primary feeder- that sidewalks and child safety are considered as there is a K-12 school and a youth fun center that accumulates significant kid foot traffic!  What is "Partition 77 penetration" mean?   What is</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/10/2018	Stephanie Buffman	stephanie@sanjuans.org	<p>Dear Leah,</p> <p>Could you direct me to the data that was used to evaluate type of aircraft, frequency of use of the Orcas Airport? In particular, could you provide the page numbers for type of aircraft (size), frequency of use of the Orcas Airport?</p>	<p>Ms. Buffman, I'm responding to comments that you sent recently regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. Your question was regarding the data used to evaluate the types and frequency of aircraft operating at the Orcas Island Airport. The forecast was just recently received back from the FAA and has not yet been approved. Once it is approved we will publish it on the Port website. Our data comes from the FAA and from the users of the Airport. For example Kenmore Air and other heavy users record fleet information and scheduled flight information which is incorporated into the analysis. Is there a specific question you have that we could help answer?</p>				
7/10/2018	Laine Pechacek	lainemariep@gmail.com	<p>A terrible idea. We live right across from the airport. Already the rotating 24hr light gives my husband flashbacks of war and activates his PTSD. (On another note is there any way to lower or move it to another position? Also putting a small billboard on the storage units would help. Can we talk about that?) The idea of the airport being expanded to accommodate larger airplanes would be difficult for the entire community of Eastsound. The light traffic we get is a disturbance as it is, but with the smaller airplanes it's a charming disturbance. Please, don't build. Thank you.</p>	<p>Ms. Pechacek, I'm responding to comments that you sent recently regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. Your question was regarding the airport beacon and planned airport improvements. The rotating beacon must be visible by aircraft needing to locate the airport at night, and there are standards to which it must be installed. When it is installed it is positioned to shine upward, but it must shine outward also. It is unfortunate that it has caused you discomfort. The airport is not being expanded to accommodate larger aircraft. All dimensional changes to the airfield are to meet FAA requirements for existing aircraft using the airport, primarily the Cessna Caravan 208B which is used by Kenmore Air and Federal Express. Thank you for your comments. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions.</p>				



Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/10/2018	Mindy Kayl	mindy@mindykayl.com	<p>I am a wetlands consultant living on Orcas Island if you need any wetland work or data. My website includes a resume and I have worked in San Juan County as a Wetland Consultant for 10 years, please learn more at <a href="http://www.mindykayl.com">www.mindykayl.com</a> or email me if you are interested in any contract work.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Mindy Kayl</p>	Thank you for your comment				
7/10/2018	David Kobrin	david.kobrin@icloud.com	<p>To the Master Plan Team:</p> <p>I understand that you have had a number of public meetings, and have published related materials about changes to the airport. That's all commendable. From what I understand, there appear to be two objectives to the proposed changes. One is to ensure modifications to the runways that will maximize safety; the second is to extend the runway so that it will allow larger aircraft, including jets. This might also include changes to Mt. Baker Rd.</p> <p>I do understand why those responsible for the airport want to make changes to increase safety. What I do not understand is why the island community needs larger planes, probably including jets. What group, or individuals, have advocated this as a helpful improvement to the island? Where did the idea originate? And, why do you believe that the lengthening of the runway is beneficial to the island community?</p> <p>I believe these are pertinent questions that require public answers before final decisions are made.</p> <p>I believe strongly that one of the virtues that make the island a valued place to live -- and to visit -- is its sense of tranquility. Quite obviously, an airport near town used by larger planes, including jets, is a major blow to the essence of community here.</p> <p>Unless there are reasons to support the expansion that</p>	<p>Mr. Kobrin, I'm responding to comments that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. You are correct that the planned improvements to the airport are intended to bring it into compliance with current safety standards for the aircraft that are currently operating there. However, there are no plans to accommodate anything larger than what is already operating there. There is also no plan to increase the pavement length. The pavement on each end of the runway is currently marked as overrun area. Overruns provide additional distance for an aircraft to come to a stop if it has not done so by the time it reaches the end of the runway. Some airplanes are currently using the overrun areas for takeoff (in the opposite direction). A couple of the alternatives show how the overrun areas could be designated as displaced thresholds, which would authorize them as usable for takeoffs. The change would make the pavement markings correspond with the current operational use. Thank you for your comments. Again, I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			have not yet been made public, I am decidedly against changes that include more air traffic, larger aircraft, or jet aircraft. Sincerely, David Kobrin					
7/10/2018	Ann Bertino	abertino5@gmail.com	I choose Alternative 1: no build	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/10/2018	Linda Ellsworth	lindaellsworth51@gmail.com	I choose alternative # 1 - No Build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	Merry Bush	merryb@rockisland.com	I just want to go on record as being totally against any expansion of the Eastsound Airport. Especially anything that would increase FAA moneys funneled to said airport. I have lived on this Island for 20 years and do not see any good reason to expand!	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/11/2018	Patty Pirnack Hamilton and Jim Hamilton	hulahands@centurylink.net	There is no explanation as to the costs and benefits or why this is needed. We feel like we need to have more information and are sorry we were unable to attend the open houses (Surgery and being off island). So at this time we are choosing Alternative One until we can get more information as the why this is needed, the impacts on the community, costs and benefits to the community. We know FAA will be providing much of the funding but what is to be gained here. That is our big question. It may be that this expansion is needed but we need to know why. Also would this expansion increase traffic or number of flights which could be a major impact. Any further information you could provide would be appreciated. Thank you so much. Patty Pirnack Hamilton and Jim Hamilton	Mr. and Ms. Hamilton, Thank you for your comment. Please check the Orcas Island Master Plan website for information on why the plan is needed, the master plan timeline, and much more information. The next Public Meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire & Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. Website : <a href="http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/">http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/</a> We hope you will join us September 19 <sup>th</sup> , and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them. Thank you, Meg Jones				
#####	Barry Rose	bdrose51@gmail.com	I choose alternative four: expand facilities to FAA Standards and minimize marine life impact. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.				
#####	John Fleischer	flash@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	Maria Nutt	wvo@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
#####	Megan Neal	megan@oicf.us	I choose alternative one: NO BUILD	Thank you for your comment.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/11/2018	Patty Pirnack Hamilton and Jim Hamilton	hulahands@centurylink.net	<p>I choose alternative one: no build. We have not been able to attend the open houses. My husband was a Port Commissioner and pilot. He spearheaded the volunteer building along with Alan Spaulding to build what now is the Terminal and meeting room. It was done with volunteer labor and the labor of Jim Hamilton and Alan Spaulding. My husband is no longer a pilot and help to start up the Classic Car Club. The trouble we have with what we have looked at is it is hard to interpret the maps. There is no explanation as to the costs and benefits or why this is needed. We feel like we need to have more information and are sorry we were unable to attend the open houses (Surgery and being off island). So at this time we are choosing Alternative One until we can get more information as the why this is needed, the impacts on the community, costs and benefits to the community. We know FAA will be providing much of the funding but what is to be gained here. That is our big question. It may be that this expansion is needed but we need to know why. Also would this expansion increase traffic or number of flights which could be a major impact. Any further information you could provide would be appreciated. Thank you so much.</p>	<p>Mr. and Ms. Hamilton, Thank you for your comment. Please check the Orcas Island Master Plan website for information on why the plan is needed, the master plan timeline, and much more information. The next Public Meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. Website : <a href="http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/">http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/</a> We hope you will join us September 19<sup>th</sup>, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them. Thank you, Meg Jones</p>				
7/11/2018	Sandra Chalk	kerstenchalk@gmail.com	<p>I choose alternative one: no build!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/11/2018	Audrey Neddermann	audrey.neddermann@gmail.com	Dear Leah Henderson, I am writing to express that I do NOT support any airport expansion on Orcas. I have lived here 9 years, I'm part of the working class and 35. I plan to live on Orcas a long time and do not support expansion that would bring larger planes, more noise and more people to the island. Our resources are already crunched and this kind of expansion can bring no good. The fact that the airport is right outside the village where most working class islanders live means any expansion distress would harm our year round community. Air travel to and from the islands is already only really available to the wealthy. We don't need any more dividing of classes here. It's already hard enough to make a living and survive here year round. Thank you for listening, Audrey Neddermann	Hi Audrey, thank you for your comment. There is a meeting on the 26th that the Port is holding to better explain the alternatives. None of them involve expanding the airport for larger aircraft. The airport does not currently meet standards for the type of aircraft utilizing the airport for both passengers and cargo. The FAA requires the airport to do their best to meet the standards (For example the taxiway needs to be moved further from the runway which causes buildings to be relocated and Mount Baker road runs through the runway protection zone and is an incompatible use). We will provide additional information to better explain these to the public early next week. I do recommend that you also read through the public meeting #1 presentation from January to help understand the FAA's requirements. Thank you. If you have additional comments or questions please let me know. Leah Henderson Project Manager.				
7/11/2018	Margaret M. Manning , Timothy P. Blanchard	peg@blanchardmanning.com	We strongly oppose all but the #1 option. If accommodating the Caravan means moving the terminal or Mt. Baker Rd., we think that we should do without the Caravans. I think the Port and its consultants seriously underestimate the feelings of Orcas residents about this radical degree of change.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/11/2018	Willie Clancy	wclancy15@gmail.com	Hello to all involved, I'm writing to show my respectful support for the airport staying at it's current size and not expanding. The environmental impacts that come from the expansion are troubling as are all expansions involving more concrete and impermeable surfaces replacing natural ones. I believe the Mt. Baker Rd reroute would impact the wetland south of the airport. Also, should the airport expansion indeed lead to more aircraft coming through, that would be troublesome to me for a couple reasons. First, the extra fuel that would be used would be a big pollution source. I know cars and ferries also use fuel, but aircrafts are one of the most inefficient fuel users. Also, the increased noise pollution is an issue for me. I'm sure there are economic reasons to expand, but I'm hoping that we can transition to holding environmental and non-economic reasons at the same or even higher level than economic ones. Thank you sincerely for considering these issues, Willie Clancy (also I'm writing this with my parents present who both support these sentiments, so please consider this as 3 comments. Thank you.)	Thank you for your comment.				
#####	Cornelius Sprenger	squaresail@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
#####	Jyl Peterson	jyl@jylho-userock.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
#####	Don Hynes	donhynes@cnw.net	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
#####	Linda Ethier	ljethier@mac.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/11/2018	Lisa Louise Davis	lisalouise@happytoast.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	Mandy Troxel	crazylegs40@rocketmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	Mike Kaulakis	makaulakis@gmail.com	I would , no need to , add my voice to the opposition of the airport expansion. I will be at the meeting on the 26th to learn more about this situation. There seems to be many questions on an issue that, to my awareness, just became public knowledge. I have heard nothing about this plan before a few days ago. I'm not a conspiracy nut but I do believe this plan was held tightly by a few people with an interest in flying. I don't think this is fair and would like to see the decision deadline put off until fall (September-late). Will be at meeting with further comment.	Mike, Thank you for the comment. More information will also be added to the website next week that may help you prepare for the meeting on the 26th. You are the third person that has stated you did not know the plan was happening. However, a postcard was sent in November to each household on the island so that everyone was well informed. We did this so everyone on the island, not just those who read a newspaper would know about the project and the schedule, and be able to sign up for the mailing list. There was also a newspaper article that ran in January and again in mid-June in various Orcas publications. Would you like me to add you to our email notification list? Thank you, Leah Henderson Project Manager				
7/11/2018	Kathi Ciskowski	ciskokid@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	Annette Marsden	admarsden@hotmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	Mara Nutt	wvo@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	William Nutt	wvo@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
#####	Millie Thorson	milliethorson@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	Jeff McCaul	kkbean@gmail.com	I choose alternative 1: no build. Closure/reduction of Brandt's Landing would negatively impact my ability to travel to my home on Waldron. I use that marina to access shopping, medical care, etc. Other marina options (Deer Harbor, West Sound, etc.) are too far and would be UNSAFE for travel in the winter.	Thank you for your comment.				
#####	Gordon Koenig	gordo@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build. Maintain what we have.	Thank you for your comment.				
#####	Stan Wagner	spwagner5@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	Clark Cundy	cj2orcas@gmail.com	Hi Leah, Thank you for scheduling a comments extension on Eastsound Airport Expansion and new meeting date and time. I'm looking forward to hearing more in the July meeting. If I could suggest a later starting time for the meeting say 5:30pm. That works better for those that work and you would get more bang for your buck with regard to public participation and input.	See 7/12 responses from LH.				
7/11/2018	Judith and Allan Dorosin	sadjad05@yahoo.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/11/2018	Michael Riordan	mriordan137@gmail.com	I oppose any major expansion of the Orcas Island Airport. Any new facilities should be built within the existing airport footprint.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/11/2018	Judy Jackson	jackson.jl@icloud.com	No to larger planes. No to FAA money if it brings B2 rating and/or other expansion-strings attached. No to increased noise.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/11/2018	Ed Andrews	ed@somelabdesign.com	I am completely against the idea of the airport expanding. It's also a shame that this project is being pushed through at such a rapid pace. This will have a negative effect on all the people who live in this area, town and the environment.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/11/2018	Pegi Groundwater	pegigroundwater@gmail.com	We are a small rural environment. All of the alternatives represent a significant degradation of our island environment and would result in even more flight in and out of the airport, necessitating even further expansion. I lived in CA most of my life and I saw that every time work was undertaken to bring facilities up to "standards" or relieve congestion they actually fostered further congestion and the need for even more expansion in just a few years. I am very opposed to a helicopter landing pad. I lived in Friday Harbor for a few years and was painfully aware of the additional air traffic noise that results from expanded helicopter traffic. I am also opposed to trying to make the airport accommodate planes larger than the Kenmore planes. The wealthy owners of those planes should buy smaller planes for visiting the island or build landing strips on their own property. I was very angry at the fatuous labeling of the seasonal stream west of the airport as "possible wetlands". It is	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>a bog much of the year. Only a fool would think it was "possibly" a wetland. There should not be any expansion in the wetlands on any side of the airport. The easiest alternative to meet Federal requirements is to move all of the offices and buildings to the dog park areas and the corner beyond and use that space to realign the runways. Easier, cheaper, and far more in keeping with our island spirit.</p> <p>Keep Orcas small and rural!!!</p>					
7/11/2018	Katie Wilkins	katieannwilkins@gmail.com	I choose Alternative 1: no build.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/11/2018	Sandy Playa	sandyplaya@rockisland.com	I choose alternative 1, No build.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/11/2018	Greg Oaksen	gregoaksen@gmail.com	Dear Dowl,I vehemently oppose the ridiculous proposals for the Orcas airport expansion. Where is the genuine community outreach and input? Please get the community seriously involved on this issue which will degrade our island environment.	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/11/2018	Kathryn Bowes	kathryn@sanjuans.com	Hello, As a comparison how does the San Juan Island airport compare to the Orcas Island Airport. I'm all for the updates but pretty sure there will be a ton of people that do not like change. Might be good to offer comparisons? And also list the benefits of the expansion/updates	Thank you Kathryn. Your question is a good one and a comparison that I have been raising recently. Even the most extensive of our plans does not make us as large as Friday Harbor. It is definitely a point I will use to frame the conversation when constituents label this plan as an "expansion." Tony	Please keep me posted. As I have a personal interest in sharing the outcome of this expansion. The question is asked on a regular basis by a select group of my clients. I've personally flown in and out of Orcas Island on a Learjet. It was exciting to say the least (too exciting). Expansion and updates comparable to our neighbors on San Juan are needed on Orcas, in my opinion. I've lived here 20 years and the prop planes are already creating noise enough! I don't want to see updates as a bigger			
#####	Wayne Munich	wlmunich@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/12/2018	Margart Manning and Timothy Blanchard	peg@blanchardmannieng.com	We strongly oppose all but the #1 option. If accommodating the Caravan means moving the terminal or Mt. Baker Rd., we think that we should do without the Caravans. I think the Port and its consultants seriously underestimate the feelings of Orcas residents about this radical degree of change.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
7/12/2018	Arielle Davis	arielledavis77@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
#####	Paul Pollard	ppollard2468@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/12/2018	Tammy Pollard	Tammy.Pollard@apmortgage.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/12/2018	Virginia Moore	ginger@orcasonline.com	I choose alternative one: NO BUILD. Moving, expanding, altering Mt Baker Road is a big NO from me. Further disrupting the wetlands, a very big NO, from me. Disrupting or reducing Brandt's Landing Marina is a big NO from me.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/12/2018	Patrick Baumann	patrick.a.baumann@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/12/2018	Jerry Weatherman	olgapottery@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: NO BUILD!!	Thank you for your comment.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/12/2018	Clark Cundy	cjj2orcas@gmail.com	Hi Leah, I was wondering if you could send me a link that can explain the difference between the airport designations of B1 and B2 with regard to airport config and airplanes associated with either so I can better understand what's being proposed as expansion.... I'm wanting to know what's needed in terms of land requirements, runway requirements , and the Make and model of potential airplanes that can use either . .	Thank you for reaching out. Please see the presentation from Public Open House 1. There are several slides that describe the differences in categories and what Orcas has versus what they need. We are also going to upload a document by the alternatives section to show the facility requirements side by side (existing versus what the FAA requires). The aircraft we have listed are examples of a B-I versus a B-II, and not all inclusive of course. What you will see is that the Caravan is actually an A-II, unless it is in icing conditions, but A-II and B-II airport design is the same dimensions. I'll find the dimension guidance and send that over as I do not believe the B-I is listed in the presentation below. <a href="http://www.portoforcas.com/dev/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PresentationBoard-LowRes.pdf">http://www.portoforcas.com/dev/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PresentationBoard-LowRes.pdf</a> If you have issues with this link it is available on the website under the first public open house. I encourage everyone to review this information before reviewing the alternatives to better understand the FAA's requirements. I'll also note that there was an incorrect statement that Mt Baker road is in a future runway protection zone. It is in the existing runway protection zone and roadways, as well as pedestrian trails or other places that people gather are incompatible land uses due to safety (aircraft are most likely to go down on approach or take off so they try to keep these areas as clear of people as possible). Please let me know if I can answer any other questions. I am on a flight currently but am email access for a few hours before being in meetings all day Friday. Thank you, Leah				
#####	Irmgard Conley	irmorcas@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no Build I do not want this Island Jewel be destroyed by Ueber Tourism and Greed!	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
#####	Anita Orne	anita@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build. Just because we can get the money does not mean we should. Thank you	Thank you for your comment.				
7/12/2018	Nancy Quackenbush	nquackenbush@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for the comment				
7/12/2018	Maile Johnson	nohealani@rockisland.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for comment.				
7/12/2018	Paul pollard	ppollard2468@gmail.com	I support the no build option. the other options create too much impact to the surrounding area. This is a small rural area and we do not need facilities that would be more appropriate for a larger community. longer runway = larger planes, jets and more noise.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/12/2018	Pierrette Guimond	pierretteguimond@gmail.com	No to extending the runway No to filling in Brants Landing  Keep airport as a rural airport, it has served us well	Thank you for your comment.				
7/12/2018	Patrick Baumann	patrick.a.baumann@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build In silence there is eloquence. Stop weaving and see how the pattern improves. - Rumi - "Quiet places on Earth are in danger of disappearing," a quote from Gordon Hempton, an acoustic ecologist. Let's save our environment.	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/12/2018	Clark Cundy	cjj2orcas@gmail.com	<p>Hi Leah, I was wondering if you could send me a link that can explain the difference between the airport designations of B1 and B2 with regard to airport config and airplanes associated with either so I can better understand what's being proposed as expansion.... I'm wanting to know what's needed in terms of land requirements, runway requirements , and the Make and model of potential airplanes that can use either. .Best, Clark Cundy</p>	<p>Clark,Thank you for reaching out. Please see the presentation from Public Open House 1. There are several slides that describe the differences in categories and what Orcas has versus what they need. We are also going to upload a document by the alternatives section to show the facility requirements side by side (existing versus what the FAA requires). The aircraft we have listed are examples of a B-I versus a B-II, and not all inclusive of course. What you will see is that the Caravan is actually an A-II, unless it is in icing conditions, but A-II and B-II airport design is the same dimensions. I'll find the dimension guidance and send that over as I do not believe the B-I is listed in the presentation below.</p> <p><a href="http://www.portoforcas.com/dev/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PresentationBoard-LowRes.pdf">http://www.portoforcas.com/dev/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PresentationBoard-LowRes.pdf</a> If you have issues with this link it is available on the website under the first public open house. I encourage everyone to review this information before reviewing the alternatives to better understand the FAA's requirements. I'll also note that there was an incorrect statement that Mt Baker road is in a future runway protection zone. It is in the existing runway protection zone and roadways, as well as pedestrian trails or other places that people gather are incompatible land uses due to safety (aircraft are most likely to go down on approach or take off so they try to keep these areas as clear of people as possible). Please let me know if I can answer any other questions. I am on a flight currently but am email access for a few hours before being in meetings all day Friday.Thank you,Leah</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/13/2018	ravin williams	ravinwing@yahoo.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/13/2018	Didier Gincig	orcasdidier@gmail.com	To Whom It May Concern, Please don't do a big airport expansion for fancy jets. We enjoy the quiet and want an island that is not like that. Please do what's best for the island feel.	Didier, None of the alternatives under consideration are a "big airport expansion for fancy jets." Every one of the alternatives under consideration actually results in an overall pavement length that is less than our current configuration and we remain smaller than Friday Harbor in every way. I am at a loss for how the perception that this is an airport expansion has developed, but it really isn't true. We are simply trying to make safety improvements to comply with FAA standards. I'm happy to discuss this over drawings to answer concerns or explain them if you like.				
7/13/2018	Stephanie Johnson Oday	sjoday@rockisland.com	Dear Leah: I represent Don and Marion Gerard, owners of property adjacent to the Orcas Airport at the northwest corner. I need to speak with you as soon as possible to discuss. The Gerards were not aware of the master plan alternatives until just recently and need to be informed. I understand there was a meeting last Tuesday. When is the next meeting?	Stephanie, Thank you for reaching out in regard to the Orcas Airport Master Plan. The draft alternatives were just shared with the public last Tuesday during our public meetings. The alternatives will be published on the Airport's website for public comment the middle of this week. We will accept public comment for a period of 30 days before moving forward with the evaluation of the alternatives and determining the preferred alternative. Our next meeting will be held in September. More information about the schedule and documents can be found at the Airport's website: <a href="http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/">http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/</a> Would you like to be signed up for our contact list? All residents				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/13/2018	Charles Toxley	innkeeper@kangaroohouse.com	Hi Leah,I was at the first meeting you hosted on June 5th. I was surprised to see the expansion the Port is proposing. I am particularly concerned about moving the taxiway closer to my house as we already have a significant amount of noise as planes taxi down the current taxiway. Removing hangars which help block noise and coming 15% closer to us and other people living in the North Beach neighborhood is going to increase the amount of sound coming our way. I mentioned this to Mike Stoltmier (sp?) at Smuggler’s Villa. Can you post the images and the rationale for suggesting these changes online? Your communications say there are documents on the Port of Orcas site, but there aren’t. These images are so detailed that they need to in a format where you can zoom in and out. I am also concerned that moving Mount Baker Road south will pave the way for extending the runway some day. You, Leah, said that is not in your plans, but more than word of mouth would be needed to insure that expansion of the runway to the south was exclusively prohibited. I hope you and Tony and the board of the Port of Orcas are going to actively engage the Eastsound community (especially the North Beach residential neighborhood)	of the island received a postcard last fall at the project initiation asking interested parties to sign up for our email list for future communications. We send out notifications and reminders about public meetings and notices when information is published as well. I am out of the office until Tuesday morning. I will have some time in the afternoon if you’d like to speak by phone or have specific questions about the master plan or the alternatives. Formal comments can be submitted by email or through the website as well. Thank you,	Charles, Thank you for your follow up email. As Tony mentioned we have an advisory committee that will meet again when we hold the next public meeting (September is the expected date but we will have to narrow down those details in the next few weeks with the availability of the fire station). Please let me know if you’d like to be involved in this committee and I will include you in our communications. As always reach out	Leah and Tony,Thank you both for your responses. I really appreciate it. I would like to be included in the advisory meetings and communications. I’m sure none of us wants to get into a long email string back and forth, but I did want to comment on a couple of points you brought up. I don’t expect either of you to respond to these comments, but would like you to keep them. Although take-off is louder for sure and shorter, in my living room we can track planes by sound as they taxi along.		

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>in your ultimate decisions and not just gather comments from a couple of open houses before you make any concrete plans. The people who live near by will take this very seriously and up to now, they've had no idea what you were wanting to do.Thank you,Charles Toxey</p>	<p>as is required in the permitting process, but please realize, as Leah mentioned, this is a 20 year plan to achieve compliance with the FAA safety standards for the aircraft that already use our airport. And that is the Cessna Caravan, the design aircraft, and not the Bombardier 850 regional jet which couldn't operate here today or under any alternative we have so that's a bit of a red herring. There will be multiple alternatives and we (the Port) already have a strong preference for the least invasive and expensive alternative, but the viability of that alternative will be subject to FAA approval. We ultimately have the ability to ignore their denial or acceptance of our alternative, but doing so may mean sustaining the airport without any assistance (for at least some period of time), which is not financially realistic. We need to show the FAA we considered full compliance and have a long term (maybe even beyond 20 years in reality) to eventually achieve it so they will sustain us</p>	<p>anytime by phone or email. Email is sometimes the easiest way to catch me and I can follow up by phone at a time that works for you. Thank you,Leah</p>	<p>Headed south or north taxiing or taking off, the sound reaching us is louder as each plane moves past the helipad, quieter along Larson's hangars and , louder again after the hangars, quieter as it passes Parnell's hangar and then louder again as it moves along the marina or in reverse. We can raise our voices to talk over taxi noise, but every time I'm on the phone with</p>		

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/13/2018	Arthur Van Gelde	cedavg@aol.com	I am against the proposed airport expansion as I do not believe that it has adequately explained nor researched for it's environmental and community impact. This proposed expansion clearly should not go ahead without further research and explanation to the Orcas community.	<p>(with lesser measures hopefully) in the interim. This is a planning process only. Even as a 20 year plan, it's not clear to me how we would ever have the money or will to buy Brandt's Landing and many other properties when, at best, 95% would be covered by the Federal and State government. Our match on the full-scope alternative would be something like 10-20 million dollars, which would take us 100 years or more to accumulate at our current tax authority. If you want me to explain the alternatives in person, please call me to schedule a meeting and bring as many North Beach residents as you desire, but again, that's what we have public meetings for. I'd be happy if the next meetings in August had 150 attendees instead of 13. Tony</p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p>		<p>someone who doesn't know where we live, they ask "What on earth is happening over there?" when they hear it.</p> <p>Conversation between people in person or on the phone has to stop when a Caravan takes off. The prospect of taxi and take off noise getting even louder with the proposal showing buildings removed and the taxiway moved closer to us is very unsettling and frankly has had me losing sleep the last few days worrying about it. Regarding the part of the presentation about plane's wings touching each other</p>		

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/13/2018	Steve and Linnea Bense	nootkarosefarm@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/13/2018	Linda Kirtz	lindakirtz@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/13/2018	Jeremy Jennings	jeremy.m.jennings@gmail.com	I choose alternative 1: no build. Without a public cost/benefit/impact analysis of the options it seems unconscionable to expand. Should expansion be deemed a legal necessity, option 2. I am 39, grew up in the islands, moved away for school and moved back a year ago.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/13/2018	Kathi Ciskowski	ciskokid@rockisland.com	Hi Leah, Thank you so much for reaching out to me. It turns out that I have spoken to you twice one on one about the project and I was at the presentation (one of the times I spoke to you) at the fire hall. It seemed like you answered my questions at the time by assuring me that there would be no larger planes flying in and the runway would not be extended. If my interpretation is incorrect, please let me know. Suddenly, the island seems to be abuzz with rumors and fears and concerns about what is happening. I am very glad you have scheduled a meeting for late July. People really need it.	Hi Kathi, I know we missed you in January but I wanted to see if you had any questions or still wanted to speak about the project. Thank you, Leah R. Henderson, C.M., ACE				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/13/2018	Christine Chaney	info@christinechaney.com	Hello!As a resident of a pretty quiet county, I'm against this project as it benefits the few while causing massive detriment to the larger community, big jets being very loud. The area could be used for better assets for the permanent residents; parks, dog parks, picnic areas, etc.Thank you for your consideration of keeping this county a refuge from disruptive noise. Ferries and smaller planes are enough to bring people to our islands.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/13/2018	Gulliver Rankin	yurtcats@rockisland.com	Please log my preference for Alternative #1, No Build.  I also would support development of the westside hangers before the eastside. I think the dog park area should be looked at being used for Busisness, wholesale, education, not plane hangers. More in keeping with zoning and role ports can play in health of diversified local economy.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/13/2018	Lanney Wixson	lanney.wixson@gmail.com	Leah,I summer on Waldron so I do not feel I should be pushing in any direction, but after retiring I volunteered on a transportation committee in Skagit County, receiving considerable practical education. 1. I commend you for looking ahead to serve needs and prevent accidents. 2. One of the things I learned is that a long term plan is necessary to avoid hostility, During a 20 year plan most properties come up for sale. If long term zoning designates use, a natural time to acquire develops and the community accepts the transition. This includes deed restrictions on adjacent properties imposed by the county on transfer. 3. What we dream of today will be our reality over 20 years if we create the proper environment early.	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/13/2018	Penney Sharp Sky	pennysky9@gmail.com	Dear Tony, As a 30 year resident of Orcas Island and a homeowner near the Eastsound Airport, I am certainly appreciative that our Airport exists and that it is small, run well, and only occasionally seems to violate noise agreements and local conventions. I also want to go on record saying that ONLY proposition 1 (No Build) is acceptable to me. Our airport is sufficient for the needs of our island now and into the future and any expansion violates adjacent neighborhoods in unacceptable ways. I totally disagree with any effort to accommodate larger planes, more planes, and the accompanying noise. I hope the Port will realize that our airport is enough the way it is.	Thanks Penny. Nothing in the range of alternatives is to accommodate larger airplanes. In fact the overall pavement length gets shorter and we remain smaller than Friday Harbor. All of the alternatives from the least extreme beyond "No Build" to the most extreme only seeks to put us in compliance with the safety standards for the aircraft that currently use the airport. All of them.Tony				
7/13/2018	Scott Knutson	SKnutson@gibsondunn.com	I vote for option One; no change to the airport. If certain planes are too large now and violate FAA rules for safety, then just forbid those aircraft from landing in the future. I have owned property on the island since 2006 and plan to live there full time in a few months. I stand with those long-term island residents that adamantly oppose any expansion of the airport. Let's keep the island the way it is and not cater to "Oprah" type customers that hope, by nibble and nibble, they can get the airport equipped to land their private jets and avoid having to mingle with the common folks on small commercial prop plans or, god forbid, the ferry.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/14/2018	Morgan Mills	imagine.peace@live.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/14/2018	Jon Barach	orcasgardens@gmail.com	As a user of our Eastsound airport I support your master plan. We need to continue to support Kenmore Air, northwest ferry, and fedex. Infrastructure improvements are so important to our island.	Thank you for your comment.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/15/2018	George Larson	glarson1@centurytel.net	Ms. Henderson, Would you prepare a list of San Country Airports that are used by the caravan and which ones meet FAA safety guidelines? Could you also do the same for Alaska airports?	Mr. Larson, I am responding on behalf of Leah Henderson. Thank you for your interest and requests. Please see the attached summary regarding airports in San Juan County. Orcas Island Airport, Friday Harbor Airport, and Lopez Island Airport are the only public-use airports in San Juan County. All three receive federal funding. They also receive state funding, when such is available. Of course, local money is used for grant-matching requirements. Roche Harbor Airport and Blakely Island Airport have paved runways, but both are private and neither receives public funds. There are no other hard-surface (i.e. all-weather) airports in San Juan County. Seaplane bases are not included in the summary, but those have different requirements and operate under Visual Meteorological Conditions (VMC). Only Kenmore Air flies scheduled routes to the islands during Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC), which require them to file flight plans under Instrument Flight Rules (IFR). Orcas Island and Friday Harbor airports are the only ones in San Juan County that have published instrument procedures. The importance of that, of course, is that if someone needs to travel via scheduled air service or take a fixed-wing aircraft to the mainland for emergency medical purposes (e.g. Island Air) during low-visibility conditions, those two airports are the only options. Kenmore Air and FedEx	Dear Mr Strong, Thanks for your detailed review. Can you summarize how much money we have received from the FAA and are we obligated to pay any of it back? What about the Citations that that sometimes land at our airport? Maybe you could secure a list of Alaska airports that have also received funds from the FAA from them? Thank you, George Larson	Mr. Larson, Thanks for your questions. A summary of FAA grants for Orcas Island Airport is attached. The FAA website has a grant lookup tool here: <a href="https://www.faa.gov/airports/aip/grant_histories/lookup/">https://www.faa.gov/airports/aip/grant_histories/lookup/</a> The earliest start date for it is 2005. However, grant histories from 1996 can be found here: <a href="https://www.faa.gov/airports/aip/grant_histories/">https://www.faa.gov/airports/aip/grant_histories/</a> On that web page, getting to Orcas Island is a bit more troublesome. Open either the pdf file or MS Excel file for "AIP Summary (All Grants)", scroll to Washington at the		

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				<p>fly Cessna Caravans into Orcas Island Airport and Friday Harbor Airport for scheduled cargo service. Neither airport currently meets FAA safety requirements for the Caravan. Lopez Island airport would not meet requirements for it either, but air cargo there is handled by San Juan Airlines on their scheduled passenger service flights. San Juan Airlines does not fly Caravans. There are several hundred public-use airports in Alaska, and some of those are the ONLY access to the outside world for the communities they serve. Preparing a summary of them would be exhaustive. Please call Leah Henderson for details on Alaska airports. She has a great deal of experience with them. Please let us know if you have any additional questions Eric S. Strong, P.E. Aviation Project Manager</p>		<p>bottom of list, and find Orcas Island. We're working on a summary of grant funding for Orcas Island from 1996-2017, but we haven't got it put together yet. With one look at the process, you can see why. Grant histories for the State of Alaska (and any other state) can be found for any year from 1996-2017 in the "AIP Summary (By State)" for each year. When an airport sponsor (Port of Orcas for ORS) signs grant assurances, the requirements are typically for a 20-year period. For most grants the sponsor is not obligated to pay</p>		



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
						<p>back any funds after the 20-year period has expired. We understand that Orcas Island gets an occasional Cessna Citation, but that these operations are rare. What specific questions do you have about them? Eric</p>		

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/15/2018	Brett McFarland	bmcfarland@orcas.k12.wa.us	<p>Good Day,I live just off North Beach Road about as close to the airport as possible, and I work in Eastsound. I realize an island needs an airport and I totally appreciate the med flight options available on Orcas. I would be saddened by upsizing our runways and facilities. More planes landing for the wealthy few who can afford them is not in the best interests of the average residents of Orcas. Jets taking off and landing are the most obnoxious of all the plane noise generated by the airport, and it would be a poor decision to increase jet traffic, or plane traffic in general. Orcas is a tourist destination, and we have a ferry system that is a quiet, romantic way to get to an island and it seems to work well for the 99% of us who cannot afford air travel.Please do not expand the airport facilities or runways. I choose Alternative 1: No Build</p>	<p>Mr McFarland Thank you for your comment. The alternatives are only suggesting airfield changes to meet FAA safety standards for the existing traffic by the Cessna caravan, not for larger jets. None of the alternatives are expanding the airport to accomodate larger aircraft. To learn more about the project you can attend the special meeting being held by the Port on the 26th at 3:30. Thank you Leah Henderson</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/15/2018	Robert Hamilton	robert.hamilton@hamaviation.com	Dear Orcas Airport Planners, Thank you for working on this master plan for the Orcas Airport. The airport is a tremendous resource for the community, and must be protected and improved for the benefit of all islanders. I personally use the airport for transportation, to fly on and off the island either in a private plane or Kenmore Air, and it is a great alternative to the ferries. I use the ferries as well, about half the time on each, and each have their benefits. Just like we need to keep our ferry system up-to-date, the airport needs ongoing maintenance and improvements as well. Even more important than for normal transportation, the airport is THE health lifeline for emergency services and major medical issues. Even if someone does not use the airport on a routine basis, I bet if they have a life threatening accident or health issue they will come to appreciate it greatly. In this it is like the fire department; hopefully you never need it, but when you do you better hope that the fire fighting equipment is top notch and in good repair. In this I speak from experience. Last year I had a eye problem while on island and needed to get to a specialist immediately. The fastest the ferry system could get me to a Seattle emergency room was	Mr. Hamilton, Thank you for your comment. We absolutely agree that the medical evacuation services the Airport provides is one of the most important assets on the island. I am happy to hear that you were able to get the care you needed quickly and recovered well. Thank you again for your thoughtful comment. Leah R. Henderson, C.M., ACE				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>in 24 hours. Calling up Kenmore, they held a plane for me for 5 minutes, and I was at the UW emergency room in 90 minutes. Without the airport I could have suffered permanent damage or loss of my eyesight. For these reasons I hope that you upgrade the airport to meet the current and ongoing needs of the island. People don't like change, so I appreciate the time and care you are taking to talk to the community. Improvements may effect the immediate surrounding areas, but from what I have read of those effects, done with creativity, they can be improvements in themselves. We all enjoy Orcas for its beauty and life style. I've seen it change over the past sixty years, and most of that change has been for the good. Let's take advantage of the opportunities we have with the airport, and keep it as a convenient and safe ongoing transportation option for the island.Thank you,Robert</p>					
7/15/2018	Kim Secunda	kimsecunda21@yahoo.com	<p>I have concern about the airport location in general as it is in the tsunami/ liquefaction zone. Bad move as we will need these services in the event of an incident. I am also concerned that the aquifers are not being considered. Am i overlooking this documentation and discussion ?</p> <p>In terms of Social Justice it is unjust to shove all the pollution, risk and degradation in the most densely populated zone the majority of residents who are low income. It is also unwise to put this in such close proximity of services.</p> <p>Storm water should be monitored as should light and noise pollution. This is a flyway for migratory birds.</p> <p>Property values adjacent to airports are traditionally negatively impacted.</p> <p>I live adjacent to the airport and already am resentful of the problems.</p>	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>of the problem.</p> <p>Move to higher ground.            Stay clear of wetlands, aquifers, flyways, critical infrastructure and people. By carrying on as is you are inviting irreparable trouble. CAO and SMP are real and cannot be negotiated. Mitigation is not viable, this is a proven fact. Stop wasting public money on lawsuits.            Best rethink the whole thing and start over. Any investment in the present mistaken location and arrangement is short sighted, likely legally fraught and damaging.            Eastsound needs to wake up and get seriously smarter, fast. 20 years is nothing. Take a longer, wider view ASAP or Eastsound is doomed.</p>					
7/15/2018	Mike Parnell	mparnell@rockisland.com	prefer option #2 with confirmation of property loss/rights.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/15/2018	Kim Secunda	kimsecunda21@yahoo.com	<p>Taking another look at the maps and it is important to stay clear of the Montessori and Kaleidoscope Day care. It is also unnerving to have the Senior Center vulnerable to airport fallout, stay clear it is bad enough as is.</p> <p>The more you look at it the more important it seems to really rethink the whole thing. Move to the Crow Valley ? that watershed has already been sacrificed...</p>	Thank you for your comment.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/15/2018	Bob Davison	bobdavison@peak.org	<p>The written alternatives discussion typically provides a single sentence and 4 to 6 bullet points of pros and cons to accompany the figures for each alternative. This is far too cursory to allow the public, or even a pilot such as me based at KORS, to understand what is proposed in each alternative and how existing airport uses, structures and facilities will be affected. As a minor example, the discussion states the "existing runway pavement will be marked to include displaced thresholds (total runway length after pavement is redesignated is 3,400 feet)." But the existing pavement is 2,900 feet, so it appears 500 feet of pavement will be added because that's the only way redesignation of pavement could bring total runway length to 3,400 feet. The brevity of the alternatives discussion creates an impression of lack of transparency, which I believe is harmful to the successful completion of the Master Plan. More written detail on each alternative should be made available prior to the September meeting. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p>	<p>Mr. Davison, The draft preferred alternative will be published later this evening (no later than 8pm) and will include the presentation for public comment. Just as the alternatives were described at our last public meeting in June with the master plan team, the draft preferred alternative will also be explained and described. You and anyone on Orcas are welcome to call and discuss questions regarding the alternatives with me. Unfortunately, only a few citizens have done so thus far, however they have been very pleased with having the conversation to better understand. I welcome you to call and discuss the project to better understand the purpose and need for many of the projects suggested in the alternatives. I wanted to clarify your question on the runway. The existing pavement at Orcas is 3,388 feet. The pavement is marked so that the runway is designated as 2901ft. Operationally many pilots are using the entire length of the pavement for takeoff and landing. The FAA has stated they would prefer the runway be marked according to how the pavement is being used to create the safest environment. Thank you and we hope to see you at our last public open house on September 19.</p> <p><b>Leah R. Henderson, C.M., ACE</b></p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/15/2018	Joe Symons	joesymons@me.com	<p>Thank you for your prompt attention to my inquiry.I have quickly reviewed the “maps” that appear to be the “plan”. They look like something equivalent to engineering drawings. Is there no text describing the intentions/meaning and benefits/costs of each alternative? Is there any contextualization for these alternatives? Has anyone done any thinking about what each alternative would mean relative to plane traffic in/out of Eastsound? Who would come? How many would come? Impact on the community? Possible pros/cons of these alternatives as they impact not just the airport but the island? Is there any “space” for a public conversation, not just submitted comments? To me, the issue has virtually nothing to do with federal regulations, safety or access to what appears to be free money from the feds. That’s all opioid-laced candy. Once the commissioners are addicted, the rules, as they always do, will continue to change and it may not be the port that calls the shots. If this were a proposal to consider “alternatives” that would discuss the number and location of additions</p>	<p>Mr. Symons,Thank you for your previous inquiry. I have answered your questions below to help clarify some information. Hopefully the additional documents on the website will also help the public understand the master plan process and purpose, which is to meet standards for the existing aircraft.If you have further questions please let me know. Thank you for your prompt attention to my inquiry.I have quickly reviewed the “maps” that appear to be the “plan”. They look like something equivalent to engineering drawings. Is there no text describing the intentions/meaning and benefits/costs of each alternative? Is there any contextualization for these alternatives? We have uploaded several new documents to the website to help the public better understand each alternative for those who were unable to attend the public meeting in June: An evaluation document that briefly describes the impacts, very rough costs and if they meet FAA standards; A description of each alternative including pros and cons; a link to the FAA’s grant assurances</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>to/of ferry docks, you can be sure there would be a whole lot of concerned folks. Taking testimony at public hearings is not the same as a comprehensive conversation. There is a point when a community needs to at least talk about the concept that 'enough is enough'. To introduce wisdom into the planning process. To recognize that continued growth is in some cases literally impossible, or it is extremely expensive, or it benefits only a small subset while dumping external costs on the majority. I'm not a pilot. I don't fly much. I was walking on a back trail in Moran State Park last evening. This 2 hour hike was 99.9% silent. Just me and the woods. A low flying biplane came by; it's sound could be heard for miles and miles. It totally disrupted the peace and tranquility that a hiker would enjoy and, obviously, expect. The pilot and his/her passengers have no concept of what an intrusion the noise makes. As a culture we have come to take this asymmetric impact (passengers go wow! hundreds of people have to stop talking because of the noise) as somehow normal and, worse, acceptable. Unrelated to your project is considerable public concern here in the San Juans of the impact of jet noise from Growlers stationed at the Whidbey Island NAS. Still. it is an</p>	<p>that the Port has agreed to uphold by accepting FAA funding in the past; and the Facility Requirements describing the dimensional criteria required by the FAA. Please let me know if you would like for me to set up a time this week to give you a call and go through each alternative with you. My schedule is fairly open Wed-Fri and I would be happy to speak with you. Has anyone done any thinking about what each alternative would mean relative to plane traffic in/out of Eastsound? Who would come? How many would come? Impact on the community? Possible pros/cons of these alternatives as they impact not just the airport but the island? Is there any "space" for a public conversation, not just submitted comments? The alternatives are all meant to meet FAA criteria for the Cessna 208B Caravan (the most common used aircraft at the Airport). They are not expanded the Airport. Prior to any project moving forward an environmental process will be completed which follows NEPA. This is a requirement and evaluated the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of projects. The public meeting held in June was meant to do this, however turnout was very low. However, the Port has scheduled a meeting for Julv 26th to have this conversation with</p>				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>example of this asymmetry. I would hope there would be a higher standard regarding the impact of various public policies and proposed development than the passive “submit a letter” process. Again, I appreciate your prompt reply and hope you might address some of the issues I raise here. Thanks</p>	<p>the community. We will hold another open house in September to meet with the public and discuss. To me, the issue has virtually nothing to do with federal regulations, safety or access to what appears to be free money from the feds. That’s all opioid-laced candy. Once the commissioners are addicted, the rules, as they always do, will continue to change and it may not be the port that calls the shots. If this were a proposal to consider “alternatives” that would discuss the number and location of additions to/of ferry docks, you can be sure there would be a whole lot of concerned folks. Taking testimony at public hearings is not the same as a comprehensive conversation. I encourage you to read the FAA grant assurances that the Port has signed to better understand the Port’s obligation to protect the Airport and make every attempt to follow FAA design criteria. There is a point when a community needs to at least talk about the concept that ‘enough is enough’. To introduce wisdom into the planning process. To recognize that continued growth is in some cases literally impossible, or it is extremely expensive, or it benefits only a small subset while dumping external costs on the majority. I’m not a pilot. I don’t fly much. I was walking on a back trail in Moran State Park last evening. This 2 hour hike was 99.9% silent. Just me and the woods. A low flying biplane came by; it’s sound could be heard for miles and miles. It totally disrupted the peace and tranquility that a hiker would enjoy and, obviously, expect. The pilot and his/her passengers have no concept of what an intrusion the noise makes. As a culture we have come to take this asymmetric impact (passengers go wow! hundreds of people have to stop talking because of the noise) as somehow normal and, worse, acceptable. Unrelated to your project is considerable public concern here in the San Juans of the impact of jet noise from Growlers stationed at the Whidbey Island NAS. Still, it is an example of this asymmetry. I would hope there would be a higher standard regarding the impact of various public policies and proposed development than the passive</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
#####	robin erly	robinwa@hotmail.com	I vote for Alternate 1, NO BUILD. I STRONGLY oppose expansion of Eastsound Airport .	Thank you for your comment.				
7/16/2018	Kim L Middleton	kim@kimmiddleton.com	I choose alternative one: no build	Thank you for your comment.				
7/17/2018	Tricia Erly	rte1955@hotmail.com	I vote for Alternative 1, NO-BUILD. I am decidedly against expanding the Eastsound airport.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/17/2018	Greg Oaksen	gregoaksen@gmail.com	Hi Leah, Can you explain why the master plan images have been removed from the Port of Orcas website? Thanks, Greg Oaksen, Eastsound	Greg, I just checked from my phone and I see everything still listed. See attachment. Let me know if you're still having issues. Thank you, Leah Henderson				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/17/2018	Bea VonTobel	bvt99@rockisland.com	<p>July 17, 2018 <b>First, a little history</b> Since the first FAA grant was authorized in 1975, total federal dollars invested in the Orcas Island Airport have totaled \$8,836,631.00. Between 2007 and 2017, WSDOT/Transportation funding has totaled \$253,309.00. Total investments: \$9,089,940.00. Current port-leased hangars total 37 plus two commercially-leased hangars and one additional land lease (FedEx). Tiedown spaces include 30 grass tiedown spaces and 23 tarmac spaces. And now, some past and future predictions Historic and forecast data for ORS show extremely modest upward trends. Looking at historical tiedown numbers, a large number of annual tarmac rentals decreased when 14 new hangars were constructed soon after 2000, and those tarmac tiedown numbers appear not to have increased, especially after the economic downturn in 2008. General transient visits to the airport have increased in the last 2-3 years. Income from those visits should be available in monthly financial statements and would indicate current trends. Enplanement data is based on data submitted by commercial operators serving ORS. Over the last 20 years, both enplanements and commercial operations have reported slight decreases. Current FAA 20-year forecast estimates show 3.1% increase in enplanements, and .87% increase in commercial</p>	<p>Hi Bea, Thank you for your comment, we hope to see you at the next public meeting on September 19th. Have a great day, Meg</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>operations. IFR activity to ORS has increased as the result of the completion of GPS approaches to both RW16 and 34. There is no easy way to discern whether that activity is due to commercial, transient or based-aircraft activity. With the FAA estimate for a 3.32% increase in based aircraft when compared to a 2.48% increase in population over 20 years, conclusions might be drawn re future residents. Observations and opinions1---it would be great to extend the east boundary of the airport north from the present corner of the rotating beacon to Mike Parnell's property boundary. Land purchase would be needed to accomplish this. 2---It would also be great to purchase land on the west side of the airport to allow the south stub of taxiway A2 to be extended to and connected with the south end of Aviator Dr, and thus to taxiway B1. This would provide aircraft access to the port's westside property and eliminate back-taxiing on the runway. Neither of these items would satisfy the FAA runway-parallel taxiway separation requirements, but that would be another item to discuss and perhaps modify. It would, however,</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>provide the port with land to develop which could provide an additional income stream for future growth. 3---The terminal is in need of an update. Its current location is wonderful, as arrivals can deplane, walk through two doors and have immediate access to ground transportation. Its location is what makes arriving at ORS such an informal and pleasantly unusual experience. It would be great to replicate that experience in a more modern and Orcas-like facility. 4-- -Much has been said about the mention of a CBP facility. We talked about it as far back as 2009. Having a seasonal facility, shared with Brandt's Landing, made sense when we were discussing it. Both pilots and boaters would have a way to come here without having to land/dock first in Bellingham or Friday Harbor. During those discussions, a price upwards of \$100,000 was the starting point for construction of a facility, with personnel costs additional. The operative word here is seasonal. 5--There has been mention of additional vehicle parking. The port owns developable land, and if 'event' parking is needed, options are available to allow that to be a private-public partnership venture. Well, that's the view from where I sit. I tend to like Alternative 1 with the modifications noted above.</p>					

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/20/2018	Stephen Stephen	selovell@icloud.com	I do not feel the "No Build" alternative is viable since action needs to be taken to ensure compliance with FAA requirements. For the same reason, Alternative 2 does not meet runway-taxiway separation. I would favor Alternatives 3 or 4, particularly since they include displaced thresholds. It would be nice to minimize impact to the marina (Alternative 4) but I do not have a strong opinion on this issue. I would support SE Development Alternative 2 with access to the terminal off Mt Baker Road. For the Runway 34 alternatives, I do not have a strong preference.	Thank you for your comment.				
7/22/2018	Robert Meador	bob@blackkitty.net	I choose alternative one: no build - until this plan can be presented and reviewed in a manner that clearly outlines the impacts and truthfully presents the pros and cons of each aspect. The "maps" that appear to be the "plan" look like engineering drawings. There is no text describing the intentions/meaning and benefits/costs of each alternative; There is no description of the impact of each alternative on the community; If this were a proposal to consider alternatives that would discuss the number and location of additional ferry docks, there would be a demand for greater information and Transparency. Airport expansion plans should receive this same level of attention. Our community needs to at least talk about the concept that 'enough is enough'. We need to have a process that introduces wisdom into the planning process; recognizes that continued growth is in some cases literally impossible, or it is extremely expensive, or it benefits only a small subset while transferring external costs on the majority.	Mr Meador, There is a description document, as well as the facility requirements table and an evaluation chart to review along with the maps. If you have specific questions about the purpose of the alternatives or specific questions I would be happy to review them with you by phone. The port is also holding a meeting to do so Thursday at 3:30. Thank you for your comments. Leah Henderson	Ah right you are. On further reading I believe that some level of improvement is necessary. The communication from Plan Ahead San Juans suggested that your info was not as well presented as it is. Bob Meador	Thank you Mr. Meadors. I am glad the additional documents were helpful. Please help spread that information as you are able. And again I am happy to speak by phone with anyone to discuss the FAA's requirements and to explain that the plan only accommodates the existing traffic at the airport.		

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/23/2018	Tracey Smith	traceylaurensmith@yahoo.com	<p>Port Commissioners, I have not attended the prior public hearings on the airport master plan, but I will be attending this Thursday. Below are the questions and issues I have regarding the current proposals. In the discussion, it has been stated that ORS does not currently met FAA standards. What are the implications of not meeting the standards, from an operational perspective, a safety perspective and a financial perspective? 2017 Total Operations are listed at 8,556. Can you provide data/ histogram that shows by hour the number of planes actively using ORS? Obviously, this will vary by month, with more activity mid-June to mid-Sept. My anecdotal data are that, with the exception of the Fly-In, there are few times when there is more than one plane on the runway/taxiway. Presumably the runway/taxiway separation is more important when two or more planes are using them simultaneously. Actual data would be insightful. Alternative 2 proposes a design that does not meet the standard and requires a</p>	<p>Tracey,It is not technically a "hearing" but rather a special meeting, where, in addition to trying to present information to clarify the process and alternatives evaluation, we will take public comment. Your questions below will become a part of that public comment by virtue of you emailing them, and I will try to answer them here, as well as address them in my presentation, since they may be "FAQs".In the discussion, it has been stated that ORS does not currently met FAA standards. What are the implications of not meeting the standards, from an operational perspective, a safety perspective and a financial perspective? From an operational and safety perspective, the FAA standards are derived from historical accident and operational data, as well as engineering analysis of risk, both probability and severity of outcomes. So, FAA standards are established to achieve a discretely definable level of safety. If we make no efforts to achieve or get closer to the FAA standards, then the FAA is likely to</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>Modification of Standard (MoS). Why not apply for a MoS for the current ORS configuration. Alternatives 3 and 4 proposes to lengthen the runway by 500'. This has the subsequent impact of having to re-route Mt Baker Rd. Per the B-II classification, this does not appear to be required. Why is it being proposed? Given the FAA forecasted growth of 1.3% in total operations over 20 year and the current under-utilization of existing infrastructure, the proposed westside and south-east development plans do not seem to be justified. Again, why are they being proposed? It is paramount for Brandt's Landing marina operations to continue unencumbered. The Ditch is one of the few place on Orcas where folks can launch their boats. It needs to remain in operation. I have to imagine there is a way to make that happen in the master plan. Lastly, the commission needs to do a better job in reaching out to and engaging with the community. At a minimum, all property owners within 500' of the current airport property line and the proposed new property lines should have been contacted directly by the port commission. This did not happen. The meeting Thursday is a step in the right direct. I hope this will continue. I look forward to the meeting on Thursday.</p>	<p>determine we are not interested in "Improving" our airport and could terminate our "Airport Improvement Program" funding. That would not be an immediate problem but in the long term it would mean the Port of Orcas would have no support in sustaining the substantial infrastructure required to even maintain the airport as is. As one example, our runway will probably need to be completely rebuilt in the next 5-20 years at a cost of 10s of millions of dollars, perhaps \$20M. With FAA and Washington State funding, such a project only requires about \$500,000 in local funding. Without grant funding, we carry the whole cost and simply would not be able to do it. 2017 Total Operations are listed at 8,556. Can you provide data/histogram that shows by hour the number of planes actively using ORS? Obviously, this will vary by month, with more activity mid-June to mid-Sept. My anecdotal data are that, with the exception of the Fly-In, there are few times when there is more than one plane on the runway/taxiway. Presumably the runway/taxiway separation is more important when two or more planes are using them simultaneously. Actual data would be insightful. I cannot show it hour by hour. Because we don't have a tower and have significant resource constraints, we don't have the ability to track this. I don't think your impression of Caravan activitv is accurate. I flv a Caravan for Island</p>				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				<p>Air Ambulance doing medical evacuations and I have been here at Orcas picking up a patient when the FedEx plane lands right after me and the Kenmore plane is already parked at the terminal. Alternative 2 proposes a design that does not meet the standard and requires a Modification of Standard (MoS). Why not apply for a MoS for the current ORS configuration? See my answer to your first question. There are 2 offices involved. One is the Flight Standards District Office and oversees Modifications to Standards. The other is the Airport District Office which oversees the AIP program and design standards. I've discussed this with the FAA. We already are under 100' separation between B-II aircraft. The only way they would give us a modification is if we restricted use of the taxiway and runway (i.e. don't allow simultaneous use) which is operationally not viable. So the Mod would not really be a Mod, but rather a restriction to meet the standard by unacceptably restrictive means. --- If we move the taxiway slightly (literally perhaps only 6'), it's possible</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				<p>they would give us a Mod to accommodate the Caravan (and same or smaller aircraft) but it's only good for 5 years and there is no guarantee of renewal. So there is financial risk to the Port to undertake this strategy. We could pay a couple million dollars to move the taxiway 6' and have the FAA come back in 5 years and not renew the Mod, effectively forcing us to re-do the project with the associated cost (or risk losing AIP funding at that time). This is precisely what happened in Friday Harbor under slightly different conditions - they already own all the land they need to move to full separation. So, I think the commissioners and I are leaning toward a minimal move of the taxiway to get 100' between wingtips of a Caravan with the perception that we are in a pretty strong position to renew that Mod indefinitely going forward. Alternatives 3 and 4 proposes to lengthen the runway by 500'. This has the subsequent impact of having to re-route Mt Baker Rd. Per the B-II classification, this does not appear to be required. Why is it being proposed? First of all, the location of Mt Baker road is already not compliant with standards for the current runway and design group. It is a pretty significant safety risk to have it where it is, and I know of one first hand report of airplane's wheel creasing the roof of a truck on the road. -- Please look at the drawings or Google Earth more closely. With our blast pads, our</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>

**Comment**

**Response**

Google earth more closely. With our blast-pads, our overall pavement length is about 3,388' and Alternative 3 actually shortens the overall pavement length. Alternative 4 gets to a similar to current 3,400' but also requires realignment of the runway with property implications. It's an alternative, but one that I see no chance of us adopting as our "Preferred Alternative." -- Although not approved, we have regular users that use the full pavement length to takeoff. The design standards for runways only allow for 125' of blast pad and so the FAA would not fund sustainment or replacement of our current blast pads and in fact, because of elevation concerns might demand we remove what we have. -- It is likely that we will adopt aspects of Alternative 3 that will result in an overall reduction in pavement length. Given the FAA forecasted growth of 1.3% in total operations over 20 year and the current under-utilization of existing infrastructure, the proposed westside and south-east development plans do not seem to be justified. Again, why are they being proposed? We are not proposing development. These plans are only laying out what that would look like if a prospective tenant comes to

**Response 2**

**Response 3**

**Response 4**

**Medium**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>that would look like if a prospective tenant comes to us wanting to build a hangar or hangars. The FAA does not fund hangar construction, we don't have the money for it and we know there is not the current demand. In reality, that development, if it ever happens, is probably 20-40 years away. This Master Plan will be updated every 10 years or so and this plan will be one piece that informs future planning. So, please don't misinterpret high-level concepts with construction drawings. That's not what these are. It is paramount for Brandt's Landing marina operations to continue unencumbered. The Ditch is one of the few place on Orcas where folks can launch their boats. It needs to remain in operation. I have to imagine there is a way to make that happen in the master plan. I don't think we disagree...but to be clear, it's not a public facility and it doesn't provide a public boat launch, which is, arguably, needed. I think we lean towards minimal movement of the taxiway that won't impact Brandt's operation at all and possibly a boundary adjustment with them, if they are interested, to permit construction of a run-up area (without impacting the marina). Lastly, the commission needs to do a better job in reaching out to and engaging with the community. At a minimum, all property owners within 500' of the current airport property line and the proposed new property lines</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				<p>should have been contacted directly by the port commission. This did not happen. The meeting Thursday is a step in the right direct. I hope this will continue. I'm deeply disappointed by this comment. We always have, are and will continue to invite involvement. We invited involvement of every person on this island through direct mail. We have invited digital engagement that is readily available and was publicized in the mass mailing and multiple times in the newspaper. We've held multiple public meetings for the public involvement process that go unattended. – The 500' cordon you advocate for is similar to the legal requirement for permitting. We aren't permitting anything here. This is long-range, strategic planning for a public facility and we've worked hard to get people involved. None of these plans move forward from this project without a rigorous environmental assessment on the federal and state level, federal, state and county permitting with all the required notifications and permitting and in all likelihood most of these alternatives are discarded in the final published master plan that is published and approved by the FAA. I'm glad you're coming to the meeting on Thursday. It will be nice to meet you since I don't think I've met you yet. You could call me and come talk to me directly and I could explain these things faster and more clearly in person with visual aids. My cell phone is 360-317-6579 and my home phone is 7800. I'm at the airport all day today. Tony</p>				



Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/23/2018	Tuck Wilson	jssmiley@comcast.net	<p>Gentlemen:I am delighted to have an opportunity to comment on the status of the airport master planning. I have visited Orcas Island continuously for 40 years from Portland via 1948 Stinson, currently own Hangar 15 and am a member of the Orcas Hangar Association.I commend the board for undertaking the challenging community engagement process. It is no easy task to discern the appropriate balance between safety improvements and the views of Orcas citizens, who have with varied interactions with the airport's services and impacts.First a few questions, recognizing that many have already been submitted. 1. As reflected in the Port's current budget, what are the major funding sources and amounts? Likewise, the major expenditure purposes and amounts? 2.Aircraft movement clearance issues (between runway and taxiway) are suggested as a driver for physical changes in airport facilities. In particular, it is suggested that the presence of Cessna Caravans, with their 52-foot wingspans, trigger upgrade of the airport to category B-II. I understand FAA wants B-II airports to create enough separation between runway and taxiway to accommodate wingspans of 49 to 79 feet. As the wingspans of Caravans are so close to the shorter end of the range, should the Port seek a waiver until and unless larger ("wider") aircraft begin to appear? (If ever they do, given the constraints against lengthening the runway. Are there instances of existing waivers under similar circumstances in Alaska, B.C., etc., that might used as resources? 3. Have the potential impacts of the various options been discussed with affected property owners? What have been their responses and concerns? 4. All but the No-build option involve the realignment of Mt. Baker Road. Is there an estimated construction cost? Have the natural resource issues been quantified? What public agency would be responsible for accomplishing and funding the realignment? 5. Please clarify the impacts of Alternative 1 (No-build) on the visitor camping area,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment last month. I apologize for the late response. I have answered them below next to your questions. I hope this helps to clarify some of your concerns. Thank you, Leah Henderson As reflected in the Port's current budget, what are the major funding sources and amounts? Likewise, the major expenditure purposes and amounts? This would need to be answered by the Port. The master plan will examine the financial feasibility in the next step after our preferred alternative is developed. Aircraft movement clearance issues (between runway and taxiway) are suggested as a driver for physical changes in airport facilities. In particular, it is suggested that the presence of Cessna Caravans, with their 52-foot wingspans, trigger upgrade of the airport to category B-II. I understand FAA wants B-II airports to create enough separation between runway and taxiway to accommodate wingspans of 49 to 79 feet. As the wingspans of Caravans are so close to the shorter end of the range, should the Port seek a waiver until and unless larger ("wider") aircraft begin to appear? (If ever they do, given the constraints against lengthening the runway. Are there instances of existing waivers under similar circumstances in Alaska, B.C., etc., that might used as resources? The FAA does issue modifications to standards and they are reviewed at least every 5 years. They are completely at the FAA's discretion. Modifications to standard are being considered. Have the potential impacts of the various options been discussed with affected property owners? What have been their responses and concerns? We are working with several nearby property owners. The Port does not have any intention of imminent domain and instead will purchase properties, as needed and as they come up for sale. Some property owners are willing to sell their property now. All but the No-build option involve the realignment of Mt. Baker Road. Is there an estimated construction cost? Have the natural resource issues</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>Aeronautical Services and the FedEx facility, and the biplane hangar made famous by Rod Magner’s Magic One and now operated by Stu/Cap’n Mac? 6.What are the geographic boundaries of the Port commission districts? Are any of the positions on the ballot in 2018? As a pilot devoted to Orcas Island and the airport for many years, I hope the Orcas Airport will continue its service to Orcas, its citizens, businesses and visitors. Below are some of the special contributions offered by our airport. 1.The annual fly-in is convening August 3 for at least its 35th run and will welcome over 100 planes and families from throughout the Northwest and B.C., an event embraced by pilots and islanders alike. 2. For years the Port has welcomed its flying visitors with the tie down/camping and bathroom facilities—and now is adding a welcome new bath/laundry facility. Visitors and islanders enjoy so much the path to town that links the airport with island businesses and essential services. 3. The Orcas airport experience stands in sharp contrast to others that at one time were animated but are now sterile and separated from the community they abut—prime example being Friday Harbor’s airport. Please, not here! 4. The Orcas airport is now surrounded with fencing, but not to keep citizens out—only the deer. 5. As a former long-time airport manager said recently, the Orcas terminal is appreciated by travelers for its informality and immediate access to ground transportation but is deserving of an upgrade. While I am always open and listening for new information and rationale for more consequential change, I personally favor Alternative 1. Its adoption would signal to the FAA that an extensive and thoughtful dialogue with the community about all of the FAA’s relevant concerns had been conducted. Having had many professional experiences serving</p>	<p>been quantified? What public agency would be responsible for accomplishing and funding the realignment? The environmental concerns will be addressed in a future environmental document. We do not have a construction cost, but will create a planning level estimate if the roadway is in the preferred alternative. The FAA would be responsible for working with the Port and funding the project. Please clarify the impacts of Alternative 1 (No-build) on the visitor camping area, Aeronautical Services and the FedEx facility, and the biplane hangar made famous by Rod Magner’s Magic One and now operated by Stu/Cap’n Mac? No build is not really an option for most of the deficiencies at the airport. The cargo facility is already being looked at for a larger facility elsewhere on the airport and the hangar is in the object free area and will likely need to be relocated or reconstructed elsewhere. The airport understands all of these facilities are very important and will ensure they all are included in the preferred alternative.What are the geographic boundaries of the Port commission districts? Are any of the positions on the ballot in 2018? This would be a Port question and I suggest you reach out to the Airport Manager at <a href="mailto:orcasairport@rockisland.com">orcasairport@rockisland.com</a>.</p>				



Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/25/2018	Paul Hamilton	2paul.hamilton@gmail.com	<p>As a long-time local property owner, user of the marina and airport, I have multiple thoughts on the airport upgrades. As a professional engineer, civil and environmental engineer and former project manager, I can provide also thoughts on the proposed project. Key stated objectives are upgrade of the airport for safety reasons and to minimize community impact. I would add the key elements of cost effectiveness, no downsizing of the facilities and related services, no negative impact on property values. I take a pragmatic approach and would propose that the minimum amount of airport upgrades be done while still meeting the objectives. I would thus use the minimum distance between the runway and taxiway. I would further fill in the southwest corner of the marina to allow the taxiway and run-up area relocation to the east of their current location. I would then remove the trees in the lot at the southeast corner marina and</p>	<p>Paul, My engineering discipline background is different (Aeronautical), but I think, as engineers, we share a similar philosophical outlook derived from data and analysis as it interfaces with regulation and bureaucracy. I just today asked our consultant to develop a likely, preferred alternative with the following characteristics (Sadly, it won't be available for tomorrow's meeting). Taxiway at 156' with a run-up area on the North end Runway width at 75' The shorter option of Displaced Threshold Paul, My engineering discipline background is different (Aeronautical), but I think, as engineers, we share a similar philosophical outlook derived from data and analysis as it interfaces with regulation and bureaucracy. I just today asked our consultant to develop a likely, preferred alternative with the following characteristics (Sadly, it won't be available for tomorrow's meeting). Taxiway at 156' with a run-up area on the North end Runway</p>	<p>Bob, Cheryl, Pleased to meet you. I understand that you have long-range plans for the marina. Are those something that we could take a look at to see how we could coordinate them with the airport work? Thanks, Eric</p>			

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>south of Smuggler's Resort townhomes and expand the marina basin eastward and install new docks, and adjacent parking. This approach will allow for continued use of the marina by the State Parks, commercial sightseeing and fishing party boats, and private boat owners. It will also reduce the impact of the commercial viability and property value loss by Brandt's Landing Marina. The obvious approach in the past to improve the Marina's viability was to expand docks into it's northwest trailer parking area. This would be precluded by the taxiway relocation. A few other notes. I would keep both the existing west and east marina docks. I think it would be appropriate for the project to pay for all construction, including the new southeast boat basin and parking. If Brandt's Landing owners, I would use the proceeds from the sale of the western property to expand the new basin a bit larger than the southwest basin to be filled and even have a long-range master plan to add several condos to the east of the new basin. I think this approach and design will still allow for a buffer between the construction and North Beach Rd. Recognizing the challenges of securing environmental permits, I feel it should incumbent upon the Port and the project vs. Brandt's landing owners, to secure all permits required for the new southeast basin and parking construction and make the airport upgrade project advancement contingent upon the granting of these permits.</p>	<p>width at 75' The shorter option of Displaced Threshold 'Grey' out most of the hangar development on the SE and West Parcel (except for 2 hangars flanking terminal, the de-ice facility and the parcel facility on the west) and 'Gray' out any taxiways on the west parcel that aren't needed to reach the parcel facility (I want it to be clear that any initial work will not be a full buildout) The shortest option of moving Mt Baker Rd. Please show a gain of grass tiedown areas that moving the helipad will create. Show the Helipad as in Figure 5. Acquisition and removal Nina Ln In essence, the least invasive combination of alternatives that is likely to be acceptable to the FAA for a long period of time with little risk of "re-visit" and those things easily accomplished or with the most affordable, yet substantial impact to safety and utility to the community. I greatly appreciate the tenor of your comments as compared to the majority I have received. Tony</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/25/2018	Janet Alderton	janetmalderton@gmail.com	<p>Dear Airport Planner, I am very concerned about the option that creates a new road across the wetlands south of Mount Baker Road. I am also concerned about line-of-sight issues for emergency vehicles exiting the firehouse for all of the options that close the current Mount Baker Road segment south of the airport. Thank you for holding the meeting on July 26th at 3 PM at the Firehall. Respectfully yours,</p>	<p>Ms. Alderton, Thank you for your comment. The wetlands are a concern for us as well and the true impacts to the wetlands will need to be determined. We were trying to keep any modifications to the existing facilities/roadways within the footprint of the Airport, or as best as possible. The Port will need to go through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process prior to designing or constructing any improvements, which will likely be an environmental impact statement (the highest environmental document). The environmental process will determine if the roadway could be moved and if wetland impacts can be mitigated. The NEPA process also has a very thorough public process as well. I also agree that the proximity of the fire station is a concern and can be addressed during the design process. Please let me know if you have any further question, Thank you, LeahHenderson</p>				
7/25/2018	Carmela Alexander, Secretary Waldron Community Meeting	wcmsecretary@gmail.com	<p>The Waldron Community Meeting, gathered in its regular monthly meeting in July 2018, voted strongly to support Option #1, No Expansion of the Orcas airport. The vote was 19 in favor, one opposed, two abstentions.</p> <p>The noise pollution of ever-larger aircraft and increasingly frequent flights would directly impact the peace and quiet on Waldron Island.</p> <p>The Waldron community strongly urges the Port Commissioners to reject the proposals that would harm wetlands, possibly disrupt a useful marina, and create more air traffic with its attendant noise pollution. Please be considerate of your neighbors in making your determination.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/25/2018	Susan Kavanaugh	skavanaugh@fortashford.com	I'd like to see all airport operations related activities on the East side of the runway which is already fully commercial area. This would include the proposed de-icing, cargo hangar, etc. The West side is already residential, even within the airport fence. West side development will increase traffic on SeaView lane which is also residential with kids riding bikes on streets, playing in the street-adjacent yards, etc. Adding the aircraft operations noise over in that area will also greatly impact the surrounding residential area both inside and outside the airport fence. Please don't do this! Keep the commercial operations on the East side!	Thank you for your comment.				
#####	Beverly Franklet	Write in Comment	Tony, Listening to pilots talking, I hear "leave it like it is." I would make only one possible change to that and it involves the taxiway.	Write in Comment				
7/26/2018	Jeannie Chamberlain	jeanniechamberlain@gmail.com	Dear Leah, I am writing to say that I completely oppose any expansion of the airport. I am deeply curious how the talk of airport expansion came about. Is there a person/s that are in favor and are pushing this agenda? Are they islanders? I find that I feel in the "dark" in relation to how this started, the lack of transparency and who has the authority to move this forward. I am hoping you will be answering questions today. There are so many more questions from all of us. These are only a couple of mine but I want to stand next to my neighbors in objection of this proposed plan. Sincerely, Jeannie Chamberlain	Ms. Chamberlain, I apologize for not responding sooner. The FAA requires airports to update airport master plans every 5 to 10 years. This specific master plan project was started because the FAA was aware of the significant use by the Cessna Caravan 208B at ORS. ORS is not built to accommodate such an aircraft safely. The FAA requested the master plan be conducted to examine current and forecasted operations and passengers and look at meeting FAA design standards to accommodate the 208B. The next public meeting is September 19 <sup>th</sup> and I would be happy to discuss the project further with you at that meeting. Leah				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/26/2018	Steven Davis	smd_1960@yahoo.com	<p>I have been a resident of Orcas Island for over twenty years.</p> <p>I have a business designing flying toys at my home on Mt Woolard. Also I am an aviation enthusiast and own a hangar and several experimental aircraft based at Orcas airport. I am at the airport most days flying and working on my airplanes.</p> <p>The part I enjoy most about Orcas Island is the community nature and the number of pilots that fly in, especially in the summer, and camp out on the field. I get a lot of inspiration talking to other pilots and builders of experimental aircraft that frequent Orcas Airport.</p> <p>Also the number of pilots flying in during the summer is a boost to the local economy, i.e. restaurants, hotels, etc. I think this is one of the main ways that the airport benefits the wider community.</p> <p>I understand the need to keep airports well maintained. I think the work that has been done over the last few years has greatly benefitted the airport. But I don't think the proposed alternatives 2 through 4 are at all necessary.</p> <p>Therefor I can only agree with No. 1.(no build) All the others encroach on the camping area and or the community nature of the airport.</p> <p>I would hate to see so much money spent and so much disruption at the airport, which I would think would last for a year or more, for a purpose that is not clear to me and that would only marginally increase the utility of the airport.</p> <p>Steven Davis</p>	Thank you for your comment.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/26/2018	Clark Cundy	cjj2orcas@gmail.com	<p>In reviewing the documentation the B-1 designation using VFR for KORS in the 2008 20 year plan, I could locate the Mt. Baker Road RPZ encroachment on the old plan. Nowhere on that document does it list that as a safety hazard? It's listed as a conflict.. Is there somewhere in the documentation that lists the conflict as a Safety Hazard for either B-I or B-II airport designation as far as the FAA is concerned? I mean I get that there is potential safety conflict between a large vehicle and an airplane approaching. But what I'm having trouble figuring out is when did it become a safety issue? The conflict has been there for years. In 2008 the Port evidently even got an 'avigation easement' for both ends of the the Runway for land use restrictions. So in that process there had to be some discussion on the Safety conflict. Why wasn't a road rerouting voiced then? Was it when the ILS was put in?... That was the main improvement on the 2008 plan. Did that system have the planes landing closer to the south threshold on a more consistent basis than under VFR rules making an accidental low approach more possible? What changed? So aside from the providers buying new planes with wider wingspans and potential B-II aircraft. Are there any other real reasons to totally redo the terminal, hangers etc?Thank you for your time! Best, Clark Cundy</p>	<p>Keep Eastsound Airport a Rural Airport.I attended the Port meeting at the Firehouse on July 26th and came away needing to read more about the project. I also attended the meeting at the Oddfellows Hall Wednesday August 1st. I grew up on Orcas back in the 60's- most of the 70's and the airport back then is pretty much like it is now. It reflects our rural character. The rural character of Orcas Island with its great community involvement is one of the reasons we moved back here a few years ago. I own a Private Pilot's license but am just not current with the FAA. I also worked for Galvin Flying Service on Boeing field for a few years back in the late 70's. I like small aircraft and all the fun and utility they can provide. We believe that the Eastsound Airport should reflect the rural community atmosphere for which it serves. We also think that the community should have the largest voice in the decision making of the new 20 year airport plan. I've read the 2008 20 year plan, and all the 2018 alternatives offered by the FAA Consultants and have come to a few conclusions about keeping Eastsound Airport a short runway Rural B-II Airport.1. Mt. Baker Road in its current location is the single best insurance policy in keeping the Airport small. No matter the alternative offered it is a conflict. It's been a conflict for a long time so what's changed to cause more of a problem now? The only major flying change in the 2008 plan was changing the airport capabilities and going from a Visual Flight Rule airport to an Instrument Landing System (ILS) airport, the rest was about hangers, tie downs and terminals buildings, the ILS has been not been completed but approach procedures using gps technology has. Maybe that puts the planes on approach closer to the numbers making the risk of an accident with a vehicle larger than under Visual Flight Rules at the South end of the runway. So, if that's the case, this is where an 'improvement' caused a need to change the airport FAA designation and configuration requirements. If Mt. Baker road is moved it will still be in the takeoff and approach lane and there would still be the risk of a low flying aircraft hitting a vehicle. When you really</p>	<p>Mr Cundy,Thank you for your comment. I would like to correct one area in the document and I would recommend a change before anything is published as it could cause confusion. The airport does not have an ILS. They do however have approach procedures using gps technology. An ILS requires ground based equipment. Hopefully this makes sense. Thank you Leah</p>			

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				<p>think about it all the people who live down Lovers Lane on the East side of the road are in an Airport Approach or takeoff lane. Those folks have accepted some risk in their daily lives associated with the airport. The instrument landing system enables more flying days into the airport because of bad weather that would prevent a Visual Flight Rule pilot from landing there. But you could argue that an GPS system for bad weather approach ups the risk of something going wrong on approach or takeoff too? Bigger planes approaching or taking off in bad weather. So with that in mind keeping the planes smaller into the airport I think has a net effect of lowering the risk in terms of crashes and risk with regard to how much damage a crash could cause. Bigger planes bigger crashes. Bigger planes will probably have a tendency to fly in poorer weather and are generally commercial flyers. The daily flying providers like Kenmore and FedEx that service Orcas have upgraded their equipment to Cessna Caravan 208's. A great workhorse of an aircraft. This change in large part is probably what's pushing the port to a new Airport designation and configuration. Their wingspan is two feet wider than a B-I airport allows according to the FAA. Two feet. Hardly a great reason to reconfigure the entire airport. B-II airports allow for larger aircraft at the expense of more area needed to use them. Runways are wider, Taxiways are wider, and the separation between the two is wider to allow for egress of two larger wider planes to go by one another, how close buildings and tiedowns etc can be... But there is no requirement on Runway Length. Eastsound Airport runway length is 2901 feet. Cessna 208's can take off in 2,055 ft and land in 1,625 ft according to the spec sheet from Textron. So our providers will be able to get in and out with either a B-I or B-II FAA designation. Runway length is the single limitation keeping many larger aircraft from using Eastsound Airport. The flying providers are currently using the place in a B-I designation and that designation hasn't inhibited them from servicing the</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				<p>community despite the wingspan being 2 feet too wide so it's not about their insurance. That brings up a question for me that if our providers are being allowed to come in and out by the port are we SJC taxpayers at risk of not being insured for that? My guess is no, if it's yes there's a real liability issue going on here. So, what's this all about? I guess it boils down to the FAA and their specs for airports and users of them, and a Port vision for the airport. There also needs to be a community vision of Eastsound Airport as a whole. So what kind of airport does the community of Orcas need and want In my humble opinion here's what I'd like to see. 1. Current level of service capabilities remain intact. 2. Mt. Baker Road stays where it is.A. Runway pavement shortened to get Mt. Baker Road out of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ). This doesn't shorten the runway from it's current length of 2901. Pavement removal will take off of the Blast zone or a part of it. Leave what you can just get Mt. Baker Road out of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ)... No runway additions could happen south past Mt. Baker road, just north and that has it's own set of land issues. 3. Relocate main Taxiway to West of the Runway from Parallel taxiway/taxilane centerline 150' to 240' to meet FAA spec. A. Keep existing taxiway to existing Terminal, Hangers, and Tiedowns. 1. Allow for MOS exception to FAA Standard.4. Widen main Runway west and maintain ancillary FAA zones to meet FAA Spec...A. Runway Width from 60' to 75' west. B. Runway Shoulder Width stays the same 10'. C. Runway Safety Area Width from 120' to 150'. D. Runway Safety Area Length Beyond RW End from 240' to 300'. E. If any of the zones don't fit, mod to existing + whatever there's room for and ask for Modification to Standard (MOS) spec. 5. Terminal location stays the same..A. Commercial and General Aviation unload and loading area. B. Parking lot Stays the same for Passenger Access. C. Money to upgrade appearance etc but keep the flavor of the building intact and retro. D. Biplane hanger stay intact, upgrade appearance et, but keep the flavor of the building intact and retro. 6. New Cargo Hanger Well West of the Main runway,</p>				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				<p>proximal to taxiway exits for FedEx, UPS et al... A. This is to allow for upgrade to new cargo facility to allow for better working conditions for People staging incoming and outgoing cargo.B. Relocation of the Cargo Hanger also separates those aircraft from passenger aircraft on the opposite side of the field. Less chance of wingtip collision. New hanger area meets FAA separation spec, and the Existing Terminal, BiPlane, area is under the MOS exception.C. New Roadway to egress to cargo hanger. 7. Old Dog Park, Pea Patch SE corner of Airport stays open space and should be designated to the Community into perpetuity. A. No new Hangers in this area. Hangers no matter how they are built are ugly metal buildings.B. New hangers could be constructed on the West side of runway in the Cargo Hanger area. All that would meet FAA separation spec. C. This would help maintain property values along North Beach Road, Mt. Baker Road. D. Current Hangers, business, etc can remain in the existing eastern area. They would be listed under the Eastside of Airport MOS. 8. Aircraft noise abatement. A. Any and all methods of noise abatement technology to quiet the place down for surrounding neighborhoods. B. Commercial Carriers would use new controlled Air Routes or Vector Hwy's and fly the channels versus flying over terrestrial island areas. This would keep the noise out over the water, hopefully in the middle of the channels, then separated by altitude for coming and going flights. Again, this would be controlled airspace. Probably by Whidbey. No control tower at Eastsound would be necessary as the pilot would activate their instrument flight plan and contact Whidbey control and they can take them from there once airborne. C. General Aviation flyers would have no change or restriction that isn't already in place.9. Fuel Depot A. Keep existing 100 octane available to local general aviation flyers using the airport. B. No new JetA fuel tanks. Providing JetA would only enhance the airports availability to expanding into the bigger aircraft. The commercial carriers currently using the airport would probably not use the utility since it would cost more per gallon. Local JetA users wouldn't use enough for a</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
				<p>cost versus benefit advantage to install the service and there wouldn't be much if any return on investment. These are a few ideas of mine, I'm sure there are any number of reasons why they won't work but at least the ideas are from an Islander concerned about keeping the flavor or Eastsound Airport small and rural....Best, Clark Cundy</p>				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/27/2018	Steve Davis	smd_1960@yahoo.com	<p>Commissioners I have been a resident of Orcas Island for over twenty years.I have a business designing flying toys at my home on Mt Woolard. Also I am an aviation enthusiast and own a hangar and several experimental aircraft based at Orcas airport. I am at the airport most days flying and working on my airplanes.The part I enjoy most about Orcas Island is the community nature and the number of pilots that fly in, especially in the summer, and camp out on the field. I get a lot of inspiration talking to other pilots and builders of experimental aircraft that frequent Orcas Airport.Also the number of pilots flying in during the summer is a boost to the local economy, i.e. restaurants, hotels, etc. I think this is one of the main ways that the airport benefits the wider community.I understand the need to keep airports well maintained. I think the work that has been done over the last few years has greatly benefitted the airport. But I don't think the proposed alternatives 2 through 4 are at all necessary.Therefore I can only agree with No. 1.(no build) All the others encroach on the camping area and or the community nature of the airport. I would hate to see so much money spent and so much disruption at the airport, which I would think would last for a year or more, for a purpose that is not clear to me and that would only marginally increase the utility of the airport. Steven Davis</p>	Thank you for your comment.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/27/2018	Jason Elrod	elrod@globalrod.com	<p>Dear Commissioners, I want to express my support for widening the runway, increasing the distance between the runway and taxiway, utilizing displaced thresholds at the runway ends, and re-routing roads out of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ). Airports are vital elements of our transportation infrastructure. None more critical to its community than the Orcas Island Airport. Ours is an island community, as such, our airport plays an even more critical role in the health and life safety of residents. The above changes will bring the airport into compliance with FAA standards for current operators and ensure continued FAA funding. They will improve safety and efficiencies for the current cargo, medical, and passenger operators and the surrounding community at large. The inclusion of displaced threshold, increasing the available takeoff distance from 2,900 feet to 3,400 feet, will afford current operators wider safety margins and the ability to carry more people and cargo. Potentially reducing the number of flights required for a given risk. At 3,400 feet however, the runway would remain too short and restrictive for large jets to use. These changes are a win, win, win. The community ensures the long-term future and FAA funding of its airport; maintain the critical transportation, economic, health and life safety benefits provides. Current operators will be afforded greater margins of safety and greater efficiencies. The runway will remain restrictive to large jet aircraft; maintaining the character and pristine beauty of Orcas island. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Jason, Thank you very much for sharing your view which is identical to my own. Its great to here that not everyone is anti-anything and everything. Tony</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/28/2018	Cindy Wolf	cwolf@seanet.com	I would like to see some analysis on the economic impact to the community of each alternative. How much more money is forecast to be pumped into the local economy by maintaining or increasing current traffic? If we scale down current service to comply with FAA standards for a B-I airport instead of scaling up, will jobs be lost? How many? Will there be other impacts on the local economy? What, expressed in dollars, is our exposure on having to return FAA grant funds?	Ms. Wolf, Thank you for your question. The master plan does not conduct an economic impact analysis on the alternatives. However, it does look at the financial feasibility after the preferred development alternative is determined. Thank you,Leah				
7/30/2018	Doug McTavish	doug@rattletop.com	My name is Doug McTavish. I live at 330 Morley Drive, Orcas Washington. I am a licensed pilot, although I do not currently own an airplane. I worked for the original San Juan Airlines for 8 years from 1981 to 1989. I have lived on the island – on and off – for over 35 years. I support the action of the Orcas Port Commissioners in the development of alternatives for a long-range plan for the airport. I support several, but not all, of the ideas in the proposed improvement alternatives. I agree with the concept that it is neither feasible nor necessary to increase the length of the runway. I ALSO agree with the concepts of widening the existing runway, and increasing the taxiway/runway separation to improve operational safety. I recognize, however, that there are potential conflicts with the needs of Brandts Landing, and the continuing usage of Mount Baker Road, that need further study. I believe the long-term viability of the Eastsound Airport is important to the Orcas Island community. The airport provides benefits that include basic transportation to and from our island for residents and tourists, life-saving alternatives in emergencies, and jobs for our residents. Much has been said about the term “airport expansion” in discussions of this long-range plan. I see these ideas as “safety improvements” rather than an	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			expansion. Our airport will never be a destination for large private or commercial airplanes. The basic determinant of what size or type of aircraft has the ability to land here is the runway length. None of these alternatives suggest an increase in the length of our runway. The improvements identified merely create a safer environment for all our citizens.					
7/30/2018	Steve Smith	orcasart@gmail.com	Hi Leah, I stopped in and talked with Tony Simpson and he will be sharing with you the work we are doing. My wife and I operate Madrona Voices. We provide information to the community and community responses on topics of interest. We conduct scientifically representative surveys of the community. We are about to do a survey regarding the Port of Orcas plans. We have provided a copy of what we are doing with the commissioners and with Tony Simpson for comment. The survey is not active yet. We want to make sure that what we distribute is accurate. Your input is desired. I will send you a link via Survey Monkey to the draft survey. It includes a lengthy summary of the key facts as we interpret what Tony Simpson has said. You can also read more about us at MadronaVoices.com	Hi Steve, I apologize I was away on vacation a few days. I am reviewing your survey right now. I do have some comments and suggested edits on the summary. Should I give you a call to discuss? Pull into a word document with track changes to add my comments? Just let me know how you would like those. Thanks, Leah				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/30/2018	Steve Bernheim	saberheim@gmail.com	<p>Hello ! I sympathize with the commissioners and their frustration at public outcry, and here are my comments on the Master Plan: I live near Doe Bay and my primary interest sought to be protected is limiting the NOISE from aircraft operations. There are already small planes and helicopters flying under 2,000 feet often, and I am out here in the country trying to enjoy the quiet noises of nature when OFTEN small craft fly along disturbing the sounds of nature. So, even though I hold a Kenmore Air QuikTix passbook, I do not want the number of flights in and out of the Eastsound airport to increase. I would rather put a lid on the number of commercial flights and have less island-wide airplane noise than increase the number of flights to cater to a small band of wealthy travelers. I oppose efforts to increase the number of commercial enplanings to 10,000+ in order to get more federal funding. I would rather put self-imposed limits on commercial flights so that the small, island-based quiet can be restored.</p> <p>To repeat: my opposition to Eastsound airport expansion is because more commercial flights means too much unwanted engine noise in the air above Orcas Island. I don't want more aircraft engine noise:</p>	Thank you for your comment.				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>it's a burden on everyone for a benefit to only a few. I also believe expanding airport operations makes our island development challenges more difficult and I oppose the idea that "progress" and "economic development" requires more and more of what causes the problems in the first place. I believe that we should "develop DOWN" to make our problems easier, not expand commercial operations to obtain more funding, thank you. Please don't take it personally when people yell and scream: airport expansion issues are important to many island residents yet in the course of the lives of us ordinary citizens we may not even have 1% of the time to devote to comments and thinking that you port commissioners do whose job it is to address these issues full time.</p>					
7/30/2018	Geri Silveira	gsilveira@verizon.net	<p>To Whom It May Concern, I have flown to Orcas Island Airport from the Los Angeles area for at least 20 years. I have often camped on the field, and there is nothing quite so beautiful as turning final approach to this lovely airport. Recently, I have been made aware of the proposed changes to the airport. These changes deeply concern me. For you see, the airport is a destination in itself, and the proposed changes degrade the culture and the environment of the airport and the town. First of all, if the problem is the Caravans, let them conform to the airport, not the other way around. It makes no sense to spend millions of dollars to accommodate one type of aircraft. Also, there have been no problems with these planes at ORS, so why make problems? Okay, I get it. The changes aren't about meeting airport standards, Caravans or safety, but about procuring money from the FAA. As I understand it, in order to get the grant,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/30/2018	Paul Anderson	CygnusPaul@hotmail.com	<p>the airport must agree to make changes--even if the changes are not good for the airport. Also, any strategy to approve a master plan with no intention of implementing it in order to receive funding could backfire badly. Some future manager and/or commissioners may decide it's a good idea. Has anyone asked the FAA to grandfather ORS in as is? The plans I saw for the changes are ridiculous if not impossible to implement. My input: NO CHANGES, please. Take the time to think this one out further.</p> <p>Dear Ms. Henderson: Thank you for providing an opportunity to comment on the proposed Orcas Island Airport Master Plan (Master Plan). I am writing as a concerned citizen and wish to have the following comments entered into the official Master Plan record. Prior to retiring last July, I was a Wetland Specialist with the Washington State Department of Ecology and from July 2006 to June 2014, I was the Wetland Specialist responsible for San Juan County. In my official capacity, I visited the airport and adjoining parcels in 2009 and twice in 2012. During a site visit in July 2012, I was asked to review the wetland and ordinary high water mark on parcels to the north and west of the airport. During that site visit, I examined vegetation and measured salinities in the ditch system to the west of the runway and the adjoining parcel to the west (Parcel Number 271131001000), now in Port ownership. Measured salinities in the ditches were up to 23 parts per thousand (ppt), well above the estuarine regulatory threshold of 0.5 ppt, and the dominant vegetation within the extensive wetland on Parcel 271131001000 (Northwest Wetland) was saltgrass (<i>Distichlis spicata</i>). I wrote up a</p>	<p>Good morning, Mr. Anderson, Thank you for your July 30th comments regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. They will be included in the records. We have the Delineation Report prepared by Wetland Resources, Inc. in May 2015. It identifies Wetland A, Wetland B, etc. (see screenshot below). We also have the Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Plan they prepared in May 2015 for the 2016 Runway and Taxiway Improvements project. Their work probably built on the preliminary work you did in 2009 and 2012 and was part of the detailed environmental approval process for that project. Our review of this earlier work gives us a good understanding of the value of the wetlands and the aquatic resources around the airfield. The work they did was specific to a particular project that was subsequently greatly reduced in scope. The final project scope had no impact on the wetlands west of the airfield. In that example you can see the difference between a high-level planning document like the Master Plan and the detailed scope of project-specific environmental documents like the wetlands delineation and mitigation reports. The alternatives showing various</p>	<p>Eric: Thanks so much for taking time to write to me and for returning my phone call. As I mentioned when we spoke, my primary concerns with the wetland characterization are the following: 1. The large wetland to the west of the north end of the runway (Wetland A) is estuarine and not riverine as discussed in the wetland delineation report. During my July 2012 site visit I measured salinities as high as 23 ppt at the far end of the ditch, well</p>	<p>Thanks for the insight, Paul. At some point when we develop the scope for a project that affects the wetlands on the west side of the runway, we will have to do a new wetlands delineation study. The rationale for separating Wetland A from Wetland B will probably be revisited at that time. The whole environmental process will probably take 12-24 months, and I assume that the Washington Department of Ecology will be involved. However, it</p>		

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>memorandum summarizing the site visit findings (attached) and believe I provided a copy to the Port as well as San Juan County (County) staff. Due to the dominance of salt tolerant vegetation<sup>1</sup> and because the dominant water regime is tidal, the Northwest Wetland is at least a Category II estuarine wetland under the state wetland rating system<sup>2</sup> and as specified in the County Unified Development Code (UDC) in § 18.35.090.B.2.a. This wetland is also an associated wetland under jurisdiction of the state Shoreline Management Act and the County Shoreline Master Program. There are three wetland-related issues that I believe the Master Plan needs to more fully address: 1. So that all parties, including the Port of Orcas, fully understand the value of the wetlands and aquatic resources on and within the project area, I ask that the wetlands be identified by name (Wetland A, Wetland B, etc.) and that the wetland category and applicable buffers be included on project drawings. 2. The alternatives evaluation indicates that Runway Alternative 4 will have “minor” impacts to wetlands west of the runway and that Westside Development Alternative 2 also has the potential to</p>	<p>airport improvements are meant to represent points on a continuum from maintenance-only of existing facilities (Alt 1 No-Build) to full compliance with all dimensional standards of a B-II airport (Alt 4). There was never any intention to pick one of the alternatives to the exclusion of the others. Rather, the Preferred Alternative will consist of elements of some of them combined with input from stakeholders (the public, the Port, the FAA, etc.). The challenge is in finding an optimum solution that accounts for all the conflicting requirements. Implementing the Preferred Alternative will require many large and small projects over many years. Each will require detailed environmental analysis including wetlands impact and mitigation requirements. I hope this addresses your concerns. Feel free to contact us if you have any more questions or comments.</p>	<p>above the regulatory threshold of 0.5 ppt. I can only infer that Wetland Resources Inc. did not measure salinities in the ditch and therefore, assumed that the wetland should be rated as riverine. I have attached the pertinent page from the state rating system manual on tidal wetlands; 2. I do not understand the rationale for identifying Wetland B as a separate wetland from Wetland B; that would only be</p>	<p>will be a year or two before we even get to that point. Thanks for your comments and for sharing your detailed knowledge of the local conditions. I look forward to meeting you on the island sometime. Eric</p>		

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>impact these wetlands. I realize that it is still in the early in the Master Plan process, but all of these alternatives need to explicitly identify how much wetland/water and buffer impact (acreage) is associated with the respective alternative.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Vegetation tolerant of interstitial soil salinities <math>\geq 0.5</math> ppt; see WAC 173-22-030(5)(ii).<sup>2</sup> Hruby, T. 2014. Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington: 2014 Update. (Publication #14-06-029). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology.</p>		<p>appropriate if there were upland separating these wetlands and there was only one-way flow (downhill) between the wetlands. There are only limited circumstances where wetlands receive dual ratings under the state wetland rating system. I have the pages from the rating system manual that discuss giving wetlands multiple ratings; and<sup>3</sup>. The ditch system and Wetland</p>			

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
					<p>system and wetlands  A/B are within shoreline jurisdiction since tidal inundation (ordinary high water mark; OHWM) extends landward into the ditch system and wetlands and the wetland meets the definition of an associated wetland (see WAC 173-22-040). Ecology is the state agency that oversees state wetland and shoreline regulation. Verifying the wetland rating and the extent and type of shoreline jurisdiction (OHWM vs. associated wetland) is within</p>			

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
					<p>wetland, is within Ecology's regulatory purview. Doug Gresham is the Ecology Wetland Specialist for San Juan County and Chad Yunge is the Ecology Shoreline Planner. I have copied both of them on this email so that you will have their email addresses. I would be happy to meet with Port staff (I've been in touch with Tony Simpson) and the Commission to give a regulatory overview and how all of these different regulations are supposed to work. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or if I can be of any further assistance. Paul</p>			

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/30/2018	Becky Griswold	becky.griswold@ymail.com	I would like to say that of the three alternative presented on the Port of Orcas website I favor the “no build” option. I don’t want to see any rerouting of traffic from MT Baker onto North Beach and Enchanted. Additionally, I don’t want to see the Ditch or the education institutions along North Beach and Enchanted Forest RDs. If the money is need that badly find another option.	Paul,My engineering discipline background is different (Aeronautical), but I think, as engineers, we share a similar philosophical outlook derived from data and analysis as it interfaces with regulation and bureaucracy. I just today asked our consultant				
7/30/2018	Nathan Bradow	outerislandx@live.com	This plan will be severly detrimenral to all the business that cater to tourist on the east side of the airport. It would likely cost the island over 8 milljom is sales each year. It would destroy jobs and lower property values.  It is a very bad idea.	Thank you for yor comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
7/30/2018	Anne Keller	wornouthag120@gmail.com	<p>To whom it may concern; my husband and i have been owners at Smugglers for nearly 20 years. fortunately, i was on Orcas last week for the meeting and attended it for its entirety. As it appears that one of the plans will progress, my comments will be limited to modifications and mitigation s. First and foremost for Smugglers owners and renters the proposed taxi area on Brandts landing. Obviously, that is the least favorable area for us. We already bare the brunt of the noise and pollution from the airport, so to increase this with a taxi/ holding zone nearly on top of our homes is unacceptable. As the meeting was rather contentious, I did not have an opportunity to ask why this area cannot be built on the other side of the run way .. or anyplace else actually, other than the closest possible area to the most populated zone? I know the people who use the dock are equally concerned, so between that population and all of the owners and renters on Smugglers, we do represent a large number of stakeholders in this project, and cannot allow this increase in noise, air and visual pollution. Further, there needs to be noise abatement structures in place; even now, the noise is often overwhelming, because of certain types of engines... that honestly should not be permitted. I am not an aviator.. however, I have learned after this meeting, that there are several types of planes that the airport could prohibit, but choose not to, I guess because as with a small island, everyone knows everyone, and the owners/ pilots of those planes are long standing members of the community. Sadly, it might be time to restrict those pilots for the greater good. I know its difficult to give up one's fun hobbies...but it might be time to consider the larger population who does not find it fun to be deafened. With regard to the potential hangers.. and I understand that the airport commission is " only" suggesting this.. i.e. leasing the property to others for building; however, there must be strict guidelines for these, certainly fewer, and provisions in the master plan for major tree planting around the proposed sites, before any potential construction. This neighborhood cannot be turned into more of a commercial zone than it already is. True, the airport was there before we</p>	<p>Hi Anne,Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018.</p>				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>were.. however, the entire island benefits from it, but its adjacent neighbors should not be the subject to unnecessary detrimental planning that will cause issues of noise, air and visual pollution, that should have been avoided. Lastly, if the word safety is being used.. as it has been.. then have a tower.. at least for certain hours. We watch the near misses, the aborted landings, ... daily. To use the word safety in ones presentation, without considering a tower seems hypocritical to those of us at our vantage point. Again, we understand the need for the FAA grant money. Who wouldnt want that? However, we will not support this project with that taxi way, parallel piece of the runway... in our faces. thank you. anne and gene keller</p>					

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
7/30/2018	Lisa Byers	lisabyers50@gmail.com	<p>Hi -I am writing to add some additional thoughts to my previous email for the airport master planning process.</p> <p>1. With regard to the SE development area, I believe that the Eastsound Sub-Area Plan requires landscape screening between different land use zones and abutting properties. I think it would be wise to show that intention on plans, even if the plans are schematic. 2.I think moving aeronautical services to the west side of the airport could be problematic from the standpoint of directing commercial traffic through a residential neighborhood. Please keep commercial traffic accessing the airport from the south. 3. would like to see the master plan include a serious analysis of the implications to the Port of Orcas withdrawing from the FAA's Airport Improvement Program. What would be the implication of "going it alone" without FAA funding going forward? And conversely, why stay in the program? What are the benefits that we as a community get? What are the costs? What are the requirements? To not analyze this is to miss the true understanding of the pros and cons of aligning with the FAA.</p>	<p>Thank you for your previous comment on the master plan. The draft preferred development will include the landscaping required in the area in the southeast development area. Thank you for the suggestion. The Port has accepted federal money from the FAA with 20 year grant assurance (renewed each time federal money is accepted). There are many implications to choosing not to meet standard and if the Port chose to no longer accept federal money they would still be held to the same standard until those obligations are met. The Port could also be at risk at repaying federal money accepted in the past. The grant assurance link is listed on the master plan page of the Port's website if you would like to dig into that further. The master plan was not scoped to look at not accepting federal money. If you have any further questions please feel free to contact me directly. Thank you, Leah Henderson Project Manager</p>				
7/31/2018	Julia Turney and Jay Lucas	luketurn@gmail.com	<p>We keep our boat at Brandts Landing Marina and were very concerned to see that all of the proposed alternatives (except the no-build alternative) take property from the marina.The marina has expansion plans for the western side of the marina which the airport expansion conflicts. The expansion would allow the installation of a sewage pump-out for boats. This facility is needed for the north shore of Orcas. It will help protect water quality. It will also bring in more boaters to Orcas, an economic advantage. The port documents note that the plans interfere with the marina but note that the marina could be improved by</p>	<p>Julia,We are working with Brandts Landing. We met with them recently and will be meeting with them again. Any changes that impact the marina will be in coordination with the Marina owners and will also be funded by the Airport. Thank you for your comments. Leah</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>the project- however, the Port never discussed the expansion with the marina owners. We do not support alternatives which take property and access from the marina. We do not support moving Mt Baker Road and paving over more wetlands and open land. We recommend that you consider excavating and depressing the Mt Baker Road section in front of the runway. The conflict with the road is limited compared to commercial and residential development in the south approach flight path to the airport. It would be much safer to remove buildings in the flight path. We support a limited building expansion into the area adjacent to Mt Baker Road. The terminal and cargo building would be suitable for this space. The addition of multiple hangers is too disruptive.</p>					
8/1/2018	Evelyn Fuchser	effuchser@icloud.com	<p>I am extremely concerned about ANY west side development, until a traffic study and improvement proposal is made any westside development is not considerable. We have no circulation for traffic, no pedestrian protection NO OUTLET If the westside is even to be considered the problems of transportation must be considered first!</p>	<p>Hi Evelyn ,Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/1/2018	Lisa Murphy	lmurphybaker@hotmail.com	To whom it may concern It is my considered opinion that the airport expansion will be detrimental to the quality of life on Orcas island. There will be an economic cost and an environmental cost. If in fact there are safety issues, they must be remedied in a way that incurs the least amount of impact. This is a classic example of believing bigger is better. It's not. Thank you for your attention Lisa Murphy	Hi Lisa ,Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire & Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them.				
8/2/2018	Norman and Becky Flint	stormannorman59@rockisland.com	As residentâ€™s of Orcas for 47 years and 4 generations our family is intrinsically connected with life here. Some of the change has been good and necessary but not not all of it. Growth is inevitable but to that extent we do have a choice as to when growth is so much that is compromises the the quality of life here in this island paradise. Expanding the runway and closing Mt Baker road does not serve the life choice we made in moving to this remote place. What would happen if for once we kept growth at bay? We would have a better chance of maintaining the nurturing community as opposed to commercialization and industrialization that big business brings with bigger planes and jets. Please help keep our community unique. Thank you	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/2/2018	Eleanor Stewart	orcasel@att.net	<p>I am in favor of Alternative 2, with the exception of moving Mt. Baker Road. I believe the safety issue of the road's location in the RPZ for Runway 34 can be addressed with a traffic control device, such as a railroad signal and crossing guards, as outlined at the end of the Introduction to Development Alternatives document. The installation of a traffic control device solves both the environmental and the public safety issues that would arise by routing the Mount Baker Road through either wetlands or in front of a childcare center, a school, and an active retail site.</p> <p>While the Alternative 2 taxiway relocation doesn't meet the full FAA requirement and requires a MoS, I think this is the most practical solution as it will bring the airport a good way towards FAA requirements without causing the major environmental damage of altering the marina required in Alternatives 3 and 4.</p> <p>I am not clear relocating the taxiway will REQUIRE the relocation of the heliport and terminal. If not, then I am in favor of leaving the SE corner undeveloped. If it</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/2/2018	Andrea Hendrick	hhendrick@rockisland.com	<p>Having looked at the proposed masterplan - a new terminal, new hangars, taking some of the marina, rerouting our major road are all part of the plan. The million\$ from the FAA would not begin to pay for this - where is the rest coming from?</p> <p>The Port's "Why" reasons: we are required to have a plan, a crash might occur someday on Mt. Baker Rd. and Amazon Prime might be delayed. The money issue indicates that future costs must be added to the forecasting of and planning for the impacts of growth on our island community. The environmental impacts including possible effects of climate change on low Wetland Basin which is our island center must be foremost in considering all future plans. This planning must be coordinated, involving the Eastsound Planning Commission, The Port Commission, San Juan Co. and others. Therefore Alternative 1 must be NO EXPANSION. More thoughtful consideration of future options must take place before a new master plan is accepted.</p>	<p>Hi Andrea, Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018.</p> <p>We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them.</p>				
8/2/2018	Kim Secunda	kimsecunda21@yahoo.com	<p>Please see to it that all these comments are made PUBLIC Please answer all the Questions and respond to comments and do so in a searchable format. Then make sure that all of this and all dialogue on the topic and related topics are published On Record. This is a complex and involved project with many players and a very concerned and engaged citizenry . Our collective history on planning, SMP, CAO and other island health and welfare issues deserves respect and care.</p> <p>I have written you previously and not had response as to if you have received the information and it would be normal to have acknowledgement and response. Can this be remedied ?</p>	<p>Hi Kim, Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>Since the first wave of comment and perusal of the plans i have had many conversations and revisited many topics. Much of what is in the air will be communicated to you by others, though some of this is reiteration, i would like clarification on the following-</p> <p>What is it we are accommodating here ? Am i over looking the traffic report someplace - i do not see the drivers to the need for expansion and word is from the flying community that 2 private jets and the non compliance to FAA is a prime driver here. A traffic report with times and date s etc as in the older reports on past plans will help us make sense.</p> <p>What have we entertained as behavioral changes to accommodate the cramped state ?</p> <p>. When i read POTENTIAL WETLANDS on maps that i remember having designated and classified wetlands spelled out it is insulting and suspicious. Yes some of the protections have been dumbed down since we messed up the CAO SMP and re drew some lines but it will be best if you come clean on the history of the properties in the area.</p> <p>I also would like to see that you have awareness about the following and show that you are alert as to what you are proposing-</p> <p>Aquifer maps and details in the vicinity  propane facilities i the vicinity  schools in the vicinity populations included hours of operation noted  sewage treatment infrastructure in the vicinity  population density and projected expectations in the vicinity  eelgrass beds in the area  national monuments in the area  whale migration pathway history. tanker traffic maps and data in the vicinity  all; watercraft traffic in the are  Sucia duly noted, data on the usage included, w/ park and moorings # of visits etc  Protected and sensitive natural resources noted and manned</p>	<p>5 to October 5, 2018. We hope you will join us September 19th!</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>mapped</p> <p>Any data on light and noise pollution and any migratory flyway data. I expected the recent clearcut to be handled differently, BMPS do not seem to have been adhered to no cover slash or replant with done to do and cost was provided.</p> <p>The dense stand of trees in the pathway between Lavender Hollow and the airport is creepy often trashed and unhealthy forest and will likely prove a hazard as those trees get higher.... often people live in there or do drugs in there. It is a zone to skirt for any woman or child. I see lack of discussion real estate value in flight pathways. Are you aware that the area is home to the majority of our islands low income families ? What do we get out of it ? It is insulting to fail to address these realities that are historically key in these dealings. These are the thoughts and topics we the people are engaging and expect to be addressed and addressed in the norms of due process. Coastal Hazards are not considered and that seems a gross mistake. Personally my top question and concern lies with sea level rise and liquefaction. the rest seems a distraction from the inevitable. Regardless as we have paid quite a lot of tax for your consultation PLEASE SEE TO IT THAT OUR CONCERNS ARE ADDRESSED AND ON RECORD, Forgive the rushed and garbled note here, we had a very bad meeting here about this and then another last night so you are likely getting flooded with the fallout from our alarm. it is not clear what boundaries and expectations go where and our Port is evidently not up to speed so the onus is on your office for now. Perhaps an extension is in order ? the map format is quite awkward and it may be better to show them in a overly style format</p>					



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>Overly style format.</p> <p>One unspoken or lowspoken concern is the worry that this may have some homeland security or ICE un derpinnings and as we have growler traffichere o the border on tnehhorizon her that there amy be other military border town politics and finances at play. Shuffles in airforce bases on this coast and vessel traffic and refinery activity loom close.</p> <p>We who live here cherish this rural island work to live small and close and protect what we are responsible to and for. We need all the information we can get so this happens with us and not to us.</p> <p>We are in it for the long haul; so take time to be real with us,We Vote and show up, civic duty fortified by your careful, thorough open information is critical.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>KS</p> <p>our home is near the airport</p> <p>we love our island deeply</p>					

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/2/2018	Janet Alderton	janetmalderton@gmail.com	<p>Dear Port Commissioners,</p> <p>Thank-you for extending the deadline for comments on options to increase the safety of our Eastsound airport. Thank-you, also, for holding the recent additional public meeting.</p> <p>I have been a year-round resident of Orcas Island since 2005. I am a former owner of a Cessna 172 and share your concerns about the safety deficiencies of our airport for pilots, passengers, and for people living near or passing by our airport. I am concerned that some of the proposed safety measures will negatively impact the Eastsound wetlands that were once, according to wetlands expert Paul Anderson, the most valuable wetlands in San Juan County.</p> <p><a href="https://www.pce.uw.edu/instructors/paul-anderson">https://www.pce.uw.edu/instructors/paul-anderson</a></p> <p>I think it is cool that our airport is within comfortable walking distance of Eastsound, but this proximity has its downside. Geographical and environmental constraints complicate the resolution of competing interests. Our Eastsound Airport and Eastsound itself were sited before we understood how valuable wetlands are for filtering stormwater, recharging our aquifers, and helping to reduce flooding from rainstorms and ocean stormsurges. While recent improvements to Mount Baker Road enhanced the bypass of the center of Eastsound, this planning</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>decision decreased airport safety by increasing traffic through the runway protection zone.</p> <p>I am fine with moving the taxiway six feet to the east if this will not impact the existing wetlands west of the airport. I am fine with relocating the terminal, parking, and commercial buildings to the Southeast Development Center. I would like the architectural standards for the new terminal to conform to the Eastsound architectural standards.</p> <p>My major concern is the impact of some of the proposed changes to the wetlands. Development of Eastsound ignored the importance of wetlands until the most recent update of the Critical Areas Ordinance. Before 2014 development on parcels under one acre did not need to take any measures to avoid and protect wetlands within the Eastsound Subarea. The wetland corridor, known as the Eastsound Swale, once spanned the Eastsound isthmus. This unique and most valuable wetland has been partially filled and its isthmus-spanning integrity has been destroyed. I ask that new airport development in wetland areas preserve the existing wetlands by elevating any new roads. Connectivity that has been lost could be restored by placing very large semi-circular culverts under Enchanted Forest Road and other obstructions. This type of restoration might serve as mitigation for future (or previous) airport development in wetlands. The connection of West Beach Creek to the ocean was</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>The connection of West Beach Creek to the ocean was restored with a very large semi-circular culvert. Before the restoration, salmon passage was blocked. After the restoration, young salmon have been observed in West Beach Creek.</p> <p>Road relocation of the segment of Mount Baker Road that occupies the runway protection zone will take time -if it ever occurs. I would like to suggest a trial that involves traffic control for this part of Mount Baker Road. Except for emergencies, most airport traffic follows predictable patterns that depend on scheduled flights. The change from only Visual Flight Rules to allow the use of Instrument Flight Rules may have changed the landings and takeoffs of private aircraft to less predictable patterns. But most private pilots will likely choose to fly using VFR during the daytime hours. Very large vehicles, such as logging trucks, could be required to traverse the Mount Baker Road bypass during hours outside the more predictable peak airport traffic. Smaller vehicles could be rerouted along Enchanted Forest Road and North Beach Road during peak periods for aircraft landings and take-offs.</p> <p>Thank-you for considering my comments.</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/2/2018	Susan Fraser	angelfare9@gmail.com	I choose alternative one: no build					
8/3/2018	Pierrette Guimond	pgblues@rockisland.com	There should not be any expansion of the runway that would close Mt Baker Road No to expansion.	Pierrette, Mt. Baker Road is the existing runway protection zone and is an incompatible land use according to the FAA. This is an existing condition and is not affected by the Airport's designation changing from a BI small airport to a BII small airport. The BII aircraft are however already serving the Airport (Kenmore Air and FedEx) and that is what sparked the FAA to request the Port conduct the Airport Master Plan study. We have not suggested the roadway be closed. We are however examining how we can eliminate traffic from being in the runway protection zone (which should be clear) during aircraft operations. We suggested several realignments to accommodate this. Another option the FAA may consider is putting gates that would be activated by an aircraft to prevent traffic from crossing this area. However, with the proximity of the fire station I am not sure this is a viable option. The master plan is proposing shortening the pavement by 200', but				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Margaret Doyle	argaretdoyle7@gmail.com	<p>"The Preferred Alternative is not simply a matter of selecting one of these alternatives to the exclusion of all others. Rather, it emerges from desirable elements of the others and from additional suggestions and input that is important to the community." from Port Master Plan documents. please consider my questions and input and recommendation regarding the Port Master Plan process. Thank you in advance for your reply acknowledging receipt of this email. Can runway repair be accomplished outside of the Port Master Plan Process?Can Orcas' certification as a "B-II" airport, so those Cessnas we depend upon for freight service and transportation can keep flying in, be maintained if Mt. Baker Road stays in its current location?Can the runway be repaired without further erosion of the Eastsound swale, the north shore (which is to be protected in the county's Shoreline Management Plan) and significant wetlands at the northwest ("unused") port property?Due to the island's limited infrastructure and other physical limitations and the location of the airport adjacent to densely residential neighborhoods on both the west and east boundaries, I strongly advocate for Alternative #1 NO BUILD as the preferred alternative in the Port's 20-year Master Plan now under consideration.</p>	<p>moving the pavement markings so that there would no longer be a stopway on the runway. This would increase the published length of the runway but would not change the way the pilots currently operate, and as I mentioned would actually decrease the pavement. I hope this explanation helps you to better understand the project. Please let me know if you have any questions.Thank you,Leah</p> <p>Thank you for your comments.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Christopher Graham	1062discovery@gmail.com	Dear Sir or Madame:The proposed plan to alter the Eastsound airport exacts too high a price on the community, on its residents living in around the airport, and on the island at large in exchange for minimal benefits in return.Orcas Island is much more than an airport; however vital the airport is to the island, it's meant to serve the island's needs —not to detract from it, harm it, or take the island in a direction that is in conflict with its unparalleled qualities.A better solution would be to continue with its current use parameters, employ tighter air traffic controls to reduce possible risks, maintain it with county, taxpayer, or FAA funds and leave Eastsound, its residents and Mt Baker Road unaffected and altered.The airport has operated without incident for decades. Other than additional FAA funding, there is no change agent present to justify the harm the proposed alterations will cause to the community, its residents and to the island.Thank you for taking my comments under advisement.	Thank you for your comment.				
8/3/2018	, and Julia van Dongen	jp@drvandongen.com	Dear Sirs, We are new residents to Orcas Island. We chose Orcas for its character and community. Twenty years ago we listened to the same conversation and proposals put forward in the name of safety by a good intentioned group of Airport commissioners. The community overwhelmingly opposed these plans, fearing that the safety changes would result in	Thank you for your comment. I understand your concern that bigger is not always better and that the quaintness of the Airport is very important to the community and it's residents. However, the FAA requires the Port to do its best to meet airport design standards driven by the largest aircraft serving the Airport with 500 or more operations per year (the	Hello Ms Henderson,We appreciate your response and the care that you and your team are			

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
	JP, Annette, Alexandra		<p>expanded airport capacity, which is exactly what happened. Increased traffic and size of planes that we were promised would never happen changed the character of the community we once enjoyed. You have huge responsibility in the decisions you make as you are the Gateway to the Gem of the San Juans. While the lure of \$1,000,000 FAA money is strong, we believe it is bait in a trap to develop and grow, as government wants us to do. Bigger is not always better. It takes courage to say 'no' and wisdom and insight to see when the tail is wagging the dog. You are in charge of this, not the FAA and big government. Please listen to your community, and remember, this is the same community that tore the traffic light down. We are proud to call Orcas home. We love our airport. As it is. Respectfully, JP, Annette, Alexandra, and Julia van Dongen</p>	<p>design or critical aircraft). The lure of an increase in the amount of yearly entitlements the Airport is eligible for is not the driving factor behind the Master Plan study. The project was initiated by the FAA to correct existing BI small airport incompatible uses (Mt Baker road through the runway protection zone) and to safely accommodate BII small standards to meet safety requirements for the Cessna 208B Caravan being flown in and out of the Airport. No suggested changes in the alternatives recommend developing the Airport beyond a BII small airport. They are all simply correcting airport design to meet the standard of the aircraft serving the Airport today. We are actually proposing that runway pavement be shortened, not lengthened. The buildings would need to be relocated out of the object free areas. The cargo facility is already exceeding their capacity and they have a strong interest in building a larger facility to accommodate their demand. Any future development, small or big, will need to be reviewed through the environmental process prior to design or construction. This would be a separate project after the completion of the master plan and could very well alter the final design and vision of the Airport. The Port has accepted federal money for many years and is obligated under grant assurances to look at ways to meet standards set forth by the FAA. This is not to say that any changes would happen in the near term, but the Port must have a 20-year plan that is approved by the FAA, or they could be in jeopardy of having to repay money received in the past. I hope this better explains the purpose of the master plan and the driving forces behind it. I am happy to discuss anytime by phone to understand your concerns, and those of others. Thank you, Leah Henderson Project Manager</p>	<p>taking in such responsible decisions regarding the future of our community. Being new to Orcas we respect that we have much to learn regarding the history and direction of the community and of course defer to the guidance of the elected leaders of Orcas. We also appreciate you being willing to consider the insights that we bring from the future. This is a wonderful benefit that living in a time capsule like Orcas gives, that we can, like a wise person, learn from the mistakes of others rather than from our own. We hope you choose the "less development" options.</p> <p>J.P and Annette Van Dongen</p>			



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Charles Toxley	inkeeper@kangaroohouse.com	<p>Dear Port of Orcas Commissioners and Tony Simpson,I attended the 2nd Master Plan Meeting and the special meeting the Port hosted on July 26th. I have read all the documents and maps provided by the Port and DOWL and read the FAA's documents detailing the AIP and sponsor's responsibilities as a result of participation in it. I have listened to your comments and those of neighbors throughout Eastsound and those potentially affected directly by various alternatives.I respect and acknowledge your thought, hard work and good will that have gone into planning for the future. The AIP is clear that all participating airports must be willing now and in the future to expand. Most airports are situated a few miles away from the communities they serve. If we expand the footprint of the airport to include all the land the Port currently owns plus portions of the adjoining parcels to the east and west as considered for taxiways and separations between runway and taxiways, the Port may be asked to expand even more, if the FAA requires it. As we all know the airport is not indefinitely expandable. At some point the Port the airport's neighboring communities have to draw some</p>	Thank you for your comment.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
			<p>lines and call it as far in each direction we are willing to expand the airport. My neighbors have what I believe is a reasonable line in the sand. It runs along the edge of Brandt's Landing, Parnell's Hangar, Larson's and then south of there, one lot (perhaps 200 to 300 feet in most cases) west of North Beach Road all the way into town. To extend the Airport closer to the North Beach neighborhood would be damaging to us, to our neighborhood, to Eastsound. I am very encouraged to hear that you are inclined to respect that boundary in your recommendations to the FAA, especially in regard to the corner of North Beach Road and Mount Baker Road. I am inclined to support the Port in its plans eastward under those circumstances. If the FAA rejects that recommendation and the Port feels pressure to cross that line, I think you and we all should consider extricating the airport from the AIP. Thank you, Charles Toxey</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Melanie Thea Patten	melaniethea@gmail.com	<p>I do not want to see access to the NW float area at Brandt's Landing Marina compromised, as could happen with Alternative 2. I do not want to see mooring spaces lost or the basin filled, as would happen with Alternatives 3 &amp; 4. I believe that this would happen if FAA regulations are strictly enforced. I do not understand why none of the Alternatives for widening the runway, the taxiway or the separation zone considers expansion to the east. This would intrude on wetlands, but the marina is a marine environment and expansion to the west would impact it. I think that expanding to the east should be one of the alternatives to be considered. Moving Mount Baker Road would slow down law enforcement vehicles traveling eastward on Mount Baker Road and would slow down fire trucks and other emergency response vehicles going west toward Camp Orkila. It would also channel more vehicle traffic southward toward housing, including toward the low-income housing at Lavender Hollow. This is unacceptable. I believe that the Port's position should be to make compromises with the FAA, rather than to attempt to foist its standards, edicts and regulations onto an area that does not need them and onto a community that does not want them.</p>	Thank you for your comment				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	Ted Enderlein	tedenderlein@icloud.com	<p>Here are some comments regarding the various alternatives:1) I'm in favor of minimal safety improvements such as widening the distance between the runway and taxi way to 156' and possibly re-routing Mt Baker highway. Although, as a pilot, I've never come close to hitting a vehicle landing 34. It seems like rerouting MT Baker road would be a significant cost, with questionable safety improvement. 2) I'm not in favor of seeing the SE corner developed as depicted. I feel that Larsen's field is a valuable view corridor into Eastsound from either Mt Baker or North beach roads. If Larsen's field is made up many hangars, I feel it will have a negative impact visually to our rural airport. 3) I'm not in favor of losing any grass/camping spots to some of the alternative schemes. Camping/grass tie downs are a major highlight and attraction. 4) I question the ease/ability of aircraft to move and transfer passengers to/from the terminal as depicted in either of the SE development plans. I occasionally fly a Caravan for a local family and see maneuvering around other aircraft at the terminal difficult. The terminal should be as close to the taxiway as possible; like it is now.</p>	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Kelly Rose	rainsinger2012@gmail.com	<p>I'm a year-round Orcas Island resident. and I have concerns about the proposed airport expansion and how that might alter the island and especially the Eastsound neighborhoods.I'm concerned that there is not enough information about environmental, air, water, and sound pollution. I'd also want to know projections of how more air traffic might effect our summer population, which is already beyond some capacities. I'm also a home owner and tax payer in the north beach neighborhood. Already many of us find the noise from the airport to be disturbing, and more air traffic would potentially effect quality of life and decrease home/land values.There is a need for greater transparency, inclusion, information, and more time for feedback from the Port of Orcas and interested parties. Meanwhile I do not support the airport expansion in any capacity.Thank you</p>	Thank you for your comment.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	heather oaksen	heather@heatherdewoaksen.com	<p>Dear Port Commissioners, I am writing to request that you postpone making your decision on the airport expansion until a larger number of citizens can meet with you in a meaningful way. Thus far, the community involvement process has been negligible and poorly handled creating unnecessary frustration and fear. As our elected officials as well as residents yourselves, it is important to hear your neighbors concerns. For example, the island is already suffering from development pressures resulting in a lack of affordable housing, changes to our rural character, increased pollution, and water quality, and wetland issues. The proposals suggested will increase population, commerce and tourism while degrading our quality of life—the reason we all moved here to begin with. I hope you will consider ways to not urbanize our airport while considering safety. I’m looking for a win-win option. Please take the time to consider a meeting that allows residents a voice. (I was shut out of the most recent one.) Orcas seems to be at a “tipping point” ...do we want to be another Nantucket? Surely not. Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	<p>Hi Heather, Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018.</p> <p>We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them.</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	Sadie Bailey	Salim3796@yahoo.com	<p>I will also be sending another email which includes petitions with 194 signatures gathered from July 7 through yesterday; I have to reduce those files so they will attach. Look for those in about an hour and please include them. We will continue to gather signatures on that petition until September's workshop date.</p> <p>Hopefully you have also been sent the online petitions circulating. We are told "no big deal, it'll never happen, not for 10 or maybe 20 years" - if that is true, why the push to have expansion plans of this magnitude in the Master Plan at all at this time? Where's the data driving this need? How many years before build are we in this process do you estimate? Citizens at the Special Port meeting had some great ideas on how to address staying in the B-1 airport category. I ask that those citizen ideas be factored-in, and that the Port make every effort to contact the corporations and private individuals basing Caravans at the airport - and codify uses back to no bigger planes than the Cessna 207s. I sincerely believe that with working together - the Port, the Citizens, DOWL, and the FAA, that we can come to some much less egregious and impactful solution to our safety and compliance issues. I'll be continuing to send comment, and hope that DOWL will not cut off consideration of our comments when this day ends.</p>	Thank you for your comment.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	China Meadows	islandorcas@yahoo.com	<p>With regard to expansion of Eastsound airport, there are many questions and too many insufficient and or non existent answers and data for plans to move forward. This expansion is dealing with both environmental and monetary realities for all Orcas residents. The communication has been barely forthcoming with belittling contempt for questions from residents. Recently the port made a decision to allow Red Bull helicopter pilots to hover for days dropping their jumpers above our port area with tremendous noise impact. If safety is a concern for this port or the noise was a concern for residents, why was this allowed to happen? Bad decisions are hastily being made at this port it seems, don't let this be one more with horrible consequences. Wth Concern, China Meadows</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment to the Orcas Airport Master Plan. Your comment was received and added to the comment log. The master plan does not examine maintenance or operational issues at the airport, therefore I am unaware of recent red bull helicopters and any issues with them. The master plan is focusing on bringing the airport from a BI small airport to a BII small airport to accommodate the existing Cessna Caravan 208B traffic. Our next meeting is September 19<sup>th</sup> 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website this evening, September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. Thank you, Leah Henderson</p>				



Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	JoEllen Moldoff	moldoff@rockisland.com	<p>I hope we can have an opportunity for open discussion and collaboration so that citizens can communicate with respect and trust. Is there a possibility of bringing in an experienced facilitator to help us reach accord on this important matter? Can we extend the deadline for making a decision so that we can have a more thoughtful process? Do citizens have a vote on whether or not to expand? My instinct says NO to expansion because it might have a negative impact on the nature of our community. But I am open to hearing other viewpoints and alternatives. Unfortunately, summer time is a very inconvenient time for many of us to attend meetings and give the matter the full attention it deserves.</p>	<p>Ms. Moldoff, Thank you for comments. The public comment period was extended several times for the draft alternatives. We are currently working on the draft preferred alternative, which will be published this week. The master plan process is not a "voting" process. Public comments are accepted and considered, but ultimately the Port must make the decision based on guidance from the FAA. The next master plan meeting is September 19th and we hope you can join us to discuss your concerns. Thank you.</p>				
8/3/2018	Margaret Manning	peg@blanchardmanning.com	<p>To the Commissioners of the Port of Orcas:Please consider the following comments for the Port of Orcas Airport Master Plan:I am a full-time resident of Orcas Island who has owned property here since 2000 and who has lived here for more than 10 years. My husband and I practice health care regulatory law.We use the airport frequently, both for business and vacation connections on Kenmore Air. I use Kenmore Air to commute to medical appointments in Seattle, where I receive all my medical care. Our firm depends on UPS/Aeronautical Services and FedEx for business correspondence and for items purchased online.To date, we have been fortunate enough not to have required medical air evacuation for ourselves, our family, or our guests, but we subscribe to both services available and consider them critically important to island residents.I was aware of the initial meeting but was out of town for it. I sought information on the Port website and found nothing helpful, and certainly nothing to indicate that the Port might be considering radical changes in the airport and the neighborhoods affected by it. I was unavailable for the next two meetings but reviewed the alternatives when they finally became available. I have fundamental concerns about the public communications used by the Port in</p>	<p>Ms. Manning, your comment was received. Thank you for your comment.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>this process, and about most of the changes that are being proposed for your consideration. I have extensive experience in federal regulation and in both defending and opposing actions supposedly mandated by law. My initial question in any such action is WHY is this action being proposed? I have heard several conflicting and unpersuasive claims in this respect: That the airport is not compliant with FAA standards, ("In its present configuration, Orcas Island Airport does not meet the safety standards required to service aircraft currently using the airport such as the Cessna 208B Caravan.") and specifically that the taxiway and runway are too close together, presenting the prospect of two Caravan-type planes' wingtips colliding and that Mount Baker Road presents a threat to vehicles (usually, a school bus full of innocent children) passing under landing planes. My first thought was, how can our Port operate an airport that is noncompliant with federal mandates? Is our airport unsafe? Should I stop flying on Kenmore? And what has changed over the past ten years to suddenly put us all in terrible jeopardy? The answer seems to be nothing much. Orcas Island Airport OBVIOUSLY meets safety standards required to service aircraft like the Caravan. It is doing so this very day. Are we supposed to believe that Kenmore send its planes into mortal danger daily? It appears to me that the airport has operated without an incident that could be put down to airport safety defects for decades. The service by Kenmore, San Juan Airlines and FedEx doesn't seem to have changed markedly for as long as I've been here. The reason everyone is speaking in terms of "noncompliance with safety standards" (which is, of course, a fairly easy "scare" sell to concerned citizens) is that the FAA generally requires compliance with ITS standards if the airport wants FAA grant money. We are all to assume that the availability of grant money</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>(soon a possible \$1 million a year) is non-negotiable, and that our island must change to insure an uninterrupted flow of said grant money. (We've seen this phenomenon all too often: bureaucrats see grant money and go chasing it without serious consideration of the strings attached. That's why we have an almost \$3 million Interstate style concrete bridge in Deer Harbor, replacing a simple wooden bridge that was sufficient in the opinion of the residents there and the first responders asked about it.)The bottom line appears to be that our airport is safe as it is. We might have to shell out some money to maintain it in the future without FAA help, but that discussion apparently wasn't even considered by the consultants because their marching orders were to provide plans that would allow the Port to provide the requisite FAA grant assurances. (How much would it cost? How much per taxed parcel? Are there waivers for grant assurances?)Is there a safety issue? On the field, we have a handful of Caravan flights a day. (I was told that there are no data about commercial or general aviation use, now or over the past ten years, which I find incredible.) It seems that, on average, Kenmore air runs three flights in here on Caravans a day and FedEx, one or two (I only ever seen an afternoon FedEx.) I'm told there are now two locals who own Caravan-class aircraft. We are supposed to believe that four or five planes might collide on taxi and takeoff. I find that proposition almost ludicrous. First, they land on a regular schedule, perhaps two a morning, one at midday, and two in the afternoon. Three of the flights are operated by the SAME company, and surely they are aware of each other and of Fed Ex's schedule. I think we have more risk from earthquake and liquefaction at the field during an operation than of two Caravans "swapping paint." Yet we are presented as feasible options major realignment of the airport,</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>including taking land of adjacent property owners and moving our iconic terminal. Once again, we seem more motivated by the opportunity to “get grant money” and build a shiny new facility that no one I have spoken to wants. Is there a safety issue with Mount Baker Road? Has there ever been a reportable incident? Where is the report? Vehicles spend mere seconds in the runway zone. Pilots are trained to land carefully, and following the instruments will never crash into the roadway. Despite these facts, we are being told that we must move the major highway on the island, and divert it through a roundabout (!) and several turns to save ourselves? Sorry, but that makes no sense. Nor does having traffic pour into Enchanted Forest Road near the schools. Our County has a longstanding commitment to rural character, and to avoiding suburban or big city infrastructure. It is a conscious trade-off from technical perfection. Do we need new facilities at the airport? Not to my knowledge. I have heard that Aeronautical would like a bigger facility. And perhaps FedEx wants an indoor facility. So build one in the existing parking lot and rearrange parking. The de-icing facility seems particularly odd. Who flies in that weather?? And how have they managed it in the past? I thought I also saw an alternative proposal to shorten the runway to make the Mount Baker Road issue disappear. But that would seem to threaten the availability of Caravan traffic. A bit spiteful, that seems. We need Caravans. Caravans have flown here safely for decades. Perhaps I misunderstand the law and the facts. It would be good to have the populace educated about them then. The recent meeting supposedly designed to do so was a disaster. I recommend that the Port call another meeting and have it in a building that accommodates 200-300 people, because that will be the number who have questions and comments. And have the meeting</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>have questions and comments. And have the meeting after regular working hours so the people with regular jobs can attend. Also, have someone with better public relations skills chair the meeting. Be prepared to hear every person out, and be prepared to provide hard data about utilization or explain why it does not exist. Either way, you should hold the September meeting already scheduled in a very large facility. The fire hall room is insufficient. The Port conference room is certainly too small. Perhaps Orcas Center or Odd Fellows Hall would suffice. And you should make all the public comments available on the Port website right away. This is the least that the consultants could do to assist public participation. Thank you for listening. P.S. Doesn't the Port have responsibility for other forms of access such as boat? Why is the Port website focused solely on the airport?</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Greg Oaksen	gregoaksen@gmail.com	<p>Other than Alternative 1 I think the master plan options are inappropriate for an airport located within the Orcas village setting. The driver seems to be the size of aircraft and a more appropriate response is to limit aircraft size to fit the airport not the other way around - a case of "the tail wagging the dog". Further moving Mt. Baker Road is way overkill for a rather bogus safety issue.</p> <p>The planning process thus far is flawed with very little community input. There should have been public involvement from day 1. I was involved with Eastsound Subarea planning as part of the San Juan County Comprehensive Plan update and there was no indication of the Ports intentions on airport planning. That is surprising to say the least.</p> <p>I urge you to seriously consider the impacts of airport options on the Orcas community.</p>	Thank you for your comment.				
8/3/2018	Pierrette Guimond	pierretteguimond@gmail.com	<p>No to expansion . Mt Baker needs to remain as is</p> <p>Re routing Mt Baker Rd is not an option</p>	See previous comment on 8/3/2018				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	Susan Malins	susan.malins@gmail.com	<p>I have previously submitted a strong preference for Alternative 1: No Build</p> <p>I have also submitted questions of the Port, which have yet to be answered. The idea that any communications to/from the airport manager should only occur in person is unreasonable, &amp; the prospect unpleasant. The public meeting did not accommodate all citizens present to participate, and those who signed up to speak were never called upon. I hope the Port seizes the opportunity to have another public meeting and to gain public trust and understanding about the alternatives before us.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that Alternative 1 is so vague: "Alternative 1: No Build. Minor maintenance and management of the existing runway and taxiways with minor use of capital projects." A full explanation of what "minor maintenance &amp; management" and "minor use of capital projects" MEANS specifically would be an honest presentation and I request that explanation please.</p> <p>Much of the public looks at this from a perspective different from airport professionals. I suggest you professionalize your public interactions and communications immediately, and prevent further fracturing of our community. Thank you for your consideration</p>	<p>Ms. Malins, Thank you for your previous comment on the Orcas Airport Master Plan. The no build scenario must be examined, but is not a good option for the Port as the FAA requires them to make attempts, when able, to meet standards. Outside of FAA design standards there are many capacity issues. The terminal and cargo for example are already exceeding their capacity and need to be expanded or replaced. The next master plan meeting is September 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website this evening, September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them. Leah Henderson</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Nicole Cline	the3ncs@gmail.com	I have really no objection to the plans but I am curious instead of closing down Mt. Baker RD in front of the airport if you could install the arms that go up and down like on rail road crossings. Since they know when a plane is about to land it would be a feasible solution and I think it would gain way more community support.	Ms. Cline, Thank you for your prior comment regarding Mt. Baker Road. We did examine the potential of using a railroad type crossing at Mt. Baker Road. While I am not saying it is impossible there are numerous concerns about the risk to public safety with the fire station being so close. If the gates were down how could the fire department respond quickly? So we eliminated this from the preferred option. We hope you can join us at our next meeting on September 19 <sup>th</sup> . Thank you, Leah Henderson				
8/3/2018	Christopher Enderlein	christophenderlein@hotmail.com	The capital improvement priorities today compared to 27 years ago when the 1993 Plan was being drafted have shifted significantly. It was a much busier airport back then based on the 1987 sampling data. The published estimates of 43,343 operations in 1987 indicate it was four times busier than it is today. The projections put the airport at 73,490 operations by 2010 and runway widening, runway to taxi way separation and the runway conflict with Mount Baker Road was not addressed as an improvement need, or as safety concerns. Why are the current improvements of airport width and taxi way separation of such focus today, when they were seemingly non-issues previously ? With 43,000 operations back then, there was a mix of larger and smaller aircraft flying into the airport at the time. The 2008 Instrument Approach Feasibility Study identified airport operations at 58,272 for 2005, and the current Master Plan identifies 7330 operations ten years later during 2015, or about 1/6th of the 2005 annual operations published in the Study. This indicates approximately 50,000 annual operations are no longer occurring and the airport is operating at a capacity considerably less than previously forecast. That is a very large decline over the period of 1987 to 2018.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Christoph Enderlein	christophenderlein@hotmail.com	The layout and proposal as illustrated on Figure 6 leaves little area for a visual buffer, vegetation and landscaping opportunities along North Beach Road and Mount Baker Road. In the 1993 Master Plan, a recommendation was included to “Establish formal landscaping and building standards for the airport to maintain the overall aesthetics of the island.” This previous approach should continue with the current Plan. Further effort is needed to show how the development of this former agricultural property, can continue to contribute to the overall aesthetics of the island as further capital improvements are planned in a way to mitigate visual impacts with this undeveloped 6.5 acre parcel.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				
8/3/2018	Christoph Enderlein	christophenderlein@hotmail.com	A fairly extensive wetland system lies under and around the current airport location. Incremental and cumulative impacts from airport and County drainage ditches have changed the wetlands over the years. The current Master Plan Figures 1 through 9 use the terminology “potential wetlands.” Additional information is available through the National Wetland Inventory mapping and has also been evaluated by the Army Corp of Engineers. The Master Plan in 1993 recognized the importance and need to “determine the exact extent of wetlands on airport property.” Now, 25 years later, and funded from federal money, Figures 1 through 9, should clearly identify the wetlands on Port property. Since future FAA funding is being contemplated through this master planning process, the FAA NEPA document will need to discuss how both past cumulative impacts and future impacts to this wetland system will be addressed so federal airport improvement funding provides for mitigation and does not cause further wetland loss or degradation.	Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	Christoph Enderlein	christophenderlein@hotmail.com	<p>The current alternatives do not provide any information regarding noise impacts to the Eastsound and North Beach Road corridor. The use of day-night average sound levels (Ldn) is not a detailed method for evaluating impacts to receiving properties, since it averages periods of high sound pressure levels with all periods of low levels. The Eastsound airport with approximately 9000 flight operations and an available 8760 hours in the year illustrates how the aircraft operation sound pressures are averaged out over a large period of time with little or no aircraft operations. When noise levels are studied by the NEPA document, background, median and maximum aircraft operations sound pressure levels at the property boundaries should be presented during the noise impact analysis.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				
8/3/2018	Christoph Enderlein	christophenderlein@hotmail.com	<p>During the airport meeting on July 26th, the comment was made that the majority of future funding would come from federal funds from taxpayers. In the 1993 Master Plan, it was made clear that funds will come from the National Aviation Trust Fund, where funds are generated exclusively from user fees and not from federal taxpayer funds. Individuals who do not use or directly benefit from an airport or its related services are not contributing to its operation or improvement. A clarification or confirmation of accuracy regarding the current/future FAA funding source will be helpful.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment that you sent last month regarding the Orcas Island Airport Master Plan Update. The website recorded your comments, but due to some technical glitches it did not forward those to us for a response. We regret the delay in getting back to you. Thank you</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	Kenneth Gibbs	kenneth.gibbs@gmail.com	<p>With the exception of #1 all of the proposed alternative would greatly expand the footprint of the airport, introducing dozens of new hangers, more than 100 parking spaces, acres of new hard-surface, etc.. Despite all of the "discussion" in various publications I have not yet reached a clear understanding w.r.t. the following:</p> <p>1) Has the FAA stated that these changes are mandatory? If not will the FAA "de-certify" the airport (i.e., force a reduction in the types of service now available)?</p> <p>2) Are current operations at the airport materially hampered by the present level of infrastructure? For example, is the terminal often crowded? Are there frequent occasions when the present parking space is insufficient? Is there a significant waiting list for additional hanger/tie-down space?</p> <p>3) Among the tables described as "Airfield Design Standard Deficiencies", are "FAA Design Standard(s)" requirements which we on Orcas are obliged to meet? Does Orcas need a de-icing facility? A provision for supplying Jet-A fuel?</p> <p>4) Have any of the present service providers: air ambulance, Kenmore, etc., indicated that unless this expansion takes place they will see operations on Orcas? If the question has not been put to them, why not?</p> <p>5) The fact that no significant accident has occurred at the airport at any time in the past six decades is pretty solid empirical evidence that operations at the airport are safe. It certainly trumps the "what if" scenarios concerning the untimely arrival of a semi-truck in the path a too low aircraft which has been suggested.</p> <p>Instead of "follow the money", I suggest "who benefits"? The larger community seems perfectly</p>	<p>Mr. Gibbs, Please find answers to your questions previously posed to the master plan team answered below. Thank you for your comments. With the exception of #1 all of the proposed alternative would greatly expand the footprint of the airport, introducing dozens of new hangers, more than 100 parking spaces, acres of new hard-surface, etc.. Despite all of the "discussion" in various publications I have not yet reached a clear understanding w.r.t. the following:1) Has the FAA stated that these changes are mandatory? If not will the FAA "de-certify" the airport (i.e., force a reduction in the types of service now available)? The FAA has stated that the Port must be making strides to meet standards. The airport is not a certificated airport. 2) Are current operations at the airport materially hampered by the present level of infrastructure? For example, is the terminal often crowded? Are there frequent occasions when the present parking space is insufficient? Is there a significant waiting list for additional hanger/tie-down space? Yes, the terminal is very crowded during flights and present parking is generally full. There is also interest in hangar construction and a larger cargo facility. 3) Among the tables described as "Airfield Design Standard Deficiencies", are "FAA Design Standard(s)" requirements which we on Orcas are obliged to meet? Does Orcas need a de-icing facility? A provision for supplying Jet-A fuel? All of the requirements are required. There has been interest in a deicing (more of a sunshade type facility not one with chemicals) so that Kenmore Air can overnight at ORS instead of deadheading to Friday Harbor. This would mean additional revenue for the Port. Jet A was not considered a need at this time. 4) Have any of the present service providers: air ambulance, Kenmore, etc., indicated that unless this expansion takes place they will see operations on Orcas? If the question has not been put to them, why not? The purpose of the project is to meet FAA standards and capacity needs. Kenmore Air and FedEx are in support of the master plan. 5) The fact that no significant accident has</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>happy with the level of service now available? This expansion would certainly benefit a small coterie of well healed part-timers but if offers little or nothing for those of us who moved to the Island specifically for its off the charts characteristics.</p>	<p>occurred at the airport at any time in the past six decades is pretty solid empirical evidence that operations at the airport are safe. It certainly trumps the "what if" scenarios concerning the untimely arrival of a semi-truck in the path a too low aircraft which has been suggested. Instead of "follow the money", I suggest "who benefits"? The larger community seems perfectly happy with the level of service now available? This expansion would certainly benefit a small coterie of well healed part-timers but if offers little or nothing for those of us who moved to the Island specifically for its off the charts characteristics. The master plan is not driven by money but is driven by safety requirements set forth by the FAA. Leah R. Henderson, C.M., ACE</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	Michael Stolmeier	smuggler@rockisland.com	<p>On behalf of Smugglers Villa Homeowners Association - 21 residential vacation properties located on the north shore immediately east of the airport.</p> <p>We strongly favor Alternative 1 - basically favoring no further airport expansion to the east, especially as may impacg our only north shore marina and the adjoining residential/resort neighborhood. For these reasons, the other intrusive alternatives are not acceptable. It is interesting that no alternatives are considered for displacing the centerline of the runway to the west, utilizing the undeveloped property that the port already owns (with FAA funding and use FAA stipulations involved). it is also interesting that none of the alternatives gives any consideration towards mitigating the current and future noise impacts of aircraft operations upon the surrounding Eastsound community. In particular, the all hours excessive noise from the aircraft runup area, located at the northeast end of the taxiway, is very disruptive. Surely there are effective measures to mitigate this constant irritant.</p> <p>For better or for worse, the Port of Orcas Airport is closely surrounded by the community of Eastsound, all within a confined geologic basin. Virtually everything that happens at our airport impacts the surrounding community. And Eastsound has been designated by San Juan County as the only Urban Growth Area on Orcas Island. Any reasonable master planning by the Port must take this reality into account, and plan for effective mitigation of the noise, hours of operation, and very real safety issues involved..</p>	<p>Hi Michael, Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018.</p>				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	Tim Blanchard	tim@blanchardmanning.com	<p>To the Commissioners of the Port of Orcas:</p> <p>Please consider the following comments for the Port of Orcas Airport Master Plan: GENERAL</p> <p>1.I am a full-time resident of Orcas Island who has owned property here since 2000 and who has lived here for more than ten years.</p> <p>2.I use the airport frequently, both for business and pleasure connections on Kenmore and San Juan Airlines.</p> <p>3.I depend on UPS (Aeronautical Services) and FedEx for business correspondence and for items that can only be purchased off-island.</p> <p>4.To date, we have been fortunate enough not to have required air evacuation for ourselves, our family or guests, but subscribe to both services and consider their availability critically important to island residents, one of the many trade-offs we make in choosing to live on a rural island rather than in an urban area.</p> <p>5.I have concerns about both the public communications used by the Port in this process, and about many of the changes that are being proposed for your consideration.</p> <p>PUBLIC COMMUNICATION/PARTICIPATION ISSUES</p> <p>I believe that this project is yet another example of the provision of the minimum mandated public process by government entities in our community. I understand that some Commissioners are puzzled why so few people showed up for the first two meetings. Islanders, while very concerned about protecting their community, are also busy living life and frequently working hard just making ends meet. A person cannot be multiple places at the same time and must triage the demands of competing public processes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your previous comment to the master plan team. Our next meeting is Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them. <b>Thank you,</b></p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>Accordingly, government entities should take steps to advise people as early as possible of the potential consequences of a proposal “ not simply that a periodic planning process is happening and not in fine-print legal notices. In this case, the notices should have stressed the potential for the proposed expansion of the airport to have dramatic impacts on the community. Identifying controversial issues clearly and early is important to avoiding the problem of misinformation flying about and panicked rhetoric that we frequently experience in San Juan County.</p> <p>CONCERNS REGARDING THE CHANGES UNDER CONSIDERATION</p> <p>I believe that the “safety” argument for rerouting Mount Baker Road is misplaced and over-weighted. A fundamental aspect of rural life and rural character is recognizing and promoting individual responsibility and enabling people to take safety precautions that they see fit based on their evaluation of the risks. It is impossible to eliminate all risk, and people who choose to live in remote and/or rural areas must accept additional risks for the opportunity to do so. We have all concluded that additional risk is reasonable to get to live where we do. In our community, we have invested in first responder capacity far superior to the capacity in most other rural areas of our size. That is an appropriate response to addressing some of the additional risk inherent in rural living. Adopting proposed safety measures that require damaging the character of our community is not reasonable. Accordingly, in my opinion, adding instrument approach systems was reasonable, but re-routing Mt. Baker Road as proposed, or any changes requiring traffic signals, should be a non-starter.</p> <p>The current situation at Mount Baker Road is a perfect example of this concept in practice. If anyone believes that driving through the RPZ on Mount Baker Road is too dangerous, alternative routes are already available to them. The School District could decide to re-route</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>to them. The School District could decide to re-route its bus if it determined that to be an appropriate safety precaution. Indeed, just as we expect of every pilot, we expect every driver, bicyclist, pedestrian, or equestrian on the public way to maintain appropriate situational awareness and exercise appropriate caution based on the circumstances they encounter. People should recognize that they are the crossing flight path and that there may be low flying aircraft at Mount Baker Road and are free and expected to proceed with appropriate caution in the circumstances.</p> <p>New is not always better. Plans for a shiny new airport terminal might be consistent with the vision of airport planners and consultants, but fail to consider the important role the current terminal and its surroundings, even including the "œsardine can" motif of the Aeronautical Services building, play in introducing visitors to our rural community. For many visitors, arriving at the Eastsound Airport is their first contact with our rural island community and those first impressions set the tone and influence visitors'™ expectations for their visit. Most visitors to Orcas are seeking to get out of town and away from the city to relax for a while. Arrival at the Eastsound terminal lets them know that Orcas is not just another suburban place with its cookie-cutter commuter airport or perhaps a theme-park rendition of a rural community, but the real thing"organic, yet functional.</p> <p>Please do not disregard the value of first impressions. Indeed, how many airport terminals are things that people, young and old alike, talk about when they get back to the city and tell their friends about "œwhat they did last summer.â€ Arriving at the Eastsound Airport -- viewing the airport during the downwind, on approach, and pulling up to the terminal-- is one of those Orcas experiences that people talk about years later (like walking out to Indian Island at low tide, seeing an eagle from Mountain Lake, or driving by</p>					



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>Cascade Lake). First impressions matter and our rural character is what brings visitors and new neighbors to Orcas. Please take care to protect these experiences for future generations of islanders and their visitors.</p> <p>Design Elements/Results That Should Be Non-Starters</p> <p>1.Any changes (physical or operating policy/procedure) that would result in a curtailment of Kenmore service to Orcas Island. Many islanders, including full-time islanders, depend on Kenmore to enable us to live and work in the community. Nothing should be done to CURTAIL the operation of Caravans and similar planes.</p> <p>2.Any changes (physical or operating policy/procedure) that would result in a limitation of air evacuation services for our community. It seems unlikely that the existing airfield cannot support those functions.</p> <p>3.Any changes (physical or operating policy/procedure) that would result in a significant curtailment of UPS (Aeronautical Services) or FedEx services to our community.</p> <p>4.Any changes that will require changes in ground transportation away from the airport that are to be determined in the future. If there are to be impacts on ground transportation, they should be addressed now. It is difficult to overstate the impact roads and road design have on a place. The feel of a place can be changed instantly from rural to urban by changes in a road, and changes in roads are very difficult to reverse.</p> <p>5.Any re-routing of Mount Baker Road to North Beach Road, especially via Enchanted Forest Road. Changes in Enchanted Forest or North Beach Roads to accommodate additional traffic from Mount Baker</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>Road would irreparably harm the rural character of Eastsound and Orcas. Such changes would also result in a net increase in safety-risks in the affected areas due to the increased risk of traffic accidents, which, of course, are far more likely to occur than an aircraft-motor vehicle accident on current Mount Baker Road south of the runway.</p> <p>6.Any change that could result in requiring a traffic signal on Orcas. We must avoid creating a situation that would require the urbanization of our community and traffic lights unavoidably change the character of an intersection and impose an urban contrivance interrupting the organic flow of a place. It might not be possible to avoid traffic signals forever, but we should do our best to design projects to avoid the need for them. (Please remember number 4, above, when considering this item.)</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments.</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Sadie Bailey	Salim3796@yahoo.com	Hello Leah and DOWL engineers, Port Commissioner and Port Manager; Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed Master Plan update and expansion alternatives. The Port did not specify the exact time stamp of when today you will close the comment period: before-midnight? today at 5 pm? May I please have an answer to that query as soon as possible? I'm confused: Is this a re-write of the entire master plan or just some expansion drawings and a powerpoint presentation? I have read the documents previously and lately provided by the Port, and still see no verifiable data driving the need for this type and scope of the expansion and becoming a B-2 design airport. The Port would do well to redress the public concerning comment deadline (extend to September's	Thank you for your comments.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>workshop and beyond) and call another Port Public meeting - done right - a short presentation by Port Commissioners, if necessary - with the majority of time used for public access. Please also seek out the individuals who came here from other parts of the state or country - and never got to speak. The port has their contact information. We want any future meetings of that scope recorded and podcasted - with a written transcript. I respectfully request that DOWL make a place on its website to put all of our Public comments, so the we the Public have access to reading them throughout this Master Plan review, and in perpetuity - on the Port website or some other Public governmental website. This would go a long way to opening the doors to Public Trust and proving Port accountability, integrity, and transparency. The Public got blamed for not showing up at Port meetings and poorly attended and advertises workshops - but it wasn't until June that expansion plan drawings were even available to the Public - and before that, this process was touted as a Master Plan Update - not plans for expansion; so how could we know? Even surrounding landowners, like Brandt's Landing Marina, were not properly notified. Included is an attachments of my long list of questions - not finished or all inclusive by any means. I will send the revised longer complete document as soon as I have included everything in it. That would supercede this one. I will also be sending another email which includes petitions with 194 signatures gathered from July 7 through</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>yesterday; I have to reduce those files so they will attach. Look for those in about an hour and please include them. We will continue to gather signatures on that petition until September's workshop date. Hopefully you have also been sent the online petitions circulating. We are told "no big deal, it'll never happen, not for 10 or maybe 20 years" - if that is true, why the push to have expansion plans of this magnitude in the Master Plan at all at this time? Where's the data driving this need? How many years before build are we in this process do you estimate? Citizens at the Special Port meeting had some great ideas on how to address staying in the B-1 airport category. I ask that those citizen ideas be factored-in, and that the Port make every effort to contact the corporations and private individuals basing Caravans at the airport - and codify uses back to no bigger planes than the Cessna 207s. I sincerely believe that with working together - the Port, the Citizens, DOWL, and the FAA, that we can come to some much less egregious and impactful solution to our safety and compliance issues.'ll be continuing to send comment, and hope that DOWL will not cut off consideration of our comments when this day ends.</p>					

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	Peter Carlson	petercarlson@hotmail.com	<p>Orcas Island Airport Commission-My name is Peter Carlson, and I am writing to you regarding the current issues around the Eastsound/ Orcas Island Airport Master Plan. I am a small business owner, property owner, community volunteer, and farmer on Orcas and have lived year-round in this community since 2011. After attending the July 26th meeting at the Fire Hall and reading through the plans presented by your offices both on paper and on your website I am writing to encourage you to leave our airport as-is, it is my express belief that our current facilities are adequate for the community on a year-round basis. While there may indeed be a couple months of the year that we face pressure from an increase in traffic, the summer months when the islands are a tourist destination, that does not justify a major spending project or plan to increase our current facilities. Expansion for expansion's sake is a dead-end game, and threatens the very character of our beautiful island community which both draws visitors and keeps our permanent communities vibrant, unique, and alive. Further, I believe that you have yet to show this community where a legitimate safety issue exists that justifies an increased federal presence at our airport, either economically or in other resources. I urge you to listen to the many voices on this island that are asking you to pay closer attention to what the needs of the community are from the standpoint our citizens, who use these services and will live with the consequences of unnecessary infrastructure and air traffic. Please choose Alternative 1, and we can work with the commercial carriers to find a compromise to allow them to continue to bring in aircraft that are currently beyond the regulations for our airfield. There must be a more creative solution that involve inspired leadership and management that can solve these relatively minor space issues within our current budget and without major infrastructure changes. This is not a burden that we should automatically assume on behalf of commercial interests, or in the interest of pursuing expansion for the sake of expansion. Let's approach this issue as a community</p>	<p>Hi Peter, Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them.</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/3/2018	Andrea Cohen	orcasandrea@gmail.com	Greetings....I have been an Orcas Island resident since 2005. I was a customer service representative For Kenmore Air for seven years, from 2008-2015, based at the Eastound Airport. My residence, which I own, is at 1702 North Beach Road in Eastsound. I was away for the entire month of June, and returned in early July to a great deal of community conversation about proposed future changes to the airport. The Master Plan graphics were not posted on the Port of Orcas website at that time, but I viewed the options at the meeting on 7/26.I was more than startled to see that, with the exception of the no-build, option 1, all other options include using the current open space on Mt. Baker Road (owned by the Port of Orcas) to relocate the airport terminal building, with adjacent buildings, hangars, taxiways and parking lots, with the development extending all the way to North Beach.	Hi Andrea ,Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire & Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018.We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have as we answer them.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>development extending all the way up to North Beach Road. I must express my strong opposition to these proposals. I feel that moving the hub of the airport - the structures, automobile traffic, activity, noise and airplane movement- out of its current 'tucked-away' location to a much more visible location closer to the heart of town is a drastic change to the character of the area that would dramatically and negatively impact Eastsound and its residents. Residents and facilities near the North Beach Rd-Mt. Baker Rd. intersection would be particularly affected, as this currently bucolic setting would be completely transformed into a bustling commercial center with airplane, truck and automobile noise, activity and emissions. I understand the need to move the terminal in order to increase the space between the current taxiway and runway. Is there no way to make use of the space northeast of the current terminal building, where numerous rented hangar buildings exist, for a relocated terminal? I would really like to see at least one proposal that relocates the building somewhere other than Mt. Baker Road. It seems to me that plans such as these, which would directly impact the entire Eastsound and Island community should be created in cooperation with the County's Planning Department and the EPRC, not just submitted to them for approval after the design process is complete. I attempted to attend the 7/26 Port of Orcas meeting at which Master Plan options were presented and discussed, but I, along with quite a few others, were told that the room was at its legal occupancy limit and that no more persons could be admitted. I was dismayed to see the meeting proceed, despite the fact that there were</p>	<p>you have so we can answer them.</p>				



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>people who could not access the room or hear the proceedings. After several minutes, a microphone was set up and I continued to stand outside the room and listen, but was not able to see any presentation materials. This was clearly not an optimal way or place to conduct a public meeting of great community importance. In my view, the meeting should have been immediately postponed when it became apparent that all interested citizens would not be able to attend, and rescheduled in a larger space. I would strongly support another public forum where the presentation materials can be projected so that all can see them. I would further recommend that, in addition to drawings in plan, there also be a concept drawing in elevation to help the public to visualize a proposed new terminal/ hangar/ parking lot development along Mt. Baker Road. Thank you for your consideration and your efforts.</p>					

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/2018	Kathy Ciskowski	ciskokid@rockisland.com	Hi, 1. Please do not do anything that will allow larger planes to land at the Eastsound airport. 2. Do not move Mt. Baker Road. 3. Be aware of any noise or traffic activity that will impact Eastsound and do all you can to mitigate that noise.	Hi Kathy Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire & Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. We hope you will join us September 19th and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them.				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/3/21018	Robert and Laurie Liebmann	orcas.isle.bob@gmail.com	<p>I have addressed this issue to Tony Simpson on many occasions and he has done a lot to help and things have improved since he took over as manager. However he can't do it alone and there needs to be more effort put into an enforceable Noise Abatement plan. Here is a portion of an email that I recently sent to Tony Simpson addressing the issue: "The airport expansion meeting last Thursday got me to thinking about the potential increase in airport parking and hangar space and the possible increase in aircraft traffic as well as the size of aircraft using the airport. What effect might this have on noise pollution as the airport and the aircraft using it are the major noise polluters on the island. I went on line and googled "noise abatement for port of orcas airport" and got this: "Takeoff Runway 34 – Climb to 1000 FT or 1 NM Straight Out Before Turning. 0700-2200 Recommended Hrs for Noise Abatement". So my question, what about all of us folks that live south of the airport? Don't we matter? Then I did notice the link to the 'Noise Abatement Brochure' and was very pleasantly surprised. This looks like a very comprehensive plan that will go a long way to mitigating the noise issue. Why isn't it being implemented or will it be implemented in the future? From my observations a significant number of pilots don't know about it, are choosing to ignore it, or it is not being enforced and is just for show. Please let me know what the plan is here as I am confused about the obvious contradiction between what is posted on</p>	<p>Mr. Liebmann, Thank you for your comment. We will add this to our comment log. We understand the environmental concerns, specifically noise. We do not anticipate a change in the type of aircraft using the Airport, however we are forecasting a small gradual increase over the next 20 years in the number of operations at the Airport. After the Master Plan concludes the Port will need to conduct an environmental study, which will include noise analysis, for any proposed changes. Unfortunately the community cannot control the airspace with any sort of regulations. Aircraft are not supposed to fly below 500', 1000' above congested areas, 2000' feet horizontally, unless you are on approach or have an emergency.  <a href="https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/field_offices/fsdo/lgb/local_more/media/FAA_Guide_to_Low-Flying_Aircraft.pdf">https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/field_offices/fsdo/lgb/local_more/media/FAA_Guide_to_Low-Flying_Aircraft.pdf</a>. Hopefully this FAA document helps. Thank you, Leah</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>http://www.portoforcas.com/noise-abatement/ and what is published in your brochure."In response I was told that enforcement was the issue and that this excellent plan was basically a "recommendation". Many decades ago when I flew for the military the word "recommendation" was enough. No more needed to be said. Now, in the minds of some pilots, that word seems to mean "ignore". Or, perhaps they just don't know there is a "Noise Abatement Plan". This points out the need for some positive, proactive action when it comes to disseminating the Noise Abatement Procedures brochure. There are many methods available to insure that pilots receive, read and acknowledge the contents of this brochure. Your help is needed to address environmental concerns such as Noise Abatement and the impact of aircraft noise on the quality of life of Orcas Island residents." Thank you for your interest and attention to this crucial matter.</p>					

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/5/2018	Robert Dash	rdashing46@yahoo.com	<p>I understand that the issues are complex and I appreciate that much work has been done. It's unfortunate that more effort wasn't made to bring in "the opposition" early on in the process so that much of the current controversy could have been avoided or at least greatly reduced. Some of my initial fears have been diminished due to the dialog of the last couple weeks, but I am still opposed to a giant bank of hangars at the North Beach Road/Mount Baker Road intersection. It looks like a recipe for an ugly industrialized entry corridor into town. I am concerned about any encroachments on Brandt's Landing or neighbors along North Beach Road. I understand the issues surrounding moving Mount Baker Road but a great deal more effort would be needed to explore all options, in order to attempt consensus with those who are strongly opposed. All of these challenges could be lessened with a sense of more humility in the port leadership. I know that this has been a trying process for all concerned. Some of that is due to what I see and sometimes feel as the lack of trust in port leadership. Hang in there—include your "enemies" in the process, and refrain from rolling your eyes in response to citizen concerns.</p>	<p>Hi Robert, Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire &amp; Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018. We hope you will join us September 19th!</p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/6/2018	Norris Suzanne Carlson	Suzanne Heyd sheyd@snet.net	<p>Dear Project Manager Leah Henderson: As an Orcas Islander, I am writing to you to register my comments on the Port of Orcas Master Plan. My first and overarching concern has to do with the need to weigh and consider each and every detail of any plan in terms of the rural nature and character of our community. The Orcas airport is a rural airport, serving a rural community of (last I checked) less than 5,000 year-round residents, who live and work and die here in very large part because of this character—we feel a sacred and enduring duty to protect this essence, even as change must and will come. There are all kinds of threats to the rural nature of this place—and of course not of them can be avoided or rebuffed. Change at some level is inevitable, and in the case of the airport, safety considerations are absolutely valid. But it is my very deepest hope that the Commissioners will sift through these proposed changes, consider the need for preservation of the rural landscape and its people, and decide firmly to honor this preservation as they make their final decisions. There must be a way that the safety improvements necessary for the airport do not take away from the character of this place. This requires discipline, I think, in thinking about each aspect of change from the current airport, which serves our community well in every way—just as it is. Rural people put their heads together and figure out how to solve the real problems they face with creativity, ingenuity, and making the best use of the limited resources they have at hand—it’s a matter of practicality, survival, and a strong will for self sufficiency and self determination. It is this spirit I</p>	Thank you for your comments.				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>hope is brought to bear on this endeavor. So, when it comes to money offered by the FAA, we must be absolutely clear that while it's nice to have help—the money comes with strings attached, and although there is nothing wrong with getting government help if we qualify for it and it is earmarked to help us achieve OUR goals, we must not chase the money—Tony Simpson stated that he would sure like to get access to the 1 million dollars that could be offered, but the Port has 750K now, and access to at least 150K in FAA funds. Enough is enough. Let's make good use of what we have and not chase around a 'bigger is better' ideal, which is how so many rural places lose their character—forever. We must live within our means! There is so much dignity in this approach. Bigger is not better. The greed for more more more is a sickness we must eschew. In terms of expansion of the current facility, I see that the proposal calls for rezoning of residential areas, and the possibility of buying surrounding land from local owners. The million dollars might come in handy for enticing owners to sell, but the airport surely can make safety improvements within its own existing borders. Can not the airport be brought into safety compliance without expanding it into residential zones or taking over new parcels of natural landscape? On the issue of moving Mt Baker Road, your proposal would either run the new main road through a wetlands or through a school zone, and potentially add traffic controls that a rural community such as ours definitely do not want. No, the moving of the road out of the Protection Zone seems a brutish way to solve the problem. There is no statistical evidence that the road is a safety hazard. if</p>					

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>statistical evidence that the road is a safety hazard, if there has been a total of one plane/car collisions since records began in the 1950's. What about creating some kind of higher fencing or other barrier so that planes taking off and landing would need to clear something higher and thus be at less risk of clipping a car? I ask the commissioners to think outside of the box here. And remember that Friday Harbr airport has asked and been granted some concessions for certain standards, given, I am sure, its rural nature. In all cases, let's capitalize on our small and rural nature, and ask the FAA to grant as many exceptions and concessions as we can. I have heard Tony Simpson say that this Master Plan is being pursued only for safety. However, I also heard him say at the Fire Hall meeting that the plans have included 5 acres of airplane hangars (I think that is the Westside Development Plan?), that could be built if a developer chose to do so (ie, that it would not cost the Port money). What, exactly, does the prospect of 5 acres of airplane hangars have to do with the safety of the airport—no matter WHO is paying for them or how much revenue they might bring in? This is an example of a threat to the rural character of the airport (and the island) and it has nothing to do with the safety of our airport. It encourages wealthy developers to find ever more creative ways to colonize our island and capitalize on it. I ask that ALL aspects of the Master Plan proposals be scrutinized for this kind of non-safety add-on—and that they be categorically scrubbed from consideration. We do not need jet fuel pumps, more parking spaces/lots, a fancier terminal with extra office space, etc. I understand that the</p>					



<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
			<p>with extra office space, etc. I understand that the terminal might need to be moved, fair enough. But please keep everything modest, visually simple, and honor the natural beauty of where we live as a priority and not an afterthought.</p>					

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/7/2018	Stu & Patsy Stephens	stu@orcas-stephens.com	To Tony Simpson, Airport Manager, and all Port Commissioners, We have owned property on Orcas since 1967 and have been full-time residences since 1979. We have benefited from the Orcas Airport and want to continue to enjoy those benefits. Please be sure that you approve whatever is required by the FAA to ensure FAA funding so that you can maintain the use of the airport for the Caravans that presently are utilized by FedEx, Kenmore Air and Island Air(for medical evacuation).Thank You	Hi Stu and Patsy ,Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire & Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018.We hope you will join us September 19th!				
8/12/2018	Mike Voetglin	orcas08@gmail.com	I have attended one planning meeting and read the materials. I have a serious concern with one aspect of what is being recommended to the Commissioners- shortening the runway overrun by 200 feet. The current runway length of 2901 ft does not provide adequate margin to get some landing airplanes stopped on a gusty day, or get an airplane stopped in time if it was to develop engine or many other issues sometimes experienced on takeoff. Even if this action does not shorten the actual runway, we would loose the overrun area which has to be a major safety concern. Today, many airplanes use that overrun as an unauthorized displaced threshold, and there is a reason for that- the runway is uncomfortably short. If Mount Baker Road needs to be moved, then either lengthen the runway somewhat, or build a true displaced threshold at both ends. To do otherwise is simply unsafe.	Hi Mike, Thank you for your comment. Please save the date for a September Public Open House. The meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19th at 1pm – 2pm at Orcas Island Fire & Rescue 45 Lavender Lane, Eastsound, Washington or from 5pm – 8:30 pm at Orcas Center 917 Mt Baker Rd, Eastsound, Washington. Formal presentations will be given at 5:30pm and 7:30pm for 30 minutes. The two presentations will be identical and there will be 30 minutes for public questions immediately following the presentation. All open house materials, including the slides, will be posted on the Port of Orcas website by September 5, 2018. Public comments will be accepted on the preferred alternative from September 5 to October 5, 2018.We hope you will join us September 19th!				

Date	Name	Email	Comment	Response	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4	Medium
8/17/2018	Bob and Cheryl Castagna	tony7nick4@aol.com	<p>As a representative of the owners of Brandt's Landing Marina, we wish to submit the attached documents for review by Dowl in the ongoing Port of Orcas Expansion plans. Like the Port, Brandt's Landing has long range plans to expand the marina basin to provide additional moorage and other marina related services for Orcas Island. Recently we have been working with the State Parks Department to explore the possibility of providing a much needed Vessel sewage pumpout facility that would in essence service the nearby Island State Parks (Sucia. Matia, Patos, etal) This project was anticipated to expand the marina waterway footprint to the west. (draft proposal attached) We also have long range plans to significantly expand and upgrade the marina facilities and have conceptual plans for this future expansion. Unfortunately, the most detailed of plans are not available in electronic format for inclusion in this e-mail. Unlike the Port, we do not have the FAA to contribute 90% towards our project and the projected permitting &amp; construction costs have put these plans on hold. There are grants available for adding transient moorage to the facility and we have been actively researching our options. The airport expansion proposals would in essence derail our existing plans as currently designed. The expansion scenario would be drastically changed and most likely scrapped if the Port decides to expand to the east. We understand the need to plan for future growth and we are not against development. We just want to make sure that the marina will be able to function profitably for the foreseeable future. Perhaps there can be a mutually agreed upon development scenario that incorporates both the Airport needs and the marina desires. Any airport expansion that limits the marina access or moorage capacity must be remedied by the Port if the Port plan is to proceed as promised (no eminent domain). The cost to cure the impacts to the marina facility would have to be borne by the Port and/or FAA. We look forward to hearing back from you so that any plan moving forward will take into account the impacts to the surrounding</p>	<p>Mr. Castagna, Thank you for the information and the below email. We will review internally and let you know if we have any specific questions. We absolutely agree that the Port and Marina can work together to ensure any impacts to the Marina are financially borne by the Port and in close coordination and support from both parties. We will be in touch again soon. Thank you, <b>Leah R. Henderson, C.M.,</b></p>				

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Response 2</u>	<u>Response 3</u>	<u>Response 4</u>	<u>Medium</u>
8/20/2018	David Kobrin	maxalice@rockisland.com	<p>landowners. A functioning marina on the north shore of Orcas Island is an asset that cannot be discounted in the Port's planning. Working together is in everyone's best interest!</p> <p>Bob Castagna for Brandt's Landing Marina</p>	<p>Mr. Kobrin, There is no intention or plans to make the runway suitable for larger aircraft. You are correct that some private larger aircraft use the airport today. The purpose of the master plan is to meet the FAA's standards for the aircraft already serving the airport today. Thank you for your question. Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.</p>				