Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
1	10/31/2017	Kathi Ciskowski	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?
Response 1			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
Response 2			We will be gone during the month of January so won't be able to participate in that event. Darn! Kathi
Response 3			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
Response 4			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
2	2/3/2018	Michel Vekved	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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 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.
3	2/5/2018	Margaret Manning	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.
Response 1			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: http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/ 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
4	5/4/2018	Margart Manning	Please stop "improving" everything. It's not broken.
Response 1			Your comment was received, thank you for your comment.
5	6/7/2018	Charles Toxley	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
6	6/8/2018	Stephanie Johnson O'Day	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?

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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: http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/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 HendersonOrcas Airport Master Plan Project Manager
7	6/13/2018	Ken Katz	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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 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
8	6/14/2018	Mike Speece	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
9	6/18/2018	Rachel Van Pelt	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
10	6/20/2018	Jim Hostler	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 helicoper landing pad. Would love to have 1500-2200 ft. of turf runway for us old tail draccer guys.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
11	6/21/2018	Charles Kangaroo House B&B	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
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
12	7/6/2018	Diane Boteler	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
Response 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
13	7/6/2018	Fred Klein	Is there not a current waiver of the for a certain distance between centerlines of runway & parallel taxiway due to Cessna Caravan opereations? Given the modest number of ops w/ the Caravan, can the waiver be extended into the future?
Response 1			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.
14	7/7/2018	David Turnoy	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.
Response 1			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.
15	7/7/2018	Paula Treneer	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.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
16	7/7/2018	Lisa Byers	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 safety. 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 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
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
17	7/7/2018	Cathy Vierthaler	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.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
18	7/7/2018	Tina Whitman	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
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
19	7/7/2018	Nathan Brandow	The plan clearly ingnores the importance of marine access and donesnt adequately consider the impact of the devekopmet in yhe neighboring marina.
Response 1			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.
20	7/7/2018	Robert Griffith	Expansion of Eastsound airport is a terrible idea and I'm having a hard time comprehending how this made it to a "plan". 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. 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 & private jets, increasing noise & 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. 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. 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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.
21	7/7/2018	Keara Axelrod	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. 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? Thank you for your time and consideration, Keara Axelrod

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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.
22	7/7/2018	Evelyn Fuchser	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
Response 1			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: http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/ , 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 2			I did notice significant development along the westside of the airstrip in one of the plans, I am aware of a serious shortcoming regarding dead end access on this side of the airstrip. I is highly inappropriate to further exasperate a problem of the dead end corridor which from its outset was strictly limited to residential access. Locally there seems a severe shortcoming in understanding the problem nature in the access egress in our roadways most likely you on the other hand would understand. If development are to occur on this side an additional outlet onto mount Baker road most certainly needs to be developed. Possibly a collector along the taxiway nearest the airstrip. Otherwise a large swath of land would need to be acquired elsewhere, ejecting upward from seaview to Blanchard. Your comments are appreciated. Also as a note in that regard the port property along seaview which is light industrial zoned can and frequently does conflict with the neighborhood traffic particularly a lot of pedestrian traffic along where the multi unit residential complexes are located on both sides of the street but particularly on the downhill side. Semi trucks on the down slope northbound lane and children playing especially at the curve is frightening to watch. This was true when silt was recently removed from under the new pavement areas. Evelyn
Response 3			I am disturbed that the following additional comment were made and yet do not appear to be in the record of public comment.My concerns are directly relational to the departments of transportation, statewide, nationwide and even Global concerns of present in transportation planning circles.Emergency access egress and interconnectivity of roadways is not properly left to emergency arrangements as they may occur, but must be planned for appropriately and preemptively during the earliest planning stages.Likewise the recent inappropriateness of a commercial propane purveyor assuming rights to private property as emergency egress without authority of the port and other private property holder agreements otherwise easements in place. It is past time someone take this problem serious. Evelyn F. Fuchser
Response 4			Evelyn, Our considered development on the west portion of our property would certainly not include propane storage and is similar to your use of your property. I find it hard to swallow that if your use and access from Seaview Street is acceptable that our similar use from Seaview would be unacceptable. I too am concerned by past uses of surrounding property for fuel storage "in transit" as I have responded with OIFR to hazmat incidents (plural) involving the same. Honestly, I'd like to buy the Propane property as an individual, group or Port to keep it out of Propane storage use. Capitalism is the easiest way to defeat such nonsense. So, in reality, regulated use, such as airplane storage or freight forwarding seems about as innocuous as could be for a parcel that is zoned SLI.I will forward your comments (via this email) and ensure they are included in the comment record. Thank you for your interest in our Master Planning process. Tony

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 5			Hi Tony, I don't think you quite understood my concern, this on 2 points. In transportation planning a dead end road is generally restricted in use to a set of occupancy limitations, this based most commonly on the length of dead end street, and on number of occupants. While I certainly would not object to the extension of occupancy if residential numbers were extremely limited, my point is that the resident occupancy numbers on this dead end are already significantly higher than would be considered normally acceptable. I am saying it's time to restrict "any" further development until an outlet is created to redirect traffic out providing reasonable circulation. Seaview is overtaxed as a dead end. This road should be redirected towards and into Blanchard rd. The nearest straight improved roadway that could release the current congestion. And or the additional congestion that would be brought via any west side expansion. I do not consider the airstrip or the taxiway appropriate emergency egress for anyone on the west side because the airstrip the most critical of public facility's. To keep open in any case of emergency. Street internectivity are the most basic of life safety consideration. Evelyn F Fuchser
23	7/8/2018	Domenic	We Want Option A! Do Nothing.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
24	7/8/2018	Melanie Thea Patten	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 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 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
25	7/8/2018	Paul Vierthaler	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. 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
Response 1			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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
26	7/8/2018	Jeff McCaull	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. 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. 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 being 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. Expansion of the Orcas airport would be a BAD IDEA. Alternative #1 (No Build) is the only option that makes sense at this time.
Response 1			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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
27	7/8/2018	Ken and Miki Brostrom	Re Proposed Eastsound Airport Expansion Please consider the following comments in the determination of any future expansion of the Eastsound Airport: 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: 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? 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 737â€™s? There is no way Orcas Island can provide the ground facilities to accommodate large numbers of 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? 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. 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. 5.Brandtâ€™s Landing. Water transportation is an integral element in the history of these islands and in the economy, both as essential 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. 6.Our Future. Yes, the qualities these islands have to offer, peace, quiet, serenity, healthy forests, clean water and beaches, are attracting â€“ and will continue to attract â€“ people for far-away and very wealthy celebrities and others with means, who have large planes and entourages 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			these actions of expansion are regretted. 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 â€“ and maintain it â€“ as the best class B-1 airport it can possibly be, without expansion. And without putting these islands on a course toward becoming the Nantucket or Hamptons of the Northwest. Respectfully Submitted, Ken and Miki Brostrom, Waldron Island
Response 1			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 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
28	7/8/2018	Steven Schiller	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.
Response 1			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
29	7/9/2018	Joe Symons	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.
Response 1			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
30	7/9/2018	Melinda Milligan	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.
Response 1			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
31	7/9/2018	Ryan Page	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?

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 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.
32	7/9/2018	Greg Oaksen	I prefer Alternative 1. Do not expand the airport footprint!
Response 1			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
33	7/9/2018	Richard Clark	Your plans to expand the airport is misplaced, the level of transparency of which youâ€™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 theyâ€™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...
Response 1			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
34	7/9/2018	Jari Brenner	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!
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
35	7/9/2018	Lynn Baker	Hi -- In considering options for the future of the Orcas airport, please consider: 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. 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. Thank you!
Response 1			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
36	7/9/2018	Ken Katz	Iâ€™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
Response 1			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
37	7/9/2018	Robert Gambell	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.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
38	7/10/2018	Suzie Thomas	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			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
39	7/10/2018	Walter Corbin	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.
Response 1			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
40	7/10/2018	Michael Johnson	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-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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			(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.
Response 1			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
41	7/10/2018	Lyman Griswold	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			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
42	7/10/2018	Michael Hurwicz	I choose Alternative 1: no build.
Response 1			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
43	7/10/2018	Jaime Rankin	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
44	7/10/2018	Wayne Rankin	I accept alternative number one: "no build"!
Response 1			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
45	7/10/2018	Errol Speed	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			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
46	7/10/2018	Erica Ekrem	I'm a concerned community member and year-round resident since 2004.."I choose Alternative 1: no build"
Response 1			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
47	7/10/2018	Cole Sisson	Regarding the airport expansion. I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
48	7/10/2018	Phillip Miller	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			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
49	7/10/2018	Carl & Sandy Burger	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.
Response 1			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
50	7/10/2018	Susan Osborn	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			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
51	7/10/2018	Charlotte Sumrall	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
52	7/10/2018	Didier Gincig	I beg you PLEASE NO!!!
Response 1			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
53	7/10/2018	Jill Sherman	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
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
54	7/10/2018	Sharon Abreu	I choose Alternative 1: no build.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
55	7/10/2018	Dan Crossman	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
56	7/10/2018	Tracey Levine	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
57	7/10/2018	Lesley liddle	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
58	7/10/2018	Lorna Rhodes	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
59	7/10/2018	Tim White	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
60	7/10/2018	Amy Harder	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
61	7/10/2018	Michael Riordan	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
62	7/10/2018	Ryan Morris	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
63	7/10/2018	Christian Hogle	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
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
64	7/10/2018	philip cohn	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
65	7/10/2018	Judy Stockwell	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
66	7/10/2018	Jill Bates	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
67	7/10/2018	Anthony Suruda	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
68	7/10/2018	Harvey Himelfarb	I strongly support alternative one: No build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
69	7/10/2018	Laura Hasselman	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
70	7/10/2018	Gregory Kramer	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
71	7/10/2018	Susan Malins	I favor NO CHANGE/Expansion
Response 1			Thank you for your comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
72	7/10/2018	Margaret M. Manning	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
73	7/10/2018	Diane Berreth	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
74	7/10/2018	Mandy Troxel	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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			of life over corporate profit.
Response 1			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
75	7/10/2018	Ed Suji .	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!
Response 1			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
76	7/10/2018	Mike Parnell	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?
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
77	7/10/2018	Stehphanie Buffman	Dear Leah, 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?
Response 1			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?
78	7/10/2018	Laine Pechacek	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.
Response 1			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.
79	7/10/2018	Mindy Kayl	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 www.mindykayl.com or email me if you are interested in any contract work. Thank you for your time, Mindy Kayl
Response 1			Thank you for your comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
80	7/10/2018	David Kobrin	To the Master Plan Team: 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. 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? I believe these are pertinent questions that require public answers before final decisions are made. 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. Unless there are reasons to support the expansion that have not yet been made public, I am decidedly against changes that include more air traffic, larger aircraft, or jet aircraft. Sincerely, David Kobrin
Response 1			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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
81	7/10/2018	Ann Bertino	I choose Alternative 1: no build
Response 1			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
82	7/10/2018	Linda Ellsworth	I choose alternative # 1 - No Build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
83	7/11/2018	Merry Bush	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 lilved on this Island for 20 years and do not see any good reason to expand!
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
84	7/11/2018	Patty Pirnack Hamilton and Jim Hamilton	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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 : http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/ We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them. Thank you, Meg Jones
85	7/11/2018	Barry Rose	I choose alternative four: expand facilities to FAA Standards and minimize marine life impact. Thank you.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
86	7/11/2018	John Fleischer	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
87	7/11/2018	Maria Nutt	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
88	7/11/2018	Megan Neal	I choose alternative one: NO BUILD
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
89	7/11/2018	Patty Pirnack Hamilton and Jim Hamilton	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.
Response 1			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 : http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/ We hope you will join us September 19th, and please bring any more questions you have so we can answer them. Thank you, Meg Jones
90	7/11/2018	Sandra Chalk	I choose alternative one: no build!
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
91	7/11/2018	Audrey Neddermann	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
Response 1			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 HendersonProject Manager.
92	7/11/2018	Margaret M. Manning ,Timothy P. Blanchard	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.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
93	7/11/2018	Willie Clancy	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 we 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 that 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.)
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
94	7/11/2018	Cornelius Sprenger	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
95	7/11/2018	Jyl Peterson	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
96	7/11/2018	Don Hynes	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
97	7/11/2018	Linda Ethier	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
98	7/11/2018	Lisa Louise Davis	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
99	7/11/2018	Mandy Troxel	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
100	7/11/2018	Mike Kaulakis	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.
Response 1			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
101	7/11/2018	Kathi Ciskowski	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
102	7/11/2018	Annette Marsden	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
103	7/11/2018	Mara Nutt	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
104	7/11/2018	William Nutt	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
105	7/11/2018	Millie Thorson	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
106	7/11/2018	Jeff McCaull	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
107	7/11/2018	Gordon Koenig	I choose alternative one: no build. Maintain what we have.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
108	7/11/2018	Stan Wagner	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
109	7/11/2018	Clark Cundy	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.
Response 1			See 7/12 responses from LH.
110	7/11/2018	Judith and Allan Dorosin	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
111	7/11/2018	Michael Riordan	I oppose any major expansion of the Orcas Island Airport. Any new facilities should be built within the existing airport footprint.
Response 1			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
112	7/11/2018	Judy Jackson	No to larger planes. No to FAA money if it brings B2 rating and/or other expansion-strings attached. No to increased noise.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
113	7/11/2018	Ed Andrews	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.
Response 1			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
114	7/11/2018	Pegi Groundwater	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 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. Keep Orcas small and rural!!!
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
115	7/11/2018	Katie Wilkins	I choose Alternative 1: no build.
Response 1			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
116	7/11/2018	Sandy Playa	I choose alternative 1, No build.
Response 1			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
117	7/11/2018	Greg Oaksen	Dear Dowl,I vehemently oppose the rediculous 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
118	7/11/2018	Kathryn Bowes	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
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
119	7/12/2018	Wayne Munich	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
120	7/12/2018	Margart Manning and	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.
Response 1			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
121	7/12/2018	Arielle Davis	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
122	7/12/2018	Paul Pollard	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
123	7/12/2018	Tammy Pollard	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
124	7/12/2018	Virginia Moore	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
125	7/12/2018	Patrick Baumann	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
126	7/12/2018	Jerry Weatherman	I choose alternative one: NO BUILD!!
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
127	7/12/2018	Clark Cundy	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. .

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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. http://www.portoforcas.com/dev/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PresentationBoard-LowRes.pdf 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
128	7/12/2018	Irmgard Conley	I choose alternative one: no Build I do not want this Island Jewel be destroyed by Ueber Tourism and Greed!
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
129	7/12/2018	Anita Orne	I choose alternative one: no build. Just because we can get the money does not mean we should. Thank you
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
130	7/12/2018	Nancy Quackenbush	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
131	7/12/2018	Maile Johnson	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
132	7/12/2018	Paul pollard	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
133	7/12/2018	Pierrette Guimond	No to extending the runway No to filling in Brants Landing Keep airport as a rural airport, it has served us well
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
134	7/12/2018	Patrick Baumann	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
135	7/12/2018	Clark Cundy	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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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. http://www.portoforcas.com/dev/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PresentationBoard-LowRes.pdf 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
136	7/13/2018	ravin williams	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
137	7/13/2018	Didier Gincig	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.
Response 1			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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
138	7/13/2018	Stephanie Johnson Oday	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?
Response 1			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: http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/ 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,
139	7/13/2018	Charles Toxley	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.Thank you,Charles Toxey

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Charles, We'll make sure the files are posted in full resolution or that you have access to them. And if you have any input, please submit it to Leah or me. Although one alternative is a "no build" alternative, that is significantly imperiled by being woefully non-compliant with safety standards for aircraft that use our airport today, every single day. That's not to say its unsafe that they do, but simply that it doesn't achieve the safety standard the FAA has established. We're being pretty solicitous of public input and transparent. We hold public meetings that are published in the paper and online, with a process to send you reminders. We had good attendance at the first meetings and it dropped off this time. To me, that's disappointing, because I want input. Honestly, I was not aware that taxiing aircraft at idle are significant noise impact and I would suspect that the aircraft taking off on the runway are the primary noise impact. --- At the same time, we have an advisory committee in a more direct consultant role and I'd be happy to have you on it to represent the perspective of adjacent landowner stakeholders, so we hear concerns just like that mentioned above. I understand your desire to have us engage our neighbors directly 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 (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
Response 2			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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 3			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. 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 someone who doesn't know where we live, they ask "What on earth is happening over there?" when they hear it. 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 as the pass on the runway and taxiway, I understand the FAA has guidelines/specs for classes of aircraft, but there is no way a Caravan (or a Bombardier 850 for that matter) on the taxiway could touch wings with another one on the runway. Not even the FAA could argue that. There is 100+ feet of separation between the runway and the taxiway now. So, if this is indeed about catering to the safety of the Caravan, them touching each other is just not a safety concern. It would have to be a Boeing 727 or some other huge aircraft with more than 100 ft wingspan to risk that scenario. You're saying you aren't designing for planes of that size to be here, so please don't tell people in your presentations that we need to increase the distance between runway and taxiway for planes the size we currently have to prevent them hitting each other as they pass. The FAA taxiway separation requirement would be overkill for the Caravan and every other aircraft using the airport. It may be an FAA recommendation, but it is disingenuous to tell the Orcas public that operations here are currently subject to this kind of risk. I will be letting our neighbors know what I've seen and heard so far. If they want to learn more they can attend the master plan meetings and port meetings going forward. If anyone wants to get together as a group I'll let you know. Thank you again, Charles
140	7/13/2018.	Arthur Van Gelde	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
141	7/13/2018	Steve and Linnea Bensel	I choose alternative one: no build.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
142	7/13/2018	Linda Kirtz	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
143	7/13/2018	Jeremy Jennings	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
144	7/13/2018	Kathi Ciskowski	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.
Response 1			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
145	7/13/2018	Christine Chaney	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
146	7/13/2018	Gulliver Rankin	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
147	7/13/2018	Lanney Wixson	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
148	7/13/2018	Penney Sharp Sky	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 occaisionally 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.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
149	7/13/2018	Scott Knutson	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
150	7/14/2018	Morgan Mills	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
151	7/14/2018	JonBarach	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
152	7/15/2018	George Larson	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?

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 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
Response 2			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 3			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: https://www.faa.gov/airports/aip/grant_histories/lookup/ The earliest start date for it is 2005. However, grant histories from 1996 can be found here: https://www.faa.gov/airports/aip/grant_histories/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 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 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
153	7/15/2018	Brett McFarland	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
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
154	7/15/2018	Robert Hamilton	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 KenmoreAir, 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 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
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
155	7/15/2018	Kim Secunda	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 ? 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. Storm water should be monitored as should light and noise pollution. This is a flyway for migratory birds. Property values adjacent to airports are traditionally negatively impacted. I live adjacent to the airport and already am resentful of the problems. 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
156	7/15/2018	Mike Parnell	prefer option #2 with confirmation of property loss/rights.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
157	7/15/2018	Kim Secunda	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. 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...
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
158	7/15/2018	Bob Davison	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 â€œexisting runway pavement will be marked to include displaced thresholds (total runway length after pavement is redesignated is 3,400 feet).â€ But the existing pavement is 2,900 feet, so it appears 500 feet of pavement will be added because thatâ€™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.
Response 1			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. Leah R. Henderson, C.M., ACE

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
159	7/15/2018	Joe Symons	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 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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 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 July 26th to have this conversation with 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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 "submit a letter" process. Again, I appreciate your prompt reply and hope you might address some of the issues I raise here.
160	7/16/2018	robin erly	I vote for Alternate 1, NO BUILD. I STRONGLY oppose expansion of Eastsound Airport .
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
161	7/16/2018	Kim L Middleton	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
162	7/17/2018	Tricia Erly	I vote for Alternative 1, NO-BUILD. I am decidedly against expanding the Eastsound airport.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
163	7/17/2018	Greg Oaksen	Hi Leah, Can you explain why the master plan images have been removed from the Port of Orcas website? Thanks, Greg Oaksen, Eastsound
Response 1			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
164	7/17/2018	Bea VonTobel	July 17, 2018 **First, a little history** 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 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, provide the

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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.
Response 1			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
165	7/20/2018	Stephen Stephen	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
166	7/22/2018	Robert Meador	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 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.
Response 1			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
Response 2			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
Response 3			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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
167	7/23/2018	Tracey Smith	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 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.
Response 1			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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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 activity is accurate. I fly a Caravan for Island 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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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 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 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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
168	7/23/2018	Tuck Wilson	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, 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 highly contentious public improvement planning (and implementation), I

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			recognize that planning processes are a continuum—and that discussions shaping the current master plan are ongoing.
Response 1			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 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 orcasairport@rockisland.com.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
169	7/25/2018	Paul Hamilton	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 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 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 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
Response 2			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
170	7/25/2018	Janet Alderton	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,

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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
171	7/25/2018	Carmela Alexander, Secretary Waldron Community Meeting	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. The noise pollution of ever-larger aircraft and increasingly frequent flights would directly impact the peace and quiet on Waldron Island. 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
172	7/25/2018	Susan Kavanaugh	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!
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
173	7/25/2018	Beverly Franklet	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.
Response 1			Write in Comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
174	7/26/2018	Jeannie Chamberlain	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
Response 1			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 19th and I would be happy to discuss the project further with you at that meeting. Leah
175	7/26/2018	Steven Davis	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. 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. 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
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
176	7/26/2018	Clark Cundy	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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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 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, 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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 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
Response 2			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
177	7/27/2018	Steve Davis	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
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
178	7/27/2018	Jason Elrod	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.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
179	7/28/2018	Cindy Wolf	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?
Response 1			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
180	7/30/2018	Doug McTavish	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 then an 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
181	7/30/2018	Steve Smith	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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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
182	7/30/2018	Steve Bernheim	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. 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: 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
183	7/30/2018	Geri Silveira	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, 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.
Response 1			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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
184	7/30/2018	Paul Anderson	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 (Distichlis spicata). I wrote up a 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 vegetation1 and because the dominant water regime is tidal, the Northwest Wetland is at least a Category II estuarine wetland under the state wetland rating system2 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 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.1 Vegetation tolerant of interstitial soil salinities ≥ 0.5 ppt; see WAC 173-22-030(5)(ii).2 Hruby, T. 2014. Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington: 2014 Update. (Publication #14-06-029). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 2			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 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 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; and3. The ditch system and Wetland 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 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
Response 3			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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 4			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. '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 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.
185	7/30/2018	Becky Griswold	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
186	7/30/2018	Nathan Bradow	This plan will be severly detrimenral to all the business that cater to tourist on the east side of the airport. It woukd likely cost the island over 8 milljom is sales each year. It woukd destroy jobs and lower property values. It is a very bad idea.
Response 1			Thank you for yor comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
187	7/30/2018	Anne Keller	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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 & 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.
188	7/30/2018	Lisa Byers	Hi -I am writing to add some additional thoughts to my previous email for the airport master planning process. 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.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
189	7/31/2018	Julia Turney and Jay Lucas	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 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.
Response 1			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
190	8/1/2018	Evelyn Fuchser	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!
Response 1			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 & 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
191	8/1/2018	Lisa Murphy	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
Response 1			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.
192	8/2/2018	Norman and Becky Flint	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
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
193	8/2/2018	Eleanore Stewart	I am in favor of Alternative 2, with the exception of moving Mt. Baker Road. I believe the safety issue of the roadâ€™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 â€œIntroduction to Development Alternativesâ€ 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. While the Alternative 2 taxiway relocation doesnâ€™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. 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 does, then Alt. 1 is preferable. Finally, I am not in favor of west side development.
Response 1			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
194	8/2/2018	Andrea Hendrick	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? 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 so we can answer them.
195	8/2/2018	Kim Secunda	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. I have written you previously and not had response as to if you have received the information and iot would be normal to have acknowledgement and response. Can this be remedied ? 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- 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. What have we entertained as behavioral changes to accommodate the cramped state ? . 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. 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- Aquifer maps and details in the vicinity propane facilities i the vicinity schools in the vicinity populations included hours of operation noted

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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 mappped 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. 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 ti 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 t ax for your consultation PLEASE SEE TO IT THAT OUR CONCERNS ARE ADDRESSED AND ON RECORD,

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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. 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. 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. 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. Thank you. KS our home is near the airport we love our island deeply
Response 1			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 & 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!

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 2			Ms. Secunda, Although some of your comments may have been addressed during the recent public meeting, we wanted to follow up with an additional response. Your comments included concerns about wetlands, the utility infrastructure, local road capacity, wildlife, and other resources. These concerns are certainly valid and merit serious consideration, but are beyond the scope of a master plan study. Evaluating the impacts of potential projects on such resources are more properly part of an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement, in which the environment and the community are considered in detail. A project-specific environmental evaluation will include opportunities for additional public comment. Any attempt to analyze the effect that a program might have before the details of it have been determined would be wasteful and futile. Thank you again for your comments. Eric
196	8/2/2018	Janet Alderton	Dear Port Commissioners, 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. 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. https://www.pce.uw.edu/instructors/paul-anderson 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 decision decreased airport safety by increasing traffic through the runway protection zone.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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. 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 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. 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. Thank-you for considering my comments.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
197	8/2/2018	Susan Fraser	I choose alternative one: no build
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
198	8/3/2018	Pierrette Guimond	There should not be any expansion of the runway that would close Mt Baker Road No to expansion.
Response 1			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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
199	8/3/2018	Margaret Doyle	"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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comments.
200	8/3/2018	Christopher Graham	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, employee 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comments.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
201	8/3/2018	JP, Annette, Alexandra, and Julia van Dongen	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 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
Response 1			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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 2			Hello Ms Henderson,We appreciate your response and the care that you and your team are 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. J.P and Annette Van Dongen
202	8/3/2018	Charles Toxley	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 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
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
203	8/3/2018	Melanie Thea Patten	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 & 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
204	8/3/2018	Ted Enderlein	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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
205	8/3/2018	Kelly Rose	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
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
206	8/3/2018	heather oaksen	Dear Port Commissioners,I am writing to request that you postpone making your decision on the airpot 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 airpot 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.
Response 1			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 & 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
207	8/3/2018	Sadie Bailey	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. 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
208	8/3/2018	China Meadows	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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 19th 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 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
209	8/3/2018	JoEllen Moldoff	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.
Response 1			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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
210	8/3/2018	Margaret Manning	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 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 require 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 (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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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, 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 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?

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Ms. Manning, your comment was received. Thank you for your comment.
211	8/3/2018	Greg Oaksen	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. The plaaning 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. I urge you to seriously consider the impacts of airport options on the Orcas community.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
212	8/3/2018	Pierrette Guimond	No to expansion . Mt Baker needs to remain as is Re routing Mt Baker Rd is not an option
Response 1			See previous comment on 8/3/2018

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
213	8/3/2018	Susan Malins	I have previously submitted a strong preference for Alternative 1: No Build 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, & 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. 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 & management" and "minor use of capital projects" MEANS specifically would be an honest presentation and I request that explanation please. 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
Response 1			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 & 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
214	8/3/2018	Nicole Cline	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.
Response 1			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 19th. Thank you, Leah Henderson
215	8/3/2018	Christopher Enderlein	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.
Response 1			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
216	8/3/2018	Christoph Enderlein	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 â€œEstablish formal landscaping and building standards for the airport to maintain the overall aesthetics of the island.â€ 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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
217	8/3/2018	Christoph Enderlein	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 â€œpotential wetlands.â€ 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 â€œdetermine the exact extent of wetlands on airport property.â€ 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.
Response 1			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
218	8/3/2018	Christoph Enderlein	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.
Response 1			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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
219	8/3/2018	Christoph Enderlein	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. â€œindividuals who do not use or directly benefit from an airport or its related services are not contributing to its operation or improvement.â€ A clarification or confirmation of accuracy regarding the current/future FAA funding source will be helpful.
Response 1			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
220	8/3/2018	Kenneth Gibs	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)? 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? 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? 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? 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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.
Response 1			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 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
221	8/3/2018	Michael Stolmeier	On behalf of Smugglers Villa Homeowners Association - 21 residential vacation properties located on the north shore immediately east of the airport. 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. 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..
Response 1			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 & 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
222	8/3/2018	Tim Blanchard	To the Commissioners of the Port of Orcas: Please consider the following comments for the Port of Orcas Airport Master Plan: GENERAL 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. 2.I use the airport frequently, both for business and pleasure connections on Kenmore and San Juan Airlines. 3.I depend on UPS (Aeronautical Services) and FedEx for business correspondence and for items that can only be purchased off-island. 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. 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. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION/PARTICIPATION ISSUES 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. Accordingly, government entities should take steps to advise people as early as possible of the potential consequences of a proposal â€“ 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. CONCERNS REGARDING THE CHANGES UNDER CONSIDERATION

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			I believe that the â€œsafetyâ€ 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. 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 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. 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 â€œsardine canâ€ 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 visitorsâ€™ 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 thingâ€”organic, yet functional. 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 â€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 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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			Design Elements/Results That Should Be Non-Starters 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. 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. 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. 4.Any changes that will require changes in ground transportation away from the airport that are â€œto be determined in the future.â€ 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. 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 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. 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.) Thank you for considering these comments.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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 & 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. Thank you,
223	8/3/2018	Sadie Bailey	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 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 -

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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 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.I'll be continuing to send comment, and hope that DOWL will not cut off consideration of our comments when this day ends.
Response 1			Thank you for your comments.
224	8/3/2018	Peter Carlson	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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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
Response 1			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 & 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.
225	8/3/2018	Andrea Cohen	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 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 these 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

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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 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 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.
Response 1			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 so we can answer them.
226	8/3/2018	Kathy Ciskowski	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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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.
227	8/3/21018.	Robert and Laurie Liebmann	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 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 attenton to this crucial matter.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			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. https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/field_offices/fsdo/lgb/local_more/media/FAA_Guide_to_Low-Flying_Aircraft.pdf. Hopefully this FAA document helps.Thank you,Leah
228	8/5/2018	Robert Dash	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.
Response 1			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 & 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!

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
229	8/6/2018	Norris Suzanne Carlson	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 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 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,

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			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 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.
Response 1			Thank you for your comments.
230	8/7/2018	Stu & Patsy Stephens	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
Response 1			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!

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
231	8/12/2018	Mike Voetglin	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.
Response 1			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!

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
232	8/17/2018	Bob and Cheryl Castagna	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 & 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 forseeable 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 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!Bob Castagna for Brandt's Landing Marina
Response 1			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,Leah R. Henderson, C.M.,
233	8/20/2018	David Kobrin	Hello,The question I have is:Is there any intention, or do you have any plans, that would enable larger planes than those currently using the airport, and/or jet planes, to use the airport either now or in the future? (I understand there are some private jets, that under certain conditions, are able to use the airport at it is now.)I appreciate that you are working hard, and have many questions to answer.
Response 1			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.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
234	9/7/2018	Tina Whitman, Friends of San Juan	Friends of the San Juans appreciates the opportunity to provide input to the Port of Orcas Master Planning process and respectfully submits the following comments, primarily related to the lack of sufficient detail on relevant natural resources and associated regulations that affect future development at the Port of Orcas including wetlands, shorelines, cultural resources and land use. Wetlands are a high value habitat type that provides multiple public benefits including water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, and flood attenuation. As a result, wetlands are protected under local, state and federal laws. With extensive, known wetlands on and adjacent to the airport, as well as current active wetland mitigation required to rectify recent Port of Orcas violations, it should come as no surprise that the management of wetland habitats will play a major role in the design and selection of alternatives under the master planning process. The current level of detail regarding the wetlands themselves, as well as the impacts to them from the various design alternatives and phasing, is not sufficient. Each wetland should be clearly identified in each of the master planning documents (site plans, alternatives evaluation tables, introduction to the development alternatives report) including clear identification for each individual wetland, the wetland category or rating, as well as the associated buffers for each wetland. Description and evaluation of each alternative/phasing must also demonstrate how it follows the required local, state and federal wetland mitigation sequence of avoidance, minimization, and lastly, compensatory mitigation, with estimated square footage or acreage of impacts in the wetlands and their buffers clearly defined for each of the alternatives/phasing. Right now, the only place where wetland impacts are even mentioned is the evaluation of alternatives table where impacts to wetlands are defined as 'none', 'none anticipated', 'minor' or 'potential' in earlier draft documents and as none, potential, yes or no in the materials provided September 5, 2018. No discussion at all of the type and size of wetlands present, avoidance of impacts or likely impacts are provided in the development alternatives report. Without any associated documentation of the wetland values, rating and area of impact, the findings in the evaluation table cannot be credibly supported. As wetland mitigation can also have a large impact on the cost estimates of the various alternatives, sufficient detail is required on avoidance of likely impacts to wetlands of each of the alternatives to inform cost benefit analysis. In addition to more clearly identifying potential future impacts to wetlands, consistency of the proposed design alternatives with the existing required mitigation actions from the wetland violations that occurred in 2017 to multiple wetlands on Port of Orcas properties must also be addressed. For example, the rerouting of Mount Baker road illustrated in the new Figure 3. Ultimate Development or the previous Figure 9. Runway 34 RPZ Alternatives figure will directly impact the wetland, including those areas currently the subject of required mitigation action to restore function, yet no detail is provided beyond 'potential impacts to wetlands' or 'yes' in the table. Mitigation sites should have long-term protection and subsequent development should avoid impacting the

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			mitigation area and associated buffer. Shorelines-There is no discussion of the shoreline environment in any of the documents produced to date in the master planning process. Multiple relevant issues related to marine shorelines should be reviewed and used in both the development and evaluation of design alternatives and phasing including: the Shoreline Master Program jurisdiction (200 feet from the ordinary high water mark and all associated wetlands) and required protective regulations; the fact that the largest wetland on the Port property is an estuarine, coastal wetland; and the fact that significant Port infrastructure and proposed future developments and property acquisitions are located within mapped coastal flood hazard zones. At a minimum, the shoreline jurisdiction and floodplain boundaries should be clearly marked on all design alternatives/phasing site plans, and as with wetlands, sufficient detail on how the various alternatives will avoid, minimize and compensate for unavoidable impacts (see San Juan County Code § 18.50.140). The projected area of impact and effects on the function of the estuarine wetland as well as marine shoreline and floodplain habitats must also be included. As coastal erosion and flood hazards are expected to increase with rising sea levels and more frequent and larger storm events, any long range planning for the acquisition of new property or development of new permanent infrastructure must include consideration of likely potential effects. As with wetland mitigation, costs to fortify low lying coastal infrastructure as well as the associated mitigation for impacts to shoreline habitats can be substantial and may influence the selection of a preferred alternative. Cultural Resources-No mention of cultural or historic resources are made in any of the Master Plan documents. Marine shorelines and associated coastal wetlands within the San Juan Islands, including north Orcas were heavily utilized by multiple area Tribes and First Nations. The State Environmental Policy Act requires an evaluation of proposed development in these areas that must include adequate identification of the cultural and historic resources present and plans to avoid impacts. As with natural resource mitigation, the presence of cultural resources can add substantially to the costs of the various design alternatives and timely understanding of the likelihood of encountering protecting cultural resources is essential. Land Use-The Orcas airport is located in close proximity to substantial residential and commercial development in the Eastsound subarea. Potential impacts to neighboring uses should be explicitly included in the master planning process, in both the development and evaluation of alternatives. Multiple methods exist for the Port to improve its understanding and consideration of local land use concerns, including expanding participation in the master planning committee and identifying relevant plans and policies that will impact the ultimate success of any preferred alternative. The proposed master planning committee is heavily weighted towards airplane-dependent and other commercial interests; efforts should be made to expand committee participation to better include residential interests. With significant proposed changes to public infrastructure included in the design

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			alternatives, it is logical for the Port to involve the San Juan County Public Works Department; their expertise in planning public projects, as well as public engagement could further improve the process. In addition, while the master planning website references future environmental analysis, it would be prudent for the Port to identify the relevant plans and policies and how they may be supported by or are in conflict with the proposed alternatives at this stage of the master planning process. These include, but are not limited to: the Eastsound subarea plan, the San Juan County Critical Areas Ordinance, the state Shoreline Management Act and county Shoreline Master Program as well as federal Clean Water and state Water Pollution Control Acts, as well as National Historic Preservation and Endangered Species Acts. As just one example of why this type of review is essential at this stage of the process, the proposed September 5, 2018 Short Term Development (Figure 1) actions include acquisition of additional shoreline property; yet the fact that this property is located in a shoreline designation under the county's Shoreline Master Program that specifically prohibits airport and nonwatery dependent uses is even not mentioned (San Juan County Unified Development Code 18.50.600). Substantial recent information on community values and perspectives for the future of Eastsound are also available as part of the comprehensive plan update process and could inform the Master Planning process. In summary, significant additional detail to wetland, marine shoreline, cultural resources and land use issues are needed to improve the quality of the various development design options being proposed,the evaluation of the alternatives as well as the public's ability to meaningfully review and provide comment. Thank you for your consideration.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Thanks Tina, I will read all of this soon, but your first paragraph shows a manifest misunderstanding of this process that I have explained many times over. This planning process serves as the source for the "Statement of Purpose and Need" that generates an environmental assessment or impact statement under NEPA. The NEPA process is what you're looking for and is a subsequent step to a Master Plan/ALP. It's also not funded under this step of the process, which is why it isn't considered in detail here. Once the Master Plan is finished, a subsequent environmental process will be undertaken to address everything in your first paragraph and I'm frankly surprised you don't know that. I do anticipate significant struggles with that and potentially insurmountable environmental challenges. That's unfortunate because that may mean operating a safe airport that meets the needs of the humans of Orcas is not possible. Tony
Response 2			Hi Tony,I'm sure I am not nearly as familiar as you with Port Master Planning processes. I do know that consideration of environmental factors is not supposed to happen at just the back end of a project under either NEPA or SEPA. Postponing meaningful environmental review is also a risk in terms of both costs and feasibility of the project in addition to missing the opportunity to inform the design phase, not just permitting. I think part of the problem in reviewing the materials is that while the environmental information provided is quite vague, the design alternatives are fairly detailed, so there is a level of disconnect there.I've attached an example evaluation table of how even at this 'high level', environmental information could better inform the evaluation of alternatives, using your exiting format. Please consider this document as part of our public comment. I look forward to learning more on the 19th. Best, Tina

Port of Orcas Master Plan suggested evaluation table (proposed additions in red)

alternative description	meets design standard	wetland impact	land use impact	wetland buffer impact	floodplain impact	shoreline jurisdiction	cultural resources impact	mitigation site impact

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 3			Again, when you look at NEPA, the entry condition to the "Environmental" is a "Statement of Purpose and Need." This very preliminary process called a "Master Plan" is not "a project" as you call it. Nothing goes in the ground based on this work alone. It is essentially establishing the "Statement of Purpose and Need" for NEPA. It is quite probable that during the environmental process, additional alternatives, ranging from "No Action" to divergent options (such as relocating the airport to another location on Orcas) would be evaluated and significant adjustments to alternatives would be considered to eliminate, mitigate or compensate impacts. In theory, the environmental process could determine that the "No Action" alternative should be selected, but in my experience, that is highly unlikely unless you are proposing an action that would eliminate significant species (normally good sized animals) or have disproportionate impacts for the gains to humans. I doubt that will be the case here. With all sincerity, I would encourage you to take a weeklong course, workshop or seminar on the NEPA process. I consider NEPA to be one of few legacies of Richard Nixon and one of Jimmy Carter's greatest legacies (in strengthening the structure and process and making NEPA strong). Honestly, it will make you stronger in advocating for environmental issues and engaging in the NEPA process. Tony
Response 4			Tina, It might seem counterintuitive to take a course like this since its meant for those that are undertaking projects that require NEPA (federal agencies), but a class like this will teach you how the process works and how you as an outside agency/individual can engage collaboratively, constructively or in an adversarial if it becomes necessary because the class will touch on how NEPA processes get challenged in court, etc. https://www.shipleygroup.com/applying-the-nepa-process-writing-effective-nepa-documents I would also be surprised if there were not SEPA equivalents for Washington State offered by colleges and private organizations. Tony

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
235	9/8/2018	Katir Wilkins	I am requesting that the Port of Orcas schedule another meeting for public comment on the Airport Expansion Plan. The most recent meeting on July 16 was an insult and an embarrassment to civil discourse on this island, and I would like for the port commissioners and airport manager to have a chance to redeem themselves. The meeting at the fire hall was well-attended, despite the inconvenient time of day. Over 150 citizens were counted, and more were turned away for lack of space. Clearly a larger venue for this topic is needed. The overall quality of public participation was high, and the questions posed to the Port of Orcas were reasonable and respectful. Unfortunately this positive engagement was met with defensiveness, evasion, and disrespect.The meeting plan was not followed. There was a sign-up sheet for people who wanted to speak, but it was not used. Airport manager Tony Simpson's presentation did not clearly describe either existing conditions at the airport or proposed changes. The presentation quickly lost direction and dissolved into a question and answer free-for-all. Inquiries about the details of the expansion were side-stepped or dismissed, and the questioner belittled. We were told multiple times that the port values public input into the design process, but the attitude exhibited throughout was contempt and impatience for citizen involvement. There have been some rude awakenings recently to development in and around Eastsound which has nothing to do with the greater good of the island community. I have heard many people express concern about Orcas losing its character, its beauty, and its ecological integrity to these changes. We are waking up to the fact that we will have to be more vigilant if we want to keep the qualities about Orcas that we hold dear. I hope that the public servants at the Port of Orcas will rise to the occasion and prepare themselves for this higher level of community engagement. These are the changes that I would like to see at the next public meeting: 1) Respect and consideration demonstrated for fellow members of the community 2) A meeting structure that is explained at the outset and then followed 3) Audio recording of the meeting with questions repeated so that everyone can hear them 4)A meeting time in the evening that is feasible for working people 5)Clear and accurate information about the various alternatives for airport expansion so that there can be meaningful public involvement. It is our duty to decide as a community what kind of growth and development is realistic and desirable. I would encourage other islanders who were discouraged by the last meeting to stay engaged, and to let the Port of Orcas know that we will not be brushed off easily.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
236	9/12/2018	Evelyn Fuchser	While I am very much in Favor of Westside port expansion development, I am very much opposed to Westside Shortsighted Development. IE Roads and Traffic have not been addressed. The Seaview Street is an was developed as a residential use, then it became mixed use and no provisions for the change were ever made.This new Development proposal does push way over the top the necessity for a secondary outlet, and Away from the more hazardous occupancies Street Connectivity should be provided and included on the drawings. Also Buffers should be included and described on the drawings. There is significant Residential/ Lt Commercial Boundary all appropriately require Buffering. I also believe the Project Planners should address the serious concern of a potential hazard in our midst the 30,000 gal proposed Propane tank. Of course this is well outside of their current concern or project, were the tank to actually go in, any development would contribute to a dire need to relieve any, and added traffic away from its potential impact As, This planning team is likely more and better equipped in planning of Airport type Essential Public facilities, and Transportation facilities in general As compared to San Juan County Planning who so sadly and inappropriately chose to allow such a facility.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
237	9/13/2018	Geri Silveira	Hello ORS people, Has Kenmore considered the Quest Kodiak airplane? It has a 45' wingspan as opposed to the Caravan's 52' span. The Kodiak has about the same useful load as the Caravan and carries up to 8 passengers and 2 crew members. Won't that solve your problem? Again, it makes no sense to reconfigure an airport for one airplane/company at a huge cost to taxpayers and hardship (to say the least) to multiple parties to meet standards that don't make sense for a place like ORS. I encourage you not to let money drive your decisions. If almost everyone is against these plans, maybe they're not good plans. Keep ORS the way it is. Geri Silveira
Response 1			Geri,Thank you for your comment. Kenmore is not the only company using the Cessna Caravan 208B and FedEx also far exceeds the 500 operations to determine the critical aircraft. FedEx uses this aircraft across the country so the likelihood of this changing is very small. Leah
Response 2			Hi Leah, Has anyone asked them to consider the Quest Kodiak? Do they even know about it? Kenmore and FedEx don't have to change the whole fleet, just the planes that service Orcas. In the past, they used Beech 18s between the islands and a Cessna 207 to go into Shaw and other islands where the Beech wasn't appropriate. So, there's no reason they can't have more than one airplane to do the job. This is far better than changing the whole airport at huge expense and harming both the people who have to give up land, the land itself and the character of the community. Talk to Kenmore and FedEX about the Kodiak--if they want to do business there, they should be the ones to make accommodations., not the airport, the people of Orcas and the taxpayers. Respectfully, Geri

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 3			Geri The Port cannot tell any company by law what they can and can't fly. Kenmore has no interest in changing their fleet. The airport is a public use facility funded by public money. Leah
Response 4			They can make suggestions to Kenmore. And they have a responsibility to spend public money responsibly. G.
238	9/13/2018	Paul Anderson	Thank you for providing another opportunity to comment on the proposed Orcas Airport Master Plan. I appreciate the Port's interest in public input. There are still a couple of environmental factors that need to be more fully developed in the alternatives. Specifically, the wetland categories and buffers as well as areas of shoreline jurisdiction need to be shown on project drawings that include specific footprints of proposed improvements. The attached comments provide specific recommendations and rationale. Please let me know if you have any questions about my attached comments or if I can be of any assistance to the Port. Paul Thank you for providing another opportunity to comment on the Port of Orcas Master Plan (Master Plan). I wish to have the following comments entered into the Master Plan record. I realize that the Master Plan includes multiple planning timelines and that some of the proposed improvements will not begin for several years. Wetland categories and applicable buffers as well as areas in shoreline jurisdiction should be included on project drawings to help inform the alternative selections. Also, the wetland categories need to be updated to be consistent with regulatory standards. My primary concerns with the Master Plan environmental characterization are the following: 1. The wetland mitigation plan for the Orcas Airport (Wetland and Buffer Mitigation Plan for Orcas Island Airport; Wetland Resources, Inc.; February 8, 2018; hereafter, Mitigation Plan) classifies the large wetland to the west of the north end of the runway as two separate, adjoining wetlands (Wetland A and Wetland B). The Mitigation Plan classifies Wetland A as a Category I riverine wetland and Wetland B as a Category III slope wetland. Because the primary source of hydrology to Wetland A is tidal influence and the salinity within in Wetland A is too high for shrubs and trees, as stated in the Mitigation Plan (pp. 2 and 7, respectively), Wetland A should be rated as an estuarine wetland. There are two aspects to tidal influence: the hydraulic aspect of landward flow at high tide (inundation) and the chemical aspect of increasing salinity. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) wetland rating system (Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington, 2014 Update; Ecology Publication No. 14-06-029) uses both of these criteria to distinguish between freshwater tidal fringe (salinities less than 0.5 parts per thousand [ppt]) and estuarine wetlands (salinities greater than 0.5 pp]). Freshwater is classified as salinities less than 0.5 ppt; higher salinities are considered estuarine or marine. The state wetland rating system was developed to assess freshwater wetlands and the typical rating forms should not be used to classify estuarine wetlands (see Attachment A, below). Estuarine wetlands are classified as "Special Characteristic" wetlands and are classified using questions SC 1.0 – SC 1.2 at the end of the rating form. During my July 2012 site visit I measured salinities ranging from 1 to 23 ppt within Wetland A/B and adjoining ditches, clearly indicating that this is an estuarine wetland. 2. I do not understand the rationale for identifying Wetland A as a separate wetland from Wetland B; that would only be 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. Attachment B, an excerpt from the rating system manual, discusses when it is

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			appropriate to give wetlands multiple ratings. 3. The ditch system and Wetland A/B are within shoreline jurisdiction since tidal inundation (ordinary high water mark; OHWM) extends landward into the ditch system and wetlands. Wetland A/B and likely the wetland immediately south of Wetland A/B (not labelled in the Mitigation Plan) meet the definition of an associated wetland (see WAC 173-22-040). Shoreline jurisdiction (shorelands) extends 200 feet landward of the OHWM and also includes all associated wetlands. I would recommend that the Port request that Ecology staff verify the OHWM and wetland ratings for all waters on the Airport. 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 Ecology's regulatory purview. Having these regulatory boundaries verified will give the Port clear guidance on which Master Plan areas are within shoreline jurisdiction and the applicable wetland ratings and buffers. This will help guide Master Plan design elements and alternative selection. Paul S. Anderson, PWS
Response 1			Thank you for your comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
239	9/17/2018	Janet Alderton	I am concerned that the master plan alternatives have not delineated the "Possible Wetlands", rated their categories, and mapped the required buffers. Logically this would be done prior to creating the proposed alternatives. It appears that the wetlands have been ignored. As an Orcas Island resident who understands the value of wetlands, I am dismayed by this oversight. As a taxpayer, I can imagine that this will open the port to costly legal challenges. I will be attending the public meeting on September 19, 2018 and expect these wetlands issues to be addressed. I have copied portions of the Washington State Wetlands Regulations and San Juan County Critical Areas Regulations below.Thank-you for your attention. Janet Alderton Wetland Regulations Washington State laws require that wetlands protected under the Growth Management Act and the Shoreline Management Act be delineated using a manual that is developed by Ecology and adopted into rules (RCW 36.70A.175; RCW 90.58.380). The changes are effective March 14, 2011.The latest federal delineation manual and its supplements should now be used to delineate wetlands in the state. You can find the federal delineation manual and its supplements on Ecology's Wetland Delineation web page:http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/wetlands/delineation.html. To see the updated rule language go to:http://www.ecy.wa.gov/laws-rules/SMA2010/1007.html. If you have any questions about wetland delineation, contact: Tom Hruby, PhD Senior Ecologist Washington State Department of Ecology P.O. Box 47600 Olympia WA 98504 or email tom.hruby@ecy.wa.govSpecifically for San Juan County: When do the critical area regulations apply? Critical area overlay districts provide regulations for land use activities, development and vegetation removal in critical areas and areas adjacent to critical areas. Critical area regulations apply even if a development or project permit is not required. Where do the critical area regulations apply? Critical area overlay districts provide regulations for land use activities, development and vegetation removal in critical areas and areas adjacent to critical areas. Critical area regulations apply even if a development or project permit is not required. Where do the critical area regulations apply? Critical aquifer recharge areas (the entire County). Plan review is required for commercial, industrial, public & institutional projects (See 18.30.140) ; Frequently flooded areas (See SJCC 18.30.130, SJCC Chapter 15.12 and SJC Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMS) produced by the Federal Insurance Administration); In or within 200 ft. of geologically hazardous areas (See SJCC 18.30.120); In or within 300 ft. of wetlands (See SJCC 18.30.150); In or within 200 ft. of Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas (FWHCAs) (See SJCC 18.30.160.B for a complete list); ¼ mile from Great Blue Heron nesting colonies. (See SJCC 18.30.160); 1,000 feet from Golden Eagle nests (See SJCC 18.30.160); Additional standards apply in or within 200 Feet of a Designated Marine Shoreline (See SJCC 18.30.160.E.6). Buffers apply when the critical area is on your parcel or another parcel under different ownership. If the critical area is under different ownership and is not accessible to the applicant, its edge may be established using available maps and information, including a visual assessment.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
240	9/18/2018	Blythe Simpson	I support the Port's Draft Preferred Alternative for the Master Plan. I know the plan as depicted is a significant change, but I understand that this plan represents the unconstrained plan to achieve compliance and that follow-on environmental actions, engineering, land-acquisition, permitting, etc. will further consider all the constraints and public concerns. It is important to me that the Port demonstrate to the FAA that they are striving for and have a plan to achieve safety compliance to ensure the Port remains eligible for Federal Funding for this essential public facility. I applaud the commission for adopting its Resolution regarding an Aspirational Statement against the use of eminent domain and I am encouraged by it. Thank you, Blythe Simpson
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
241	9/18/2018	Jennifer Pietsch	To the Eastsound Airport Commissioners &Tony Simpson, Airport Manager, Thank you for presenting the draft preferred alternative for the Airport Master Plan. I am in full support of the ultimate preferred alternative as presented, understanding that an environmental process will follow the Airport Master Plan. The safety of both the aircraft and passengers that use the Airport, and those of us on the ground is very important. The Airport supports and touches the entire island community through not only air transportation for leisure (for both residents and tourists) and medivac, but also supports our economy by providing cargo service. Continuing to support our cargo operators and passenger operators is very important. Thank you so very much for your thoughtful perseverance and effort towards a successful airport for our island. Your ability to gracefully hold your ground (even if unpopular) to ensure the safety of our community, airport passenger and pilots is very appreciated. I feel confident knowing you are looking out for our safety.
Response 1			Jennifer, Thank you for your comments. I have passed these along to the Port. Leah
242	9/19/2018	Andrew Stephens	I am writing to send my support to the Port Commissioners and Manager. All I seem to hear now in the paper and online is "Port Bashing". I
Reponse 1			Andrew,Thank you for your comments. Leah

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
243	9/19/2018	Annette van Dongen	Slide 10 – Key Design Facility Requirements – shows a possible runway length of 3,400’ Slide 13 – Mid Term Development – shows a runway of length 3,255’ Both of these lengths accommodate larger passenger turboprops and jets. Slide 14 – Ultimate Development – shows “Mt Baker Road Realignment Rerouting Mt Baker Road would be one solution to the protection zone problem, accommodating a longer runway.Receiving federal dollars to improve the airport makes sense. Improving safety and enjoyment of the facilities at the airport makes sense. Accommodating and attracting jet traffic to Orcas Island makes no sense. It would irreparably damage life on the island. Please keep the runway length at 2,901’ while working toward FAA compliance for width, taxiway separation, and protection zones.
Response 1			Annette Thank you for your comment. The existing pavement will be reduced by 133’ as shown in the mid term and ultimate drawings. The facility requirement shows the standards. The runway length will not accommodate larger aircraft than what is already using the airport today. Once the road moves out of the RPZ the FAA will not allow the runway to be lengthened putting the road back in the RPZ. Based on space the runway cannot be 3400’ unless Mt Baker is rerouted to enchanted forest. Nothing shown on the map or in the master plan is to accommodate larger aircraft. I hope this clears up some of the confusion. Thank you Leah Henderson
Response 2			The naming and renaming pavement game continues. (1) Today there is nearly 3,400' of pavement with 2,901' of that pavement marked as runway. Any portion of existing pavement can be marked as runway and that will be the runway length. How we change the runway length has never been the point.(2) The Master Plan Mid Term Development shows runway length at 3,255’ and Long Term Development at 3,400’ with Mt Baker Road rerouted. If there is no actual intention of designating a longer runway in the future, then why tie federal grant money to those numbers by putting them in the Master Plan?(3) If the runway length is increased, however that is accomplished, then owners of larger aircraft will feel at ease frequenting this airport. And this is about quality of life. At the Sept 19, 5:30pm meeting, Leah & Erik were asked about the probability of increasing jet traffic after the airport is upgraded. Leah & Erik did not seem to understand the question. Their answer was that the airport only saw two jets last year, so this is a non-issue. That makes sense. Engineers and planners answer technical questions about airport safety and compliance. They don’t answer questions about quality of life in a community. If the airport safely accommodates jets, more will come because Orcas Island will be the charming destination that is easy to get to. People with jets have the means to tie up swaths of real estate for their vacation time and to develop gated communities for their jet-setting friends, while Orcas Islanders struggle with affordable housing. If the Master Plan accommodates people who can afford to alter the island’s economics, housing, & quality of life with no skin in the game, then our quality of life will be irreparably damaged. The spending of tax payers' dollars should benefit the majority, not the elite few.As Warren Hendrickson wisely said that afternoon, successfully forming an airport Master Plan is analogous to solving a Rubik’s Cube. It's not just having the numbers line up; the reason for having an airport is improving quality of life. Respectfully yours, Annette van Dongen

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 3			Thank you for your comment. A point of clarification. None of the drawings show a runway length of 3400'. Thank you,Leah Henderson
Response 4			See slide 10 - Key Design Requirements
Response 5			Annette, The facility requirement slides show the FAA standard at 100% of fleet. 95% of fleet is the minimum requirement. If you review the drawings, which show our proposal, none mention 3400'. 3400' would be impossible with Mt Baker Road in its current location. Thank you Leah Henderson
Response 6			Annette, That is, as we have stated time and time again, the overall pavement length gets shorter. We have acknowledged that the published runway length increases, but our current users commonly use our existing blast pads as runway. That includes jets and pistons, from the elite to the more pedestrian. Full time residents and folks from as far as Florida. A published length of 3,255 vs 2,901 is not going to change the use here a bit and in fact, the overall shortening of the pavement may drive some of our current users away.Thank you for seeking clarification of our intentions. Tony
244	9/19/2018	Harvey Glasser	As both a frequent passenger via Kenmore and a frequent flier using Orcas during the better weather, I can claim thousands of hours in my Cessna 210's and landing on Orcas. I want to endorse the efforts to pursue the safety and utilization improvements in the master plan and continue to be eligible for FAA funds. Improving landing facilities improves confidence in the airport and greater utilization from more confident pilots. Please continue your efforts in this sensible direction.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
245	9/19/2018	Katie Wilkins	I would like for the public comments to be more readable and to have a "search" feature that allows readers to sift through all the comments. I also submitted a comment that never appeared in the public record. I sent an email to DOWL with the original text of my comment and have not yet heard back. I am worried that public participation is not being honored or considered in this process.
Reponse 1			Thank you for your comment. Your comments have all been logged, to include the one you did not see in the log last month.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
246	9/19/2018	Kim Secunda	Please address storm water TX on all proposed impervious surfaces. Is storm water monitoring the normal and required at location? Sea level rise?! Please get consultation and avoid waste. Provide economic impacts of each proposal. Noise pollution? Light pollution- Please address. If you do not plan on lights, put it in writing. What moderations to present operations can be implemented to accommodate need and when addressing the plan please list the behaviors that can meet now need? EX- one plane at a time, limit size, Kenmore and FedEx-Can they modify behaviors and how can they participate and modify? Why are we accommodating them so much and marina changes. Who pays with what money?
Response 1			Ms. Secunda, Although some of your comments may have been addressed during the recent public meeting, we wanted to follow up with an additional response. Your comments included concerns about wetlands, the utility infrastructure, local road capacity, wildlife, and other resources. These concerns are certainly valid and merit serious consideration, but are beyond the scope of a master plan study. Evaluating the impacts of potential projects on such resources are more properly part of an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement, in which the environment and the community are considered in detail. A project-specific environmental evaluation will include opportunities for additional public comment. Any attempt to analyze the effect that a program might have before the details of it have been determined would be wasteful and futile. Thank you again for your comments. Eric

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
247	9/19/2018	Susan Kavanaugh	First I want to thank you all for taking the time to not just present the plans but to listen to everyone's concerns today. I was really just there to listen myself since I didn't feel I had all the background and online research isn't the same as meeting and discussing and seeing the latest plans.My major concern is the proposed relocation of the cargo facility (Fedex and UPS) to the proposed hangars on the West side of the runway at the end of Seaview lane. I am really hoping that you all have time to drive down Seaview tomorrow before you leave the island and just count mailboxes on the right side as well as the homes on the left side. There are MANY homes on this street and many children in these homes that I need to look out for as I drive in and out via Aviator drive as I often see them riding bikes and hanging out with each other and their dogs in the roadway. There is the issue of airplane traffic to and from that facility (noise) but that is not my concern as that is airport land after all. My concern is the amount of truck and auto traffic that would be generated by that facility being at the end of Seaview Lane. There is the matter of the Fedex and Aeronautical vans but also trucks and private cars bringing large items or packages to Aeronautical to be shipped and people coming to pick up their packages. This is a steady stream of traffic in and out every day. It would seem to make more sense to have the cargo facility at the south east end of the airport, closer to town and the passenger terminal for many reasons. Access for people needing to drop off or pick up packages would be much easier and closer. Also, access would be via a main county road and not a smaller residential street. It would also take all that truck traffic away from the private homes, privately leased hangers and the camping tiedown area.I believe that the "clockwise" turnaround area could be reconfigured to allow space for a FedEx plane to unload at a cargo terminal there which could be accessed from North Beach Road which is a much more compatible area and better for trucks and traffic. Thank you so much for listening to me tonight and taking feedback from the community.
Reposnse 1			Thanks for your insightful comments, Susan. I read the comments you posted, and it was very helpful getting your local perspective. We are taking another look at locations for the cargo facility, and we are noting your contact information below. Eric Strong
248	9/19/2018	Kim Secunda	Please address storm water TX on all proposed impervious surfaces. Is storm water monitoring the normal and required at location? Sea level rise?! Please get consultation and avoid waste. Provide economic impacts of each proposal. Noise pollution? Light pollution- Please address. If you do not plan on lights, put it in writing. What moderations to present operations can be implemented to accommodate need and when addressing the plan please list the behaviors that can meet now need? EX- one plane at a time, limit size, Kenmore and FedEx-Can they modify behaviors and how can they participate and modify? Why are we accommodating them so much and marina changes. Who pays with what money?

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Ms. Secunda, Although some of your comments may have been addressed during the recent public meeting, we wanted to follow up with an additional response. Your comments included concerns about wetlands, the utility infrastructure, local road capacity, wildlife, and other resources. These concerns are certainly valid and merit serious consideration, but are beyond the scope of a master plan study. Evaluating the impacts of potential projects on such resources are more properly part of an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement, in which the environment and the community are considered in detail. A project-specific environmental evaluation will include opportunities for additional public comment. Any attempt to analyze the effect that a program might have before the details of it have been determined would be wasteful and futile. Thank you again for your comments. Eric
249	9/21/2018	Patsy Stephens	Please consider my strong support for the Orcas Port Commissioners, the Airport Manager and the current effort to honor the requirement of the FAA to present a Master Plan for the Airport. As a year round resident of the island for 40 years, we recognize the value of this airport to the well-being and economic vitality of our community. The factors to be included in the plan are: a safe, FAA compliant facility which supports the current usage. I trust the Commissioners and the Manager to plan for the best interest of the community.
Respone 1			Thank you for your comment.
250	9/21/2018	Stu Stephens	Airport Commissioners and Manager, I strongly support a master plan that will provide for the use of the Orcas Airport by Caravans of Island Air, Fed Ex and Kenmore Air. Please be sure that we meet FAA standards so that we are not called on by the FAA to return funds that have been previously granted. Sincerely, Stu Stephens
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
251	9/23/2018	Michel Vekved	Hello, Here are my questions with some context. 1.During the presentation meeting held on September 19th, the Dowl Staff frequently used the terms “we” “us” and “our”, in reference to “our community” and possible land being sold to “us” by the owners of Brandt’s Landing, placing themselves members of the community not as third party project consultants. My question is, as the contractor presenting the alternative airport plans and facilitating the question and answers, does Dowl have a vested interest or benefit in anyway to the recommendations chosen for the master plan? Is Dowl an unbiased third part consultant?2. In the “next steps” slide the process was laid out as submitting the plan for FAA approval, followed by the draft report and public comment. My question is why is the public comment fall after the submission of the plan to the FAA for approval? If the port is striving for an FAA approved Master Plan, why is the final master plan report open for comments 30 days following the submission? 3. The seventh slide discussed enplanements. How are enplanements tracked and forecasted? Do those counts included the fly in weekend? If that number is forcasted to rise to 15,948 by 2037 is there anyway to limit enplanements? Is there any other airport that regulates or limits the number of enplanements? 4. Can you share the formula used to forecast enplanements as well as the number of operations? 5. The staff presentation materials both on screen slides and paper on the tables did not indicate any environmental studies. Where can that information be found? This would be in reference to your fourth slide (Status and Update) where the staff discussed NEPa and SEPA environmental reviews. 6. A follow up question, from an audience question which was posed about recommendations and whether the recommendations met NEPA and SEPA requirements. The staff response was that the recommendations may not meet those regulations but would be addressed after a review. Why aren’t the recommendations designed to meet NEAP and SEPA standards? 7. How many airports in the U.S., of a similar size or locale (or of a similar category as as Orcas Island) are not in compliance with FAA standards? 8. Dowl emphasized that camping next to planes is desirable and that green tie downs are an asset. Why is this important in the master plan? Is this an approved FAA activity? 9. It is a typical part of the process for Dowl to emphasize for the sake of empathy or fear, that “our packages” are being sorted in the rain and that the short runway means scrap metal or worse lives lost? Thank you in advance for responding to these questions. As a comment, I appreciate the effort that Dowl put into these additional presentations to educate this community and draw a greater awareness for the master plan. However, it was frustrating to see Dowl staff taking a defensive stance with some of the community and whispering on stage while a member of the community asked a question, it conveyed a lack professionalism. Thank you for your time.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			In the fourth slide it stated as an update an environmental study had been done at least initially. Therefore my question: Where can that information be found? This would be in reference to your fourth slide (Status and Update) where the staff discussed NEPa and SEPA environmental reviews. Or does this mean, as an update you have not done any environmental assessment? Michel
Response 2			Michel, Enplanements are reported by the carriers to the FAA directly and also to the airport less formally and tracked by the Port. It is not likely that a fly in had any impact on enplanements unless someone chose to board a commercial aircraft versus flying their own aircraft in to Orcas. An enplanement is only a passenger boarding a commercial flight. Enplanements are forecasted using historical data and interviews with carriers and looking at local, regional and national trends. The Port cannot limit enplanements. Enplanements are purely driven by the number of seats provided by the carriers and the desire to pay for a ticket by the public. Hopefully this clears up your questions about enplanements. Leah
Response 3			Michel, NEPA comes after the master plan, so we have not conducted any environmental studies related to the development being examined in the master plan. A NEPA study would likely kickoff sometime in 2019 or 2020. Leah
252	9/24/2018	Lisa Byers	Hello, I am writing to thank planners for making some accommodation to public comments, such as the landscape buffer strip along North Beach Road, keeping the major traffic pattern into and out of the airport from Mt. Baker Road, and reducing the number of airport hangers on the SW parcel. I am writing with additional concerns that I hope will be taken into consideration: 1. Placing aeronautical services and Fed at the end of Seaview seems to me like a poor choice. This is a residential road. Kids ride bikes on the road, because it is safe--virtually a dead end. If it is "improved" by being widened, it would only result in cars driving faster. People who use aeronautical services and Fed Ex should have easier access from the main road, and those customers should not drive down a residential street.2. Ms. Henderson referred to the proposed new terminal as a building that could be designed to be a "showcase" for Orcas Island. I appreciate that SeaTac has become more and more attractive as a place to hang out while waiting for flights. But that is not what I want for Orcas Island. I prefer a simple, functional airport terminal. No fancy please. 3. I wish that the Port Commissioners would take seriously the exercise of determining the consequences of "no to very little change." The FAA must run into this in other locations. There must be a way to exit from the grasp of the FAA's demands. The FAA must have to acknowledge that on-the-ground community goals mean that their exact standards are not always met. Please take this request seriously and evaluate the possibilities. Thank you, Lisa Byers
Response 1			Lisa, Thank you for comments. Leah

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
253	9/24/2018	Didier Gincig	Less Is More Please!
Response 1			Thank you for your comment. Leah
Reponse 2			I don't feel that the community will be respected. Didier
Response 3			Mr. Gincig, I appreciate your minimalist slogan. The draft preferred alternative is effectively the minimalist approach to maintaining compliance with our grant assurances. It only shows how we would become fully compliant with all safety standards for our current users in an unconstrained environment. As with our plans from 1993 and 2008, there are many elements that will likely be prevented by the many constraints we face. Tony
Response 4			I have doubts that as our island tries to retain a rural peaceful setting that we will not be inundated by load, large jets. I feel sad about that.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 5			Mr. Gincig, Currently, the critical factor that limits most jet use at Orcas is the overall pavement length. Our plan includes a shorter overall pavement length. While the "published" runway length is increased by converting parts of our current blast pads into displaced thresholds, the published runway length, at 3,255' remains too short for most jet use and won't materially change the operators that feel comfortable bringing light jets in here. In fact, some that already use our blast pads for takeoff may be discouraged from continuing to operate here because we shorten the overall length.Our plan is not an increase in usable length and the minor changes to the runway envisioned will probably discourage more jet pilots than it encourages. I say this having started flying jets 26 years ago, having 29 years of flying experience and having managed runway suitability issues for years in the Air Force. It's disappointing to me that nobody trusts my experience and honest assessment of what this plan actually will facilitate. One critic has cited Aspen airport as a parallel to the efforts we envision. Aspen's runway (albeit at significantly higher altitude) is 8,006' long and slopes up to the South at about 2% grade. (A simplistic correction for altitude would increase true airspeed by 16%, kinetic energy required for dissipation on landing by 34% and would make Aspen's equivalent runway length at Sea Level about 5,975', or 2,720' or 84% longer than our final runway. That is not anywhere close in comparison and is why I normally don't waste my time pointing out the fallacy of this comparison.) If you look around the region or country at airports between 0 and 3,500' long, on level ground, and with no obstructions, you'll find extremely limited jet usage and not much difference between 2,901', 3,255' and 3,400' simply based on hard stops on aircraft performance limitations, FAA rules and insurance restrictions. There are some completely unobstructed airports that are uphill that might be "effectively" longer for landing when landing uphill, but that is not Orcas. We are basically flat and have obstructions along the flightpath to the South and laterally around the airport. The simple reality is that almost every jet, except for very lightly loaded Citation 2's and 3's, with extremely competent and experienced pilots, operating privately only and only on bone dry pavement will attempt Orcas at either 2,901' published (3,388 total) or 3,255' published (3,255 overall). Again, the pavement ends up shorter overall.I have absolute confidence that if our runway gets built exactly as shown in the long-term plan, there will be no change in jet usage that can be attributed to the changes and I stake my reputation and my own quality of life on Orcas Island on that statement. Tony Simpson
Response 6			May your work help us keep the quality of life we came here for. Thank you for your thoughtful reply. I am becoming a bit more pessimistic these days about things like this. Let's see what happens. Didier

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
254	9/27/2018	Bill Bangs	Thank you for your efforts to keep the Port of Orcas airport (KORS) safe and compliant with applicable FAA regulations. However, the most recently published Master Plan documents including the Alternatives EvaluationTable(http://www.portoforcas.com/dev/wpcontent/uploads/2017/10/ORS-Alternatives-Evaluation_table.pdf) appear to include some recommendations that may not be required by the FAA. The Alternatives Evaluation Table includes items that are clearly demanded by safety and regulation considerations such as taxiway separation. But the table also includes items that may not be required and may be more properly designated as political and economic considerations such as runway length. And even the issue of public roadways within a Runway Protection Zone is only subject to FAA guidance and consultation rather than regulation. Please consider distinguishing these categories (safety regulations and economic/risk considerations) in your future documentation and reports. The runway length recommendations appear in AC 150/5325-4B. Orcas Island (KORS) would seem to fall into the “95 per cent of Fleet” category. With a mean high temperature in July and August of 70°F, the required runway length from Table 2-1 is just over 2800 feet and so it seems that there is no reason (per FAA advisories) to increase the existing length of 2901 feet. I recommend you consider not increasing the runway length unless there is a compelling argument from the community to increase the types of aircraft that can safely land and take off at KORS. And if you persist in recommending an increase in runway length, please identify the additional classes of aircraft that would then be allowed to operate at KORS. You assert that the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) “does not meet standard.” This is apparently the case both to the North of the runway (the marina area and Nina Lane) and to the South (covering a portion of Mt. Baker Road). But the RPZ designation appears to be “off the end of the runway end that serves to enhance the protection of people and property on the ground”. That is, the key issue is one of risk to people and property on the ground. For existing airports, the most recent FAA guidance requests that airport operators consult with the FAA about numerous items within an RPZ and provide an analysis of alternatives (including risk). See, for example, the National Academy Press publication: “Enhancing Airport Land Use Compatibility, Volume 1: Land Use Fundamentals and Implementation Resources.” The risk of injury to property or people on the ground should be evaluated based on known and predicted traffic patterns in the air and on the ground including historical accident statistics. Suppose that the probability of an aircraft intersecting the Mt. Baker roadway low enough to collide with a vehicle is roughly one every 25 years. (This number is just a wild guess but the actual number should be determined from known accident patterns in the vicinity of airports and the predicted activity at the Orcas airport.) If the vehicles are spaced, on average, 200 yards apart then the chances of a vehicle being hit is on the order of 2% or 1/50. So we could expect a vehicle to be hit by an aircraft once every 750 years. Is this unacceptable risk? This is something that the community should decide and, if so, just what price they are willing to pay to reduce the risk significantly. I recommend that you provide a quantitative risk analysis to people on the ground should Mt. Baker Road remain as is. If you cannot provide that analysis, please recommend that such an analysis be performed before there is any serious

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			consideration of moving Mt. Baker Road. Once again, thank you for your efforts to improve the safety at KORS. But please provide the explicit justifications for each of the recommended alternatives so that the community can evaluate those recommendations in an objective manner.
Response 1			Mr. Bangs, Thank you for your thoughtful comments. It is certainly refreshing to see someone put as much time into researching the requirements as you obviously have. Using AC 150/5325-4B with a temperature of 70o F and a published airport elevation of 34.7 feet, we determined that a runway length of 2,900 feet is required to serve 95 percent of the fleet mix. The present length of 2,901 feet satisfies that requirement. Please note that a runway length that can serve 100 percent of the fleet mix can be justified for "communities located on the fringe of a metropolitan area or a relatively large population remote from a metropolitan area" (Paragraph 205.a (2)). A 3,400-foot runway is needed to serve 100 percent of the fleet.The process for analyzing risk is located in Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP) Report 50, "Improved Models for Risk Assessment of Runway Safety Areas". The software for performing the analysis is called Runway Safety Area Risk Analysis (RSARA), and is explained in that report. The software was originally developed to evaluate risk in the Runway Safety Area (RSA), but has been adapted to the analysis of risk in the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) by shifting the consequence focus from onboard safety to safety on the ground. The evaluation of risk, however, is beyond the scope of a master plan study. Such an analysis would more likely be part of the Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement, in which potential impacts to the environment and the community are considered in detail. Thank you again for your insightful comments. Eric

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 2			Thank you for your prompt response, Mr. Strong. But your email raises a couple more questions. According to AC 150/5325-4B, an airport designer is to select between the 95% and the 100% categories based on the listed criteria. They are: 95% "This category applies to airports that are primarily intended to serve medium size population communities with a diversity of usage and a greater potential for increased aviation activities. Also included in this category are those airports that are primarily intended to serve low-activity locations, small population communities, and remote recreational areas. Their inclusion recognizes that these airports in many cases develop into airports with higher levels of aviation activities." This sounds a lot like Orcas. 100%: "This type of airport is primarily intended to serve communities located on the fringe of a metropolitan area or a relatively large population remote from a metropolitan area." This does not sound like Orcas - we are neither on the fringe of a metropolitan area nor a relatively large population! I think we are a 95% of fleet category airport (and are likely to remain so for a long time) and our runway length need not exceed 2901 feet. I'm not sure how you can justify a longer runway according to FAA standards. How can you justify KORS being closer to a 100% of fleet category airport?Thank you for your reference to how a risk analysis for people and other objects on the ground and under an RPZ might be performed. It seems strange that preferred alternatives can be developed and proposed without regard to potential risks. Nevertheless, it seems that the risk increases as a runway threshold gets closer to such objects as roadways. Your preferred alternative shows runway 34's threshold moving south (towards Mt. Baker Rd) by about 200 ft from its current location nearly 500 feet to the north of the roadway. My calculations show that given vehicular height restrictions imposed by our ferry clearances, the current threshold location is a safe distance from the road. The proposed alternative significantly reduces this safety margin. I strongly recommend that the current threshold be maintained (or even moved to the north). In summary, please maintain the runway length at 2901 feet and the southern threshold at its current position. Thank you again for your consideration of my concerns.-Bill Bangs
Response 3			The distance between the threshold bars is 2,901 feet, but the total pavement length is 3,388 feet. Occasionally the full length is being used for take offs. The FAA is primarily interested in safety, and prefers that the runway be marked for the way it is being used operationally. They have told us that they would support a runway length that can serve 100% of the fleet mix based on AC 150/5325-4B, Paragraphs 205.a (2) and 205.b (2). We understand your preference to maintain the runway length at 2,901 feet, and that preference is noted. With a 2,901-foot runway, the pavement beyond the threshold bars on each end could then be removed, but that would only affect a handful of operations each year—none of which are being conducted by Cessna Caravans. Also, the south RPZ would remain in its current location, and there would still be a conflict between the RPZ and Mount Baker Road. Eric

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 4			Thank you, Mr. Strong: It appears that the Orcas Island Airport may be operating inconsistently with its own standards: Orcas Island Airport Minimum Standards [http://www.portoforcas.com/dev/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Minimum-Standards-2014-02-261.pdf]. In particular, 1. "Runway is described as follows: runway 16/34 is 60' wide and 2900' long, with stop overruns of 250 feet at each end to be used for emergency landing conditions only." [I.E.7] and 2. "… no aircraft may use the Airport if its manufacturer requires a runway longer than 2,900' to operate." [III.A.6] I can understand why the FAA would desire the airport design to be consistent with safety standards that apply to actual operations. But if the airport were to operate according to its own standards then there would be no need to increase the runway length.I recommend that the Orcas Island Airport operate within its own published minimum standards and that the runway length not be increased beyond 2,900 feet. I believe that this position may be held by the overwhelming majority of Orcas Island residents. Bill
Response 5			Mr. Bangs, Enforcement is the problem. I have no tower controllers and no way to penalize operators that use the blast pads for takeoff. Likewise, manufacturers don't generally publish "minimum required runway" lengths. They publish performance data. Even without the blast pads being used as displaced thresholds, those aircraft would have performance data and the "minimum required runway" (but not balanced field length) to use the airport, but with less margin of safety. And on a personal note, one of the CJ2 operators that comes in here, maybe 8 times a year, is a huge supporter of our public schools' athletic programs. Without him, our teams would not have uniforms. I'm personally inclined to support efforts to sustain his ability to come here. The blast pads are "non-standard" and the very real threat from the FAA was that when the runway was reconstructed, they would remove all but 125' of each blast pad…effectively shortening the runway as it is used in practice today. Your recommendations would push out current users. I'm not inclined to support that either. I will actually recommend to the commission to change our minimum standards to permit use of the blast pads "at the users own risk" because I support their use as displaced thresholds. Thank you for sharing your beliefs. They are noted. Tony

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 6			Thank you, Tony. Your explanation is very helpful to my understanding. Let me be sure I've got it right. The airport currently admits visits by aircraft that require runways on the order of 3100 to 3200 feet. Attempting to restrict operations to aircraft that can operate within the listed 2900' is impractical. If we modify the airport design to a 3255' runway length then all current operations would satisfy FAA concerns. Such a runway extension (from 2900' to 3255') would permit operations by any aircraft that can safely land and take off on a 3255' runway. There are only a few light executive/private/business jets such as a couple of Citation models and the Phenom 100 that would be able to take advantage of this extension. (We are, after all, restricted to "small" (12,500 lbs) aircraft.) It is likely that this would increase traffic at the airport by at most a few dozen flights and fewer than about 100 passengers per year. Finally, this relaxation of minimum airport standards is up to the Port commissioners - that is, this is really a local decision and not a decision to be made by DOWL or the FAA. Am I close? -Bill Bangs
Response 7			Maybe 50%. The actual limits of a given aircraft are a function of its underlying design and performance characteristics and the parameters of the actual flight. Temperature and Pressure Altitude affect density altitude and true airspeed as compared to indicated airspeed. Useful load, or the amount of fuel, passengers and bags that can be carried in an airplane filling it to its maximum gross weight can be reduced to offset performance limitations. So, if I am performance limited by the runway length and weather conditions, I can possibly offset it by reducing the aircraft loading. Reduce the passengers, reduce the fuel, reduce the bags. All of the VLJs that use our airport on occasion are significantly restricted by this. They bring in many less passengers than they are configured for. They have very little fuel because they need to be light for takeoff. Etc, Etc, Etc. They never have balanced field length, which is a requirement for commercial operations, so they could never operate here on a commercial basis. Many private operators of these jets have insurance limitations placed on their policies that don't cover operations at an airport without a specified minimum length or balanced field length.As I explained in a public meeting, we don't really have a mechanism to enforce weight restrictions and they aren't really in play here. Friday Harbor uses "punitive" landing fees for aircraft that land over 12,500 lbs MGTW (that is, even if not actually overweight, the landing fees are based on the publish maximum gross takeoff weight of the design). We never get aircraft that have a MGTW above 12,500 lbs, so we haven't bothered to adopt this strategy. Friday Harbor is 3,400' long and has no obstructions to Runway 34 and a nice uphill slope that assist in reducing landing distance and takeoff distance. (Land uphill, takeoff downhill). I would estimate they get maybe twice the jet traffic we do, certainly not orders of magnitude more. And that is uphill, with 145' more than we would ever have. Our minimum standards are OUR minimum standards, approved by the commissioners, edited or drafted by the airport manager. Since our blast pads are already used by some as displaced thresholds, I suspect the commissioners would either formalize "use at your own risk" or continue the policy of turning a blind eye…because that is what I would recommend. Why? Because it is safer for the pilot taking off and their passengers. A few dozen and a hundred is probably the upper limit of anything I could imagine. Tony

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 8			Thanks, Tony. I'll interpret your 50% as my batting 500 which is pretty good. And thank you for clarifying 'balanced field length' which has been bothering me and I was afraid to ask. -Bill
Response 9			Please consider moving the entire runway as far to the North as possible. It appears that there may a couple hundred feet to move the northern RPZ almost completely over water and to reduce the existing conflicts with the southern RPZ. Thank you, Bill Bangs
Response 10			We are on an island and the faa agrees we could design for 100% Tony
255	9/28/2018	Katir Wilkins	Dear Port Commissioners, Tony Simpson, and DOWL consultants, I am sure you are receiving lots of questions as the deadline for public comment approaches. I appreciate the time that it takes to respond to all of them, and I want to respect your time, so I will try to be as specific as possible. What is the extent of our liability to the FAA, both in terms of dollars and in terms of length of time spent accepting funding? How much have we received? And if we had to pay back the FAA for funds we've already accepted because of non-compliance, how far back would that responsibility/debt go? Five years, ten years, twenty years? Are there instances of other airports (especially small, rural airports) having to pay back the FAA for falling out of compliance? Can you please give two or three specific examples that I might reference? This is a heavy selling point for most of the proposed changes to the airport, so there must be a historical precedent for taking the risk of FAA repercussions seriously. I followed the link on the Port of Orcas master plan page to the FAA website page on grant assurances. There, I read that the one of the factors affecting the duration of FAA grant obligations includes "the useful life of the facility being developed." Has there been any discussion in the planning process or dialogue with the FAA about seeking cooperation/forgiveness for some non-compliance based on the limited lifespan of an airport barely above sea level in a world of rising seas? I recommend checking out NOAA's "sea level rise viewer" mapping tool for an idea of what the Orcas airport would look like with one foot of sea level rise. It helps to put these plans into a larger perspective. I realize that the airport serves important community functions, including moving people and

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			materials to and from the island when time is critical. I am sure there is a way to maintain those needed services while preserving the small, rural character of the airport that residents and visitors both value. We also need to come to terms with the idea that the life span of our airport as it exists may be limited because of a changing planet, and pursue our plans accordingly. I have heard many "assurances" from port commissioners and from the airport manager that even if some of the proposed plans do end up on paper, they won't come into effect for 20 years, or, in Tony Simpson's words: "most of this will not happen in my lifetime." I am 32 years old, and I hope to be here in 20 years, so I am not comforted by these "assurances." I want community planning for the long haul--as if this place mattered, as if what we do today matters for the future. We are talking about my future and the future of people and places I love. Let's have a master plan that the port believes in, that respects community wants and needs, and find a way to work with the FAA to make that happen. Thank you for taking time to consider these comments and answer my questions. I look forward to hearing your response. Sincerely, Katie Wilkins
Response 1			Katie, Our liability is at least $9M but probably more because land acquisitions get valued at current assessment. Land acquisition obligations are in perpetuity, while other AIP grants are a 20 year obligation. The $9M figure is our 20 year grant history, but does not include earlier grants for land. The 9-year figure would be higher when land acquisitions would be “re-valued.”Friday Harbor allowed the construction of a fire station on land acquired under AIP for stormwater detention. To pay back that land acquisition, they forfeited 3 years of AIP entitlement. At the time, I think that was effectively $450,000 to pay back the FAA for the land. That is a relatively minor example. I would defer to DOWL or the FAA to cite other examples. I don’t think airports do this very often (to the extent a “no build, complete withdrawal” would entail) for obvious financial reasons. The majority of this plan won’t be accomplished in 10 years and then we’ll need another master plan. Sea Level Rise is a concern and may influence future plans or engineering/construction. We looked at relocating the airport as an option and dismissed it very early on based on limited locations to put it and loss of farmland, impacts to island life, etc. The low end of the runway is at about 15’ above sea level. If we were to lose the runway to sea level rise that couldn’t be mitigated (along with most houses on the North Shore/West Beach), I don’t think the FAA would penalize us for environmental impacts changing use or closing the airport. I’m 48. My kids are 18 and 15 and will live on Orcas someday as adults… I guarantee it. Granted, we live in Doe Bay, where it really is rural, but the things we are doing are akin to moving the fire station from Roses to its present location or putting sidewalks in front of Darvill’s bookstore. I’m confident our airport will support the community well and better if only a quarter of the plan envisioned materializes. Tony

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
256	9/28/2018	Sadie Bailey	Hi Leah (or whoever, if Leah is out of town);1) I'm a bit confused about the comment deadline. Are the comments for this comment period due BY October 5 or ON October 5? I want to be sure. Also, is there a time-of-day limit for THIS deadline - such as, due by 5 pm or due by midnight of the date they're due? Thanks for clarifying.2) regarding the August 3 deadline comment document; has that been updated and the latest version put onto the Orcas Master Plan website? I know of at least one person, Katie Wilkins, whose first comment was not included on the document and I would like to see that rectified along with being placed in the date she sent that. I would also like to see all attachments sent by me and others be included with the comments, for public view - Would you please let me know when Katie's comment is added, and how you plan to show the attachments we sent as part of our comments? Thanks. 3) Last question: There was a DOWL young lady at the afternoon workshop named Meg who was the person I think who is responsible for posting our comments onto document form. We discussed some specifics about comments, including how to add our attachments sent with our email comments for Public view. Since I don't have her email address, how would I continue that conversation with her? Thank you;B. Sadie Bailey
Response 1			Sadie,Please see answers below. 1. Answer: Please submit by midnight on the 5th. 2. Answer: We will ensure the comment document that is uploaded in mid-October includes all attachments and we will reverify against Katie's comments. Attachments will be included in the pdf. This pdf will be uploaded with all comments and attachments received by October 5. There will not be an update prior to this. 3.Answer: Your advice was taken into consideration and we are working on the comment log and pdf. All attachments will be in the pdf we upload mid-October. Thank you, Leah
257	9/29/2018	Greg Oaksen	Dear Dowl,Eastsound airport is intimately embedded in the community and directly affects residents due to noise, air pollution, land use, traffic and other environmental impacts. Thus far the master planning process has not been comprehensive since planning criteria forming the basis for decision making are narrowly engineering oriented rather than developed through a community based planning process. The claim that airport planning is responsive to county comprehensive planning and Eastsound subarea planning is simply not true.There was been no engagement by the Port during the subarea planning effort of the past couple of years. Incredibly until two months ago members of the EPRC were unaware that there was a member of the advisory committee representing the EPRC . The master planning effort should have engaged the community at the outset. Instead narrow value judgments and engineering criteria were applied. For some unstated reason Alternative 1 could not be considered. However all other alternatives present extreme site development. No option for meeting safety issues, supposedly the driver for decisions, in a minimal way were explored. Instead the master plan goes way beyond safety issues and includes more tie downs, new hangers, a new relocated terminal, and new cargo loading facilities. Indeed the specific planning criteria and reasoning behind the criteria for developing the plan have not been made explicit. Apparently one of the issues is that the FAA allowed Caravan type aircraft to use Eastsound airport as an exception and now the airport will be expanded to accommodate them. In the September 19 public meeting the planning consultant stated that the Port has gotten substantial sums of money from the FAA and the Port

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			may be liable if the master plan does not proceed. This would not be an issue with a minimal accommodation of FAA safety concerns. Also, there needs to be an accounting of when and what liabilities were assumed. The Port has sought and is seeking more money and therefore put the community at risk in terms of liabilty. I would seem logical to engage with the FAA to define the extent of these liabilties rather than vague statements about possible liabilities. Having said this I think there is time to step back and go through a genuine planning process now that the Orcas community is finally aware of the scope of this planning effort and significant impacts on Orcas. I would take more time but in the end will be the most efficient and least costly in terms of dollars. social cohesion, and political capital. Sincerely, Gregory Oaksen Eastsound
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
258	9/29/2018	Greg Oaksen	Dear Dowl, A followup comment to my earlier email. I finally realized that the biggest driver behind this planning effort is to get as much FAA money as possible. That might be nice for Dowl and certain individuals but not so good for Orcas.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
259	10/1/2018	Jane Rosevelt	I am not in favor of enabling larger planes to land on Orcas. I like the airport the way it is, and do not support expansion of the runway or the taxiway. I am a part-time resident and on demand air taxi operator (Rose Air). For 25 years I have brought up to 3 passengers at a time to and from the Portland OR area. Most of my charters have been in the summer but I have provided service all year weather permitting. I am concerned that an increase in larger faster traffic will result in more accidents. As you know the weather is often not predictable, and in winter below VFR minimums. Do you want to encourage a runway overshoot? Hmm, wet or dry? Over the years I have seen an increase in airport usage in the summer. Pilots have enjoyed the country atmosphere of the annual fly in and many enjoy camping under the wing. The current airport facility and size seems to support this. Please don't change Orcas' rural, friendly and inviting nature. Please don't change the qualities that make the island special.
Response 1			Hi Jane, Thank you for your comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
260	10/1/2018	Richard Fant	I'd like to see airport related traffic kept on the airport access points; not spread out to the westside using Seaview. it's simple, keeping all airport activity via Shoen lane, it uses the space correctly (sharing parking and traffic flow) and provides more hangar space on the westside. Thanks.
Response 1			Rick,The cargo timing and placement is a struggle and I understand your concern. ASI has been looking for a place for a couple years now. Not today…years ago. They are well beyond capacity where they are. They even considered the lot where the propane was CUP'd. I think if Anders' asking price was more reasonable there in Aeroview, they would look at that… It is SLI, I think.There was almost overwhelming opposition to putting the cargo facility next to the terminal. At least from those that spoke and are concerned about 'industrial' placement proximal to the 2 churches on the corner. Timing wise, ASI can't wait for development of the SE parcel anyhow. I've floated some ideas in that area to be a bridge, but getting the air freight to them (safely) will be a problem until the SE parcel is developed substantially and the roads/terminal are moved. And that could be 10 years.There are better places, like Larson's property or Griot's property, but the North Beach Rd "Coalition" would come unglued. They don't like the idea of any access off North Beach Road, even to the planned 6 hangars 0.15 miles down the road from the intersection with Mount Baker.Like Seaview, North Beach, is a County Road with residential uses along it that serves light industrial property. We haven't really left any options where the totality of zoning and land-use makes sense.As to the hangars on the West side, I think there are more hangars plotted over there, even with the Cargo facility, than all of the hangars in use today.Their last "ask" was to temporarily expand the building they have. Where?!?!? Onto the Ramp? Across the Access Road to the Ramp? Towards Schoen Ln? Or the Terminal? I really don't see an option, don't think the FAA would approve and the only possible option would probably eliminate all of their parking. This is the fruit of neglectful long-term planning and execution over the last 20-30 years. I have a shorter description, but hesitate to put it in writing. If you have a solution where they can start building in 6 months, I'd love to hear it.Tony

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 2			Tony, no doubt that any change is hard and I sympathize that there is no answer that makes most people happy. However, there is a wide open field (the old dog park) that has been identified as the growth for the airport - get started and put the new cargo facilities there. It's already Port Property - it has access from Mt baker Rd (across from the fire station) which is currently handling the traffic. To help the churches, put it on the north side. I want the cargo and passenger services at ORS to grow; But, adding more traffic to Seaview will have the same situation as North Beach - the Seaview residents will come "unglued"; we are already fighting the propane tank and are organized. It will come down to money; you're right, ASI didn't grab an opportunity with Anders hangar (they should spent the money) - access to Mt Baker could have been made possible thru AC. OK, I'll stop - everybody has an idea and you must get a million of them. Balancing the need is tough - been there, done that and I got the T-shirt. My argument is simple - use existing access points and existing available property; even if it's a temporary "fix" with trucks to offload airplanes and move across Shoen lane (certainly not ideal, but - needs must).
Response 2			Thanks Rick, Just to clarify, the Port owns the property on the West side where the Cargo Facility would be off of Seaview and it is accessed directly from County Road and is zoned for SLI. It's difficult to believe that Anders second parcel (behind his hangar and not accessible from Aeronautical Center) and accessed off of Seaview would be more palatable to Aeroview residents than the Port's property. My initial inclination was the first rendition and had the Cargo Facility to the East of proposed terminal. I agree that the North Row of hangars on that parcel, accessed from North Beach Rd would be a good solution. I struggled with how to get it there in the very near term and my solution was to either (1) allow the 207 to taxi across Schoen Lane once a day or (2) make ASI schlep the air freight across Schoen Ln on either a cart or an electric go-cart/mini-truck. They either didn't understand or truly were opposed. I need to readdress with them and I will. Tony
Response 3			Interesting …. I did not realize ASI was looking at Lot 3 (the open lot) - I thought we were talking about Lot 1 (the current big hangar) that Dana Gillespie purchased. As noted the Gillespie property could get access to Mt Baker Rd … but, that's behind us. You're right that lot 3 is too small and would not work. Best option is still east side. Rick
261	10/1/2018	Chris Bullock	I support the Port's commitment to honor their FAA grant assurances and create a plan to work towards compliance with the FAA's design standards for BII small. The plan as presented will bring the Airport into compliance and ensure the FAA will continue to support the Port's mission to serve our community. Of specific concern for many of our community members is the continued operation of medical flights and BII small. I believe these services to be critical for the health and prosperity of our residents. Without FAA funding I don't believe our community alone can support these much needed services. Thank you, Chris Bullock
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
262	10/1/2018	Chris Sutton	It is amazing to me how much Orcas Island doesn't like change, and actively wants to try and roll back time. With each organization in the community that tries to improve things (School District, Fire Department, OPALCO, OPAL, County), Orcas seems to fight back against what would be a good thing. What are we afraid of? The misinformation is also amazing. No where in all these plans is there any change that would allow larger airplanes to land here, yet that seems to be one of the "facts" that has people against planning for the future. I moved to Orcas in 1974 when I was 4 years old, and lived here until 1988. Orcas in 2018 is much different than it was 30+ years ago. It will continue to change. Lets plan ahead for that change and work on improving things. I think the full build out master plan is the best for the future of Orcas. Chris Sutton
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
263	10/1/2018	Walter Corbin	I was unable to attend the evening sessions. I thought the presentation was well done. Except for the need for pressing safety issues. I am not in favor of expanding our airport facilities. Since 1990 the FAA has continually pressured our community to spent millions of dollars- a 3.2-million-dollar terminal building-the purchase of 10 acres for airport related business-a fence which keeps deer within the fenced perimeter, and now I am sure 100 or millions more for infrastructure of our small, rural airport. The airport manager said we must move a main road, because a pilot crashed into a car while landing. They should have taken the pilot's license. We ca never build an airstrip that is idiot proof. This is Orcas-not Seattle. Why, after so many years of landings and takeoffs is the airport suddenly unsafe?
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
264	10/2/2018	Dick and BJ	I strongly support the Port in the continued efforts to provide a functioning and safe airport. Appreciation is extended to Tony Simpson and the Port commissions for their extensive time and efforts in working toward compliance with the FAA's design standards to ensure the FAA continued support of the Port's mission to serve our community.Thank you. Dick and BJ Arnold
Response 1			Thank you for your comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
265	10/2/2018	Chris Hensel	Someone else said this, but I agree whole heartily that just because you can grow doesn't mean you have to. I, as do many others in this community, DO NOT WANT THE CHANGES TO BE MADE AT OUR AIRPORT! It has been working just fine as it is! We don't need more service here. This spring/summer I had a plane go over my house almost every single day. People live here for peace and quiet. What about the impact on the properties surrounding the airport? And the environmental impact? The people here want our community to stay small. There's nothing wrong with that I copied the following paragraph written by another Orcas islander because you need to see it. It embodies how this community feels:"To have no real influence on the outcome, although the majority of us have said we don't want this overkill, is an insult to our community and shows disrespect and lack of understanding of how important this place is to us, and how united we feel in our desire to keep a small footprint for our airport. The safety requirements, we understand – to a point. We recognize the efforts made. It's the attitude of "while we're in there, let's build everything we can" that rubs the Public wrong and erodes Public Trust." You need to stop and listen to the community here. A common ground can be found. There's no harm in making compromises.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Ms. Hensel, Thank you for your very clear feedback. As we have communicated throughout this process, the airport does not meet the safety and design standards of the current users of our airport. All of the features included in the master plan draft preferred alternative, except for the quantity of possible hangars, are driven by the safety standards. I know it's difficult to believe, but we have examined every conceivable alternative that meets the safety and design standards and chosen the least invasive and extensive of changes. Many of the features were also present in our plans from 1993 and 2008 and have not come to fruition. Notably, the hangars shown only get built if a private developer approaches the Port and agrees to our terms. Nobody is currently beating our doors down to build hangars and I suspect we'll build no hangars (except perhaps replacing two near the terminal because they are and will be too close to the taxiway). However, to build anything on the airport requires it be approved by the FAA. This plan is that approval process and why we show them in various locations. As we have also noted repeatedly, any of these changes that involve land not currently owned by the Port, will require the land owners to voluntarily sell us the property and for us to be able to afford it. There was some concern about the Port using eminent domain and the commissioners passed a resolution aspirationally committing to not using eminent domain. Even with FAA funding assistance, it is unlikely that we can afford any one of the individual properties in question. There also has been virtually no interest from those parties in selling to the Port. For any of the projects to move forward will also require environmental assessment, planning and possibly mitigation under the National Environmental Policy Act and State Environmental Policy Act as well as federal, state and local permitting. Finally, a master plan is required under our grant assurances to the FAA. Those obligations require us to undertake planning that complies with FAA standards. The plan must meet those standards. A plan that doesn't meet those standards puts at very real risk of being removed from the Airport Improvement Program and possibly having to repay grant funds received over the life of the airport in excess of $9M. The airport has been here since before 1949 and the Port has operated the airport for 60 years. While exiting the Airport Improvement Program is a possibility, it would likely require the airport to quadruple its tax levy to sustain the airport infrastructure even without repaying any of the previous grants. Many suggestions were received and incorporated into the draft preferred alternative you see. We significantly altered our use of the parcel at North Beach and Mt Baker and have struggled to find a decent alternative for the Cargo Facility. I live at Point Lawrence and planes fly over my house every day of the year as they transition from Bellingham to Friday Harbor, much as they have since Bob Schoen and Roy Franklin started flying here after World War II. Thanks again. Tony

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
266	10/2/2018	Clark Cundy	Keep Eastsound Airport a Rural BII short runway Airport Part II: An un-intentional expansion. Please take time and get some coffee. If you take time to read this thank you for your time! In August, 2018 I posted a few ideas about Keeping Eastsound Airport a Rural Airport. Now a few weeks and meetings have gone by and the Port of Orcas/DOWL have posted a 'preferred' 20 year vision or plan of Eastsound Airport, for the public to consume and comment on until Oct 5th. I attended the public meeting held by DOWL at the Orcas Center Sept 19th at 7:30. According to the DOWL schedule posting comments or ideas after the date of Oct 5th DOWL and the Port will be moving toward implementation planning so I'm not sure what value any comments people possess in between now and then may have. I was unable to figure out how this particular preference of plans using weighted metrics via public comment, advisory board, DOWL, and the Port responses was arrived at. Also the original purpose of the plan is to rectify insufficiencies with FAA Air Safety Requirements. For a plan that didn't intend an expansion, the plan goes a long way toward that end. Longer runway, bigger terminal, more tie downs and hangers, Parking lot…. My goal was to view the FAA Safety requirements and see if there were ways to visualize a master plan that could be implemented with the least impact to community and environment possible. The following are some questions, concerns, and observations I have about the 20 year Master Plan. This letter will be sent to DOWL, Port of Orcas Manager, Commissioners as well as to the local public communication sights. The Port of Orcas website(http://www.portoforcas.com/) website has two things of interest to me. One being a voluntary noise abatement procedure pamphlet located at http://dev.portoforcas.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/NoiseAbatementBrochure.pdf. Then on the Port of Orcas Master plan page a listing of people who evidently were invited to be on the Airport Advisory board to help build the new 20 year Master Plan. There really isn't a public islander component on this committee, this is listed as a technical/tenant committee. Had there been a public component to this committee those public representatives could have through citizen surveys, meetings etc, weighed on their own the merits of the original options with the technical people also on the advisory board in an effort for more public consensus and transparency. Then DOWL could have created the Original Options from that. Part of those options then would have been derived from Islanders apart from flying providers plus external business and political interests. The original master plan options provided to the public by DOWL/Port and used to help in the creation of the current 'preferred' masterplan are no longer available on the Ports websites. So unless you saved those documents for comparative analysis with the current masterplan a person wanting to do so wouldn't be able to. There is a short excel version but it's hard to visualize what it's telling you without the Airport diagram options in front of you. The advisory committee list of names can be found here at the bottom of the http://www.portoforcas.com/master-plan/. It is highly weighted toward commercial flying interests and local business interests. 1. Noise abatement plan: Currently any noise abatement is voluntary and procedures for pilots are after you're in the air. There's plenty of noise on the ground before an aircraft takes off or lands but there really wasn't any best practices for that. It's good that the port has a pamphlet of best practices for aviators of the airport. It would really help if the pilots actually followed airport egress pdf in the air. There is nothing in the Master Plan figures 1-6 or the Power Point presentation that addresses noise abatement for the future. With the larger planes potentially coming to the airport a quantified noise abatement plan especially for commercial carriers on the ground and in the air are critical to the local neighborhoods and island peace in general. The master

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			plan shouldn't be implemented without one. I've been told that the FAA doesn't normally fund noise abatement devices on the ground which is probably why DOWL didn't include one since they were hired and funded by the FAA to start with. Where we live is in the yellow noise sensitive area on the pamphlet. The hill just above us is about 500' above mean sea level (MSL) so when the planes fly over our house heading to Friday Harbor they're not at the 1500 feet Above Ground Level (AGL) as the pamphlets suggested flight level offers. Some mornings at 7:30am I would guess some of the planes are between 500-700 feet AGL as they go over the hill. We don't need any alarm clock at 7:30 am... The windows rattle and it's coffee time. Did I mention we are in the yellow 'sensitive' area in the voluntary noise abatement plan?… A codified noise abatement plan for commercial carriers at least needs to be written into the 'preferred' masterplan. The commercial carries could really help keep the noise down if they just flew over the water channels. Stay out over the water keeping the flying noise out there. Further if there will potentially be bigger aircraft using the airport that may have reverse thrusters to stop faster causing all sorts of noise with that process. That will happen more often since the new terminal will be located at the South end of the runway, the physical location of the old terminal is far better suited to the airport since it's located more in the middle of the runway. With the new Terminal location all commercial passenger traffic will be routed to the South End of the runway. So more ground noise on taxi or pilots will land further down the runway when landing to the south. Most commercial pilots will want to cut taxi time down by stopping faster making a bit more noise. There's good reason to have a noise abatement plan for both ground and air to maintain as much as possible the quality of life in the nearby airport neighborhoods and those in the flight paths. 2. Master Plan Figure 1: For the first 8 years nothing really changes and we remain a no build B-I airport except for an apparent land acquisition at the north end of the airport. So at this stage in the master plan it seems all the current safety violations remain intact? I didn't see where in the Power point or diagrams where any safety violations would be addressed in the next 8 years. 8 years, I had to let that sink in a little. I was wondering just how bad can the safety violations really be if the Port is willing to accept this plan with the current Mt. Baker Road risk assessment? DOWL representatives kept repeating how bad and sad it would be if someone were killed if the Mt. Baker safety violation remained intact. And it would be a definite tragedy. In their plan however they have allowed for 8 years of that risk to remain at Mt. Baker road. At the front end of the presentation DOWL representatives were stressing that the time frames of the plan could change at any time. Why in a Eastsound Airport safety and risk assessment would you as a consultant group be willing to suggest an 8 year waiting period of a listed major risk at the airport where you were suppose to fix the safety violations to start with? I can only assume that there is no liability to them with that suggestion and probably not much risk. It's up to the Port to accept that risk as is obvious anyway since the Mt. Baker Road has been a violation for quite a while. This kind of thinking makes my head spin…This is minor but I'm wondering why when you're driving Mt. Baker road Westbound by Schoen Lane you see a 'Low Flying Aircraft' sign, to warn you to at least look before proceeding…But if you're driving Eastbound on Mt. Baker road there is no such sign to offer those motorists the same advantage… Why is that? Mt. Baker Road being a major Airport safety violation for the Port in any of the plans offered seems to disregard Eastbound drivers? 3. Master Plan Figures 2-3 and 5: Transition from BI to BII airport designation. The two big takeaways for me here are, runway is longer, and displaced thresholds are added at the ends of the runway. This makes the runway pavement longer now from 2,901 to 3,255 feet without newly included thresholds length included. According to the displaced Threshold

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			definition I found 'a displaced threshold or DTHR is a runway threshold located at a point other than the physical beginning or end of the runway'. If you include the threshold length the runway length approaches 3,400 feet. We were told the main impetus for all these safety changes are the Cessna 208's wingspan that our providers now use. Cessna 208 aircraft need wider runways not longer than Eastsound Airport already has, Cessna 208's wingspan is 2 feet wider than a BI airport is supposed to handle. Cessna 208's can take off in 2,055 ft and land in 1,625 ft according to the spec sheet from Textron. Eastsound airport is already 2,901…Plenty of existing runway. And they weigh in at maximum takeoff weight at 8000 lbs. So the added runway length is not needed to support our provider's aircraft or fix any of the safety requirements. So why the added length in the runway? I asked this question at the meeting and we went off topic in short order. I then asked what kind of BII aircraft could be supported by a 3,400 runway and none could be named. I thought that interesting. I then added I saw a Cessna Citation CJ2+ a jet aircraft tied down at Eastsound in it's current configuration? So really, what kind and class of aircraft are being invited to Eastsound Airport with the added length and why? I'm left to guessing the answer because in the new airport masterplan runway length is not a FAA requirement to fix the safety violations the masterplan is supposed to be addressing. Runway width and taxiway separation does need to be addressed but really that's it. With the runway and taxiway separations the FAA is requiring the Airport to be in perfect spec creates the need for the old terminal and the bi-plane hanger to be removed and relocated. DOWL and the Port seem to not want to try getting a Mod to Standard (MOS) from the FAA to leave the old terminal. That is not be considered. Personally, I think the building could be upgraded/remodeled larger with the same architectural flavor to keep it retro and rural. With the new Cargo Hanger going in on the West side (figure 4) of the runway further mitigates possible Cessna 208 wingtip conflicts with passenger aircraft making leaving the old terminal even more of an option and retain shorter taxi times. What will the new building be used for and who will its tenants be? It's bigger, more tiedowns, has ugly metal hangers nearby that will need to be built by private money, more parking lot, de-icing area (I was wondering how many de-icing opportunities KORS had last year for UPS or Kenmore Air), and the open space is gone forever. I think the SE corner should remain open space and donated to the community into perpetuity. There was some talk in the meetings I went to of having a US Customs port to service the boating and air traveler needs. Oddly, Friday Harbor just opened up one this summer, KING 5 has a news video of it, and a new airline from Canada North-star Air has started scheduled flights. I can only imagine that North-Star Air would like and Orcas Stop added as well. A suggestion here would be to conserve Boarder service by making the new Friday Harbor check-point the only one for the San Juans. A conservation of resources and money. Passengers coming from Canada could check in at Friday Harbor and then North-Star Air could continue to Eastsound Airport and drop the checked in passengers off. That is unless the Aircraft at North-Star Air need a longer runway than we already have to support that class of Aircraft. North-Star flies Islander Super Q aircraft that only need 1,600 feet of runway to take off on to clear a 50' obstacle. So that's not the reason for the installation of a longer runway. In the June airport masterplan meeting at the Fire Station there was a sort of off the cuff remark about potentially creating a US Customs port of entry at Eastsound airport to facilitate aircraft and boat traffic. In a Jan. 19, 2018 newspaper article the Port suggested exactly that. DOWL didn't cover any of that aspect of the new expansion at the last meeting I went to. Does the island community want a permanent Federal presence on the island all the time? And what does that bring with it. One thing it brings with it are US Customs Aircraft. Here's the link: https://www.cbp.gov/border-

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			security/air-sea/aircraft-and-marine-vessels. So the new bigger BII faster aircraft, Cessna Citation, Beechcraft King Air Series 200 (as long as the crew kept the max takeoff weight under 12.500 lbs)., two drones plus Boarder Patrol Boats probably in Brandt's Landing …Personally I don't want a US Customs or ancillary ICE or Boarder Patrol port on Orcas. Nothing has been said as to whom the tenants will be in the new terminal building or what that intent is or was… I do think the Port/DOWL need to be as clear with the community as possible on the net effect of having Customs and Boarder Patrol point located on Orcas. As far as the Island Community goes I think we as Islanders at least need to know the answer to the US Customs entry port question or who the new tenants might be, so we go in with our eyes open. Potential New Risks: Longer runway length may invite pilots to use the displaced threshold as runway length. According to the Displaced Threshold definition it's okay to do this on takeoff but not landing. Is the community willing to take this added risk?Example: A question for the community is how far do we want to go with the type of aircraft served. Driving by the airport the other day I observed a Cessna Citation cj2+ at the tie downs. I have a picture but didn't post it due to the fact that the call numbers are on the tail. This is a jet aircraft. It has a maximum takeoff weight of 12.500 lbs, Takeoff distance 3,360 ft and Landing distance 2,980 ft. Please remember that Eastsound airport runway is currently listed at 2901 plus blast zones. The new masterplan runway length is listed as 3,255 on figures 2-3. This plane does have a lower approach speed but why was it here? So do we as a community want to support that way of thinking, with the added risk when it involves a jet aircraft? Safety left to individual pilot discretion? We could play 'what if' on a bunch of different levels but I think the point is taken. If the runway pavement is lengthened to include displaced thresholds it may invite pilot behaviors and risk we don't want. It's hard enough already to get pilots to use the voluntary noise abatement policy for departures and arrivals. To me letting those type of Aircraft into Eastsound creates a new Safety Risk that can only be fixed by an even longer runway. The new displaced thresholds don't help with the RPZ Safety violation at the south end of the runway and Mt. Baker Road at all, in fact it makes that worse due to the new runway length being added moving further south the current pavement, especially if you include the displaced thresholds. MasterPlan wise it's okay only if Mt. Baker Road is moved or the Safety violation mitigated. Mainly because the Master Plan will be using runway length without threshold, but Mt. Baker road is closer to pavement end and pilot wise its left to the pilot's discretion on threshold use. If you take the masterplan to the next step the plan does move Mt. Baker road and the RPZ further south, at that point, but until Mt. Baker's safety violation is mitigated or the road is moved a potentially worse safety hazard than before. This could accelerate the time window and the need to move Mt. Baker road sooner than the 20 year time frame. That would be sometime within figure 2 timeframe 8-19 years. Figure 4: This upgrade looks good to me and provides separation of Cargo aircraft from passenger aircraft. It also provides an updated facility for cargo workers moving orders in and out of the airport. Grass tie-down for camping next to small general aviation planes are also provided. Figure 6. Brandt's landing is heavily impacted by the plan with regard to property acquisition, and at the last public meeting DOWL stated that some agreement might be attained with the owners of the landing to facilitate the taxiway and dig more ditch to move the docks. The Airport commissioners have evidently signed a document stating and stored by the state that they will not use Eminent Domain for the airport property acquisitions. They should post a copy. For me if the landowners are willing then that's a zero sum deal. The Brandt landing business will remain with new

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			dock space. Again, all of this is for FAA spec's of a two foot wingspan violation supposedly and creating a taxiway to the north end of the runway with the runway built to spec. I haven't heard any figures as to how much all of this will cost the US taxpayers but it will be pretty substantial. And keep in mind that the Customs and Boarder Patrol Boats will probably be moored there with any security and fencing that goes along with that too. In previous plans there was a fuel farm that could include JetA…I'm assuming that the 100 octane will still be available for the general aviators, but Eastsound Airport I don't believe should offer JetA at any level. Offering JetA will only entice the larger aircraft that use Jet fuel…When pilots are playing around with weight and runway length both coming and going it's best not to offer anything to come in light with. There probably wouldn't be much if any Return on investment for local users of JetA to justify the expense of that part of the new fuel farm installation. If there's a Customs and Boarder Port here the Port will probably be required to install JetA tanks and then if memory serves the Port will also need to apply for a government fueling contract permit or license. Since we are in earthquake country any breach of the fuel tanks the fuel could end up in the aquifer. I haven't seen what kind of fuel or what kind of capacity or location the Port/DOWL are proposing. In the DOWL presentation at Orcas Center there were statistics based on speculation of future airport traffic deplanements etc. to help justify the new airport expansion. The FAA shouldn't be the entity dictating to the community how much airport capacity Orcas Island should endure over time. The Island community should be the entity that dictates it's own airport destiny. In the DOWL power point presentation there is a lot of statistics on growth into the future. The community in the capacity planning of how much and what kind of air traffic it wants should take precedent over FAA speculation and not be subservient to them. The community should be able to pick the level of capacity that the airport should run at and what islanders are willing to accept as the safety risks, noise, air pollution et al that goes along with that. In the meantime all the business interests involved should be able to continue to make money…Since the safety violations were the supposed reason for the new airport masterplan I'm for keeping the existing runway length at 2901 and removing the blast zones that are being used as added runway length…That will maintain all the service we are now used to having by providers like UPS and Kenmore Air, but help keep the larger faster aircraft out. Personally I want nothing to do with a Federal Customs or Boarder Patrol point here on Orcas. There are two already around locally, Friday Harbor and Bellingham. There are strings with that set up as there were strings with the FAA grants and loans that KORS had starting accepting way in the past. Now the FAA is sitting in the catbird seat telling the Port of Orcas its either take more money and do what we want or repay everything we've given you in the past, which isn't really a financial option. So mitigate their financial power by just fixing the safety violations and not building a terminal and runway to support Customs and Boarder Patrol.To me Mt. Baker road Safety Violation has 3 options. 1= do nothing and accept the risk, that violation has been there for years without event. Even if you move Mt. Baker road it's still in the glide or takeoff path…I don't think moving it solves much other than achieving an FAA spec number. There's still the risk of a vehicle being hit by the larger faster aircraft now using the longer runway. It's a matter of FAA spec. An arbitrary number picked out of the blue. 2= Using modern tech for aircraft detection and location on departure and landing (maybe the current GPS landing system could be used), place two lights on the side of the road (no barricades, bells or whistles), for westbound and eastbound traffic, The plane is only actually over Mt. Baker road for a couple seconds so normal traffic you get a green light, a plane on approach or takeoff you get a yellow light, and when an aircraft passes a certain point, a few seconds say 10 you get a red light. Traffic stops

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			momentarily then goes again…Safety violation solved. This type of system was offered in the original set of options but wasn't mentioned in the 'preferred' plan. 3. Dig a tunnel. Violation solved. So the 'preferred' masterplan runway is wider, longer, terminal is bigger, more tie downs, new bigger better cargo hanger. Maybe the initial intention was not to expand the Airport but it looks like that's exactly what happened. The unintentional consequences of the masterplan morphed into unintentional Airport Expansion and the original now dubious intent of the Masterplan to fix Safety Violations has had scope of project creep to now include options for potentially a Federal Custom and Boarder Patrol station. The community really needs to discuss this Masterplan Scope Creep before letting all that in here. Once here we will be hard pressed to have it removed. That's my 2 cents . Clark Cundy

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Mr. Cundy,Thank you for your comments titled “Keep Eastsound Airport a Rural Airport Part II” that were submitted to the project website. This reply is for the record in response to those comments. You have sent comments and questions directly to us, to which we have responded, but those were not submitted as public comments and are not included with them. Although an exhaustive response is not provided, all comments are considered in development of the master plan. Some pertinent responses are provided below.Traffic lights on Mount Baker Road, activated by aircraft taking off or on approach, may cause more problems than the ones they are intended to solve. The section of Mt Baker Rd that crosses the RPZ is a major traffic artery for Orcas Island. It is also adjacent to the fire station. Restricting traffic on it would increase traffic congestion and hinder response by emergency services.In addition, airplanes in Aircraft Approach Category B (AAC-B) are coming in to land at 105 – 140 mph. At 140 miles per hour, an airplane will travel a mile in just under 26 seconds. The detection network that would be required to identify multiple distant airplanes in various weather conditions and determine their intentions to land in time to activate a traffic control mechanism would be so complex that its practicality would be questionable.The total runway pavement is not being increased. It is being shortened and re-marked to correctly reflect the way it is currently being used. That includes re-designating blast pads on each end as displaced thresholds because they are currently being used by Cessna Citation CJ2 and CJ3 airplanes, Beechcraft King Air airplanes, and others. The Port is not in favor of preventing use of the airport for any of its current users. The Cessna Caravan does not need to use the blast pads for additional takeoff or landing capability, and removing runway pavement beyond the current threholds would not affect their operations.There are no plans for Customs and Border Protection to establish a presence on Orcas Island. The Port does not believe that a CBP office is needed, nor does the Port plan to incur the expense of setting up a CBP office on Orcas Island.The FAA does not dictate to airport sponsors the size and capacity their airports should have. However, the FAA requires that grant assurances be complied with when federal tax dollars are used for airport improvements. Those grant assurances include provisions for the safe operation of aircraft at the airport, regulation of obstructions that penetrate the airspace surrounding the airport, etc.Thank you again for your involvement in the public comment process.Eric
267	10/3/2018	Didier Gincig	Please don't have jets and more jets and bigger is better. We like our small island the way it is. Didier
Resposne 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
268	10/3/2018	Evelyn Fuchser & Mike McKinstry	Public Comment re: The Port of Orcas Master Plan To my Orcas island community, The Eastsound Planning Review Committee, The Port of Orcas, and The Dowl “Human Resources Professionals” I attended the most recent open house at Orcas center. The Dowl group did a fine job describing their plans for our future. However, I came away very disappointed. Generally, the responses in answer to the limited to one question per person, were devoid of answers “the questions were meaningful” The responses varied from good to shades of gaslighting. The questions and responses of record are incomplete. I must repeat myself, I have expressed these concerns numerous times they have yet to be addressed correctly, at least should they want to garner public support. It is inappropriate for reasons of safety to further any nonresidential development along Seaview Street. Seaview Street was up until the Aero-View development exclusively residential. It is reasonable that the Port of Orcas after purchasing the large westside parcel has a desire to use it. The Problem is, reasonable access and exit needs. Adding the shipping concerns for Aeronautical services, and or Fed Ex ANYTHING ELSE to the end of Seaview before relieving the no outlet condition as well as some form of pedestrian improvement to move the heavy pedestrian traffic off of the roadway of the existing street should absolutely Not happen! The access from Mount Baker road is a dead end no outlet street. It has become increasingly mixed use travelled as a both residential and industrial “Dead End, no turnaround Road”. The street is now commonly travelled by large trucks and sometimes excessively. There are a large number of residents along this street and, the numbers of residents will rise as the residential street is not fully built out. Most of the occupants along this street and other Orcas Islanders are aware of, or have viewed the danger imposed on the pedestrians that DO regularly occupy the pavement that is also a vehicular street. Planners should be considering traffic, pedestrian safety and connectivity needs of this growing community. Especially when, the GMA focus on a UGA intensifies our connectivity problems, and on top of that, much of it “the UGA” lies within areas of known potential hazards. The growth of our small port of Orcas is not a declared emergency. We do have the ability to properly plan for the people on the ground and existing in our currently quiet neighborhoods and, As well as some future expansion, or remediation of port air related activity. Currently as we are all aware The Port is preparing a new Master Plan to please The Federal Aviation Administration which focus on safety concerns as imposed by FAA rules. Sadly, this planning process has assumed zero concern or assumption of any responsibility or attempt to preempt the obvious danger involved in pressing more activity into this heavily pedestrian, including residents’ visitors and dog walkers as the animal shelter is just down the street. This is not the first time this problem has been addressed. We are concerned at this lack of vision, as I suspect most of the Seaview residents are. As a former land developer, always concerned with costs and feasibility of any development including pedestrian/street and utility improvements to be undertaken which is normally at least in my own experience borne by the developer. It is incredibly obvious that the very first course of concern in attempting to develop that Westside property 'Must' be the elimination of the dead-end condition, appropriation for pedestrian traffic, and appropriate design of Industrial Use classification buffers for neighboring residents and to alleviate the appearance of congestion and an overbuilt environment. What is remaining and that only, should be considered in planning for future use. Please be respectful of the many residential occupancies along both sides of all access patterns. There is much pride in the private properties along this street. I do suggest if, the Port expects any Westside development, the port must correct the existing condition. I would

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			propose to extend Sea view along port property to Nina Lane (a non-exclusive access and egress easement) and improve the westward Nina Lane to Blanchard. Blanchard is a straight road out letting on a less hazardous intersection at Mt Baker Road. This community cannot allow development conditions which jeopardize the life safety concerns of many neighboring occupants. Neighbors and Orcas Islanders, Please Let us make this perfectly clear.Do the right thing! Provide Good properly designed Outlets for heavily occupied streets/ or deny development. When an emergency does occur, Wisdom should account for saving lives/Not costing them. Evelyn
			I attended the recent port meeting at orcas center to listen and view dowl s presentation of the new airport master plan. I have resided at 162 Aviator Dr. (formerly Grassylvania) for 21 years and am pro expansion on the west side of the airport. The problem is Dowl hasn't done their due diligence to see if developing the Westside with new hangers and buildings to house aeronautical services and fed ex is even feasible. When I asked the project manager Leah Henderson how Dowl was going to address the problems with Seaview st being a dead end street, her response was that will have to be addressed when the development occurs, I asked again what happens if there's an emergency where do people go it's a dead end there's no outlet? Her response was that will have to be answered by another agency. Look, my wife/partner and I have been developers of a few sub divisions, and before you even present the idea of a project to the municipalities you complete a feasibility study, you make sure you address all the infrastructure questions before you start drawing up your development plans, does the road meet the needs and requirements of the proposed use?, if not, what will I be required to do to bring it up to those standards Width, Visibility, loads, pedestrian separation , lighting and most importantly an inlet and an outlet to ways in two ways out ,connectivity. When there is an emergency, and people have to flee there is no way out other than the Mt baker road inlet (it may be blocked), and no turn around. The only other way is to cross the runway. Most mixed use development, residential/commercial, and especially industrial use require two way accesses by municipal code. The authority of the Fire marshal to employ vacation via private property is viable upon the situation of a declared emergency, however in the planning stages of development there is no such emergency and or authority by the Fire Chief to declare neighboring property open for public use or egress. Those are my comments, Mike McKinstry Aviator Drive Eastsound Orcas Island

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Mike/Evelyn, It is possible we could connect to Nina Ln and if the county were to require that in permitting, that is a solution we might pursue. However, I don't think any part of the current county code would require it for the proposed uses. Perhaps you should approach Council about adopting that as a code requirement, but since most roads on the islands are dead-ends, I'm not sure they would be supportive. To start that conversation, I have copied our council member, Rick Hughes, above. You might also propose that discussion with EPRC and you can discuss with Paul Kamin, also CC'd above. Thank you for comments. Tony
Response 2			But in fact you have not considered the building and fire codes, dual outlets are a necessity in most commercial and especially split occupancies where an outlet is in excess of 600 feet from a connector road. This jurisdiction is grossly short of understanding the various implications of planning in a UGA. When the fire chief suggested the port property he did so incorrectly. This because he had no authority. The requirements preceded the fire chief/Martial authority.Now regarding the propane tank, the plat restrictions requiring residential appearance on seaview, no outside storage, alone, along with the no outlet condition, and obvious incompatibility with Airport use should have alone created the no condition. Additionally the light industrial designation is not at all in the real world compatible with bulk fuel capacity's greater than 2000 gallons. Evelyn
Response 3			Can you provide a reference for something in County Code or that would be included by reference in County Code for such a requirement? I don't see it in County Code and I don't see it included by reference, but you seem to have some specific reference in mind. Please share it. I and the Port have nothing to do with the Propane tank other than us stating clearly that access across the airport was not granted. I think I can paraphrase Rick Hughes said to me recently, in effect --- that the CUP can't be complied with or executed for a variety of reasons, including the ingress/egress requirements. --- If they attempt to execute, we will call code enforcement as Rick suggested to me. Perhaps, if/when/ever we submit a building application, you can engage the hearing examiner. Us putting it in a master plan is the equivalent of a private landowner thinking in private what they might do with a parcel someday. If you want me to include upgrades to the road, pedestrian access, utilities, etc., I could possibly do that, but that will only fire you up more. Leah - Would you please make a note in the Master Plan... Development of West side for hangars or cargo may require upgrades to access roads and utilities to comply with (Design Standard reference to be submitted by Evelyn Fucher).Tony
Response 4			2015 IFC Appendix D, as intended therein and reference to GuidelinesForAmendingFunctionalClassification_WSDOT.pdf http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/mapsdata/travel/hpms/pdf/GuidelinesForAmendingFunctionalClassification_WSDOT.pdf a cursory only review of what's out there. Evelyn

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
269	10/3/2018	Mike Parnell	We spoke about the port acquiring all or part of my ramp, relocating the fuel tanks and pumps for taxi separation targets. Is the port open to purchasing an easement on my property for that benefit? Ps: support lengthening the runway, moving Mt Baker rd, new terminal and future growth plan. Oppose condemning the marina. When our current fire station was built- 10-12 yrs ago same outcry over to big, not necessary, but community expanded and we grew into it sooner than anticipated.
Response 1			Mr. Parnell, Thank you for your comments. The specific details and timing of property acquisitions will have to be worked out in the coming years. If federal funds are used, that money will have to be programmed into the airport's Capital Improvement Plan and the Port's budget. No one has ever proposed condemning the marina or any part of it. The marina owners have plans to expand their facility, and there appears to be opportunity to coordinate the airport improvement work with theirs. Thank you again for your involvement in the public comment process. Eric
270	10/3/2018	Suzie Thomas	I STRONGLY oppose an international airport on Orcas Island. We are a small island. We have so many beautiful spaces, that the never ending concepts of big and bigger and even bigger keep infringing on. The changes that would have to take place tomake the airport yet another of the BIGGER infringements on our town and island would destroy so many elements of the character and beauty that are Orcas. I DO NOTwant to see this happen.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment .
271	10/3/2018	Fred Klein	Gentlepeople,I urge you to reconsider location of the expanded cargo area envisioned on the west side of the runway…consequences of vehicular traffic unacceptable to the community.I'm told that the need for expanded capacity is significant and "now". A suggestion would be to build a new facility in the NW corner of the large vacant parcel envisioned for the future terminal…95% of incoming cargo arrives by truck at present…if that should change in the future, the other aspects of the MP will provide direct access by aircraft as well…in the meantime, airport management advises that provisions can easily be made for access to a new cargo facility east of Shoen Lane by the lone Cessna 207 used at present.In final phase of MP, customer (and truck) vehicular traffic can enter off N. Beach Road

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Thank you for your comment .
272	10/4/2018	Sheila Macclean	hello- I just would like to bring up 3-or so points- that I felt were negative in re: to this plan- number 1- there is a power station very close to the airport- on Lovers lane- and also, a very large propane tank to be placed nearby as well- on Seaview st. - these 2 things seem to be risky to the idea of expansion of the airport- 2. also, too many planes flying already too low- over the Lavendar Hollow 22 apts. (very close)- there seems to be several things that make this seem to be a bad idea- 3. also, the hearing of several of the persons living at Lav. Hollow apts. has been impaired already- the proposed heliport- also, seems to exaberate this as well-as the noise alone would be deafening - (it is proposed to be adjacent to the road) although, there is some talk of moving the road?- noise and air pollution are just 2 ofr the negative factors- also, it seems to put so many hangers squeezed into such a small area- questionable- thank you so much for your attention to this- sincerely yours, Sheila MacLean
Response 1			Thank you for your comment .

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
273	10/4/2018	Jan Alderton	Dear Orcas Port Commissioners and DOWL, Thank-you for this opportunity to comment on the Preferred Alternative to improve our Eastsound airport safety for both aircraft and the general public. I have been learning quite a lot during the public process. My priorities are not only safety, but also wise use of public funds at both the local and federal levels. Negative impacts to our environment and increasing noise impacts for Eastsound residents and visitors also concern me. Firstly, I would like to support Clark Cundy's proposal to address the Mount Baker Road safety issue. It seems to me that this solution could be implemented much more quickly and at a much lower cost than the relocation of Mount Baker Road. This sounds like a win-win for all: "Using modern tech for aircraft detection and location on departure and landing (maybe the current GPS landing system could be used), place two lights on the side of the road (no barricades, bells or whistles), for westbound and eastbound traffic. The plane is only actually over Mt. Baker road for a couple seconds so normal traffic you get a green light, a plane on approach or takeoff you get a yellow light, and when an aircraft passes a certain point, a few seconds say 10 you get a red light. Traffic stops momentarily then goes again…Safety violation solved. This type of system was offered in the original set of options but wasn't mentioned in the 'preferred' plan." I agree that runway width and taxiway separation must be addressed for the Cessna 208 aircraft. According to Clark Cundy, the Cessna 208 do not need a longer runway. Creating a runway longer than Eastsound's existing one will attract larger and noisier aircraft. Clark Cundy says, "We were told the main impetus for all these safety changes are the Cessna 208's wingspan that our providers now use. Cessna 208 aircraft need wider runways not longer than Eastsound Airport already has, Cessna 208's wingspan is 2 feet wider than a BI airport is supposed to handle. Cessna 208's can take off in 2,055 ft and land in 1,625 ft according to the spec sheet from Textron. Eastsound airport is already 2,901…Plenty of existing runway. And they weigh in at maximum takeoff weight at 8000 lbs. So the added runway length is not needed to support our provider's aircraft or fix any of the safety requirements. So why the added length in the runway? I asked this question at the meeting and we went off topic in short order. I agree with Clark Cundy's statement:"Since the safety violations were the supposed reason for the new airport Master Plan I'm for keeping the existing runway length at 2901 and removing the blast zones that are being used as added runway length…That will maintain all the service we are now used to having by providers like UPS and Kenmore Air, but help keep the larger faster aircraft out. Personally I want nothing to do with a Federal Customs or Boarder Patrol point here on Orcas. There are two already around locally, Friday Harbor and Bellingham. There are strings with that set up as there were strings with the FAA grants and loans that KORS had starting accepting way in the past. Now the FAA is sitting in the catbird seat telling the Port of Orcas its either take more money and do what we want or repay everything we've given you in the past, which isn't really a financial option. So mitigate their financial power by just fixing the safety violations and not building a terminal and runway to support Customs and Boarder Patrol." I completely agree with Clark Cundy that our community, not the FAA, should be responsible for choosing the scale/capacity of our airport. Clark stated, "In the DOWL presentation at Orcas Center there were statistics based on speculation of future airport traffic deplanements, etc., to help justify the new airport expansion. The FAA shouldn't be the entity dictating to the community how much airport capacity Orcas Island should endure over time. The Island community should be the entity that dictates it's own airport destiny. In the DOWL power point presentation there are a lot of statistics on growth into the future. The community in the capacity planning of how much and

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			what kind of air traffic it wants should take precedent over FAA speculation and not be subservient to them. The community should be able to pick the level of capacity that the airport should run at and what islanders are willing to accept as the safety risks, noise, air pollution, et. al, that goes along with that. In the meantime all the business interests involved should be able to continue to make money. I oppose creating a US Customs port of entry at Eastsound airport to facilitate aircraft and boat traffic. Clark Cundy states, "In the June airport Master Plan F meeting at the Fire Station there was a sort of off the cuff remark about potentially creating a US Customs port of entry at Eastsound airport to facilitate aircraft and boat traffic. In a Jan. 19, 2018 newspaper article the Port suggested exactly that. DOWL didn't cover any of that aspect of the new expansion at the last meeting I went to. Does the island community want a permanent Federal presence on the island all the time? And what does that bring with it. One thing it brings with it are US Customs Aircraft. Here's the link: www.cbp.gov/border-security/air-sea/aircraft-and-marine-vessels. So the new bigger BII faster aircraft, Cessna Citation, Beechcraft King Air Series 200 (as long as the crew kept the max takeoff weight under 12,500 lbs)., two drones plus Border Patrol Boats probably in Brandt's Landing. Personally I don't want a US Customs or ancillary ICE or Border Patrol port on Orcas. Nothing has been said as to whom the tenants will be in the new terminal building or what that intent is or was. I do think the Port/DOWL need to be as clear with the community as possible on the net effect of having Customs and Boarder Patrol point located on Orcas. As far as the Island Community goes I think we as Islanders at least need to know the answer to the US Customs entry port question or who the new tenants might be, so we go in with our eyes open." I am concerned about the costs of reconfiguring the docks at Brandt's Landing as indicated in Figure 6.Clark Cundy states, "Figure 6. Brandt's landing is heavily impacted by the plan with regard to property acquisition, and at the last public meeting DOWL stated that some agreement might be attained with the owners of the landing to facilitate the taxiway and dig more ditch to move the docks. The Airport commissioners have evidently signed a document stating and stored by the state that they will not use Eminent Domain for the airport property acquisitions. They should post a copy. For me if the landowners are willing then that's a zero sum deal. The Brandt landing business will remain with new dock space. Again, all of this is for FAA spec's of a two foot wingspan violation supposedly and creating a taxiway to the north end of the runway with the runway built to spec. I haven't heard any figures as to how much all of this will cost the US taxpayers but it will be pretty substantial. And keep in mind that the Customs and Boarder Patrol Boats will probably be moored there with any security and fencing that goes along with that too." Thank-you for your attention.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Ms. Alderton, Thank you for the comments that you submitted to the project website. Your comments included a substantial amount of narrative from Mr. Clark Cundy. In addition to a response to his public comments, we have clarified numerous questions he has asked us directly. Although an exhaustive response is not provided, all comments are considered in development of the master plan. Some pertinent responses are provided below.Traffic lights on Mount Baker Road, activated by aircraft taking off or on approach, may cause more problems than the ones they are intended to solve. The section of Mt Baker Rd that crosses the RPZ is a major traffic artery for Orcas Island. It is also adjacent to the fire station. Restricting traffic on it would increase traffic congestion and hinder response by emergency services.In addition, airplanes in Aircraft Approach Category B (AAC-B) are coming in to land at 105 – 140 mph. At 140 miles per hour, an airplane will travel a mile in just under 26 seconds. The detection network that would be required to identify multiple distant airplanes in various weather conditions and determine their intentions to land in time to activate a traffic control mechanism would be so complex that its practicality would be questionable.The total runway pavement is not being increased. It is being shortened and re-marked to correctly reflect the way it is currently being used. That includes re-designating blast pads on each end as displaced thresholds because they are currently being used by Cessna Citation CJ2 and CJ3 airplanes, Beechcraft King Air airplanes, and others. The Port is not in favor of preventing use of the airport for any of its current users. The Cessna Caravan does not need to use the blast pads for additional takeoff or landing capability, and removing runway pavement beyond the current threholds would not affect their operations.There are no plans for Customs and Border Protection to establish a presence on Orcas Island. The Port does not believe that a CBP office is needed, nor does the Port plan to incur the expense of setting up a CBP office on Orcas Island.The FAA does not dictate to airport sponsors the size and capacity their airports should have. However, the FAA requires that grant assurances be complied with when federal tax dollars are used for airport improvements. Those grant assurances include provisions for the safe operation of aircraft at the airport, regulation of obstructions that penetrate the airspace surrounding the airport, etc.Thank you again for your involvement in the public comment process.Eric

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
274	10/4/2018	Heather Oaksen	Dear DOWL, and Port Commissioners,Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the plan on the record. I have attended three different meetings to try to understand the intent for the airport expansion plans; here are my thoughts. 1. The community participation process was at first both negligible and poorly advertised; the apparent disinterest in community opinions has led to mistrust about the true motivation behind the plans. Who will benefit most from additional F.A.A.funding and the "preferred alternative"? 2. It appears that the issue of safety could be accomplished through widening of the runways—without restructuring the entire airport footprint; and with creative site re-organization, Fed X shipping facilities could be expanded without destroying the neighborhood on the west side. Additional private airplane storage/tenting sites should not be a priority land use. 3. Residents live here because of the Island's intimate rural character; we do not aspire to have a world class terminal, nor more services for wealthy tourists to use while they visit. Fueling increased growth through large scale airport expansion is also not compatible with the County Comprehensive Plan, nor the Eastsound Plan's Vision Statement. Furthermore, we do not yet have figures for the Island's overall carrying capacity of our limited natural resources. 4. There is inadequate information and attention given to the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods of increased air and surface road traffic, as well as noise levels for island residents on the whole. A question most of us are asking…who will truly benefit from this expansion? What about a less grandiose solution? If minimum safety standards could be established, and FedX/UPS facilities could be expanded to meet CURRENT demand, could we not opt out of all the other so called "benefits" that really only serve tourism? As Port Commissioners, you are elected officials…selected to represent the interests of our local citizens. Please take another look at what is possible and preferred by the majority of your constituents. Thank you for your consideration, Heather Dew Oaksen

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Ms. Oaksen, Thank you for the comments that you submitted to the project website. 1. Since January of this year, three public open-house meetings and a Special Meeting of the Port Commission have been held in support of this planning process. In spite of mailings to all island residents, notification on the Port website, and in local news outlets, the January and June meetings were poorly attended. It was difficult trying to determine the desires of the community with such little input. The people of Orcas Island and the visitors who go there are the greatest beneficiaries of FAA funding for the airport. San Juan County, the State of Washington, and the FAA all have documents indicating the value of Orcas Island Airport to the island and the surrounding region. In preparing the master plan, we attempt to incorporate all those requirements and the desires of the community and facility users. 2. The primary objective of all the alternatives that have been explored to date has been to meet the FAA safety requirements for the airport with minimal impact to the surroundings. Tents and hangars are far down the list of potential land uses. 3. The FAA would not object if the terminal building were a phone booth. The only objection is that it is inside the Runway Object Free Area (ROFA)—a safety hazard. 4. Impacts of specific projects are dealt with during the environmental clearance process, during which there will be many more opportunities for public involvement and comment. Detailed environmental impacts cannot be determined during the master planning process before they have even been identified. Opting out of the FAA Airport Improvement Program is certainly an option. The funds provided by U.S. taxpayers that have been planned for Orcas Island Airport and the funds that have already been invested in it that will have to be repaid can be more effectively used elsewhere. Orcas Island Airport can be supported by local taxes to the extent that island residents are willing to fund it. Thank you again for your involvement in the public comment process. Eric

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
275	10/4/2018	Sheila Gaquin	These are my comments regarding the Eastsound Airport proposals: 1.I am opposed to moving the Mt. Baker Road. The problem of aircraft flying over vehicular traffic can easily and inexpensively be solved with a traffic light system that stops traffic for the few seconds it takes for the plane to cross over the road. 2. I am opposed to making Eastsound a port of entry with US Customs at the Eastsound facility.3.I am opposed to extending the runway in order to bring more and larger aircraft to Eastsound.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
276	10/4/2018	Natalie Menacho	Hi There, My name is Natalie Menacho and I live in Eastsound. I am very alarmed that the county is moving forward with the Airport Expansion against the wishes of the community. I don't feel there has been adequate outreach or education and moving forward with a "solution" that the majority of the people do not support feels very wrong. I am in full support of the statement below, written by Janet Alderton. Thank you for your consideration. Dear Orcas Port Commissioners and DOWL, Thank-you for this opportunity to comment on the Preferred Alternative to improve our Eastsound airport safety for both aircraft and the general public. I have been learning quite a lot during the public process. My priorities are not only safety, but also wise use of public funds at both the local and federal levels. Negative impacts to our environment and increasing noise impacts for Eastsound residents and visitors also concern me. Firstly, I would like to support Clark Cundy's proposal to address the Mount Baker Road safety issue. It seems to me that this solution could be implemented much more quickly and at a much lower cost than the relocation of Mount Baker Road. This sounds like a win-win for all: "Using modern tech for aircraft detection and location on departure and landing (maybe the current GPS landing system could be used), place two lights on the side of the road (no barricades, bells or whistles), for westbound and eastbound traffic. The plane is only actually over Mt. Baker road for a couple seconds so normal traffic you get a green light, a plane on approach or takeoff you get a yellow light, and when an aircraft passes a certain point, a few seconds say 10 you get a red light. Traffic stops momentarily then goes again…Safety violation solved. This type of system was offered in the original set of options but wasn't mentioned in the 'preferred' plan." I agree that runway width and taxiway separation must be addressed for the Cessna 208 aircraft. According to Clark Cundy, the Cessna 208 do not need a longer runway. Creating a runway longer than Eastsound's existing one will attract larger and noisier aircraft. Clark Cundy says, "We were told the main impetus for all these safety changes are the Cessna 208's wingspan that our providers now use. Cessna 208 aircraft need wider runways not longer than Eastsound Airport already has, Cessna 208's wingspan is 2 feet wider than a BI airport is supposed to handle. Cessna 208's can take off in 2,055 ft and land in 1,625 ft according to the spec sheet from Textron. Eastsound airport is already 2,901…Plenty of existing runway. And they weigh in at maximum takeoff weight at 8000 lbs. So the added runway length is not needed to support our provider's aircraft or fix any of the safety requirements. So why the added length in the runway? I asked this question at the meeting and we went off topic in short order. I agree with Clark Cundy's statement:"Since the safety violations were the supposed reason for the new airport Master Plan I'm for keeping the existing runway length at 2901 and removing the blast zones that are being used as added runway length…That will maintain all the service we are now used to having by providers like UPS and Kenmore Air, but help keep the larger faster aircraft out. Personally I want nothing to

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			do with a Federal Customs or Boarder Patrol point here on Orcas. There are two already around locally, Friday Harbor and Bellingham. There are strings with that set up as there were strings with the FAA grants and loans that KORS had starting accepting way in the past. Now the FAA is sitting in the catbird seat telling the Port of Orcas its either take more money and do what we want or repay everything we've given you in the past, which isn't really a financial option. So mitigate their financial power by just fixing the safety violations and not building a terminal and runway to support Customs and Boarder Patrol." I completely agree with Clark Cundy that our community, not the FAA, should be responsible for choosing the scale/capacity of our airport. Clark stated, "In the DOWL presentation at Orcas Center there were statistics based on speculation of future airport traffic deplanements, etc., to help justify the new airport expansion. The FAA shouldn't be the entity dictating to the community how much airport capacity Orcas Island should endure over time. The Island community should be the entity that dictates it's own airport destiny. In the DOWL power point presentation there are a lot of statistics on growth into the future. The community in the capacity planning of how much and what kind of air traffic it wants should take precedent over FAA speculation and not be subservient to them. The community should be able to pick the level of capacity that the airport should run at and what islanders are willing to accept as the safety risks, noise, air pollution, et. al, that goes along with that. In the meantime all the business interests involved should be able to continue to make money. I oppose creating a US Customs port of entry at Eastsound airport to facilitate aircraft and boat traffic. Clark Cundy states, "In the June airport Master Plan F meeting at the Fire Station there was a sort of off the cuff remark about potentially creating a US Customs port of entry at Eastsound airport to facilitate aircraft and boat traffic. In a Jan. 19, 2018 newspaper article the Port suggested exactly that. DOWL didn't cover any of that aspect of the new expansion at the last meeting I went to. Does the island community want a permanent Federal presence on the island all the time? And what does that bring with it. One thing it brings with it are US Customs Aircraft. Here's the link: www.cbp.gov/border-security/air-sea/aircraft-and-marine-vessels. So the new bigger BII faster aircraft, Cessna Citation, Beechcraft King Air Series 200 (as long as the crew kept the max takeoff weight under 12,500 lbs)., two drones plus Border Patrol Boats probably in Brandt's Landing. Personally I don't want a US Customs or ancillary ICE or Border Patrol port on Orcas. Nothing has been said as to whom the tenants will be in the new terminal building or what that intent is or was. I do think the Port/DOWL need to be as clear with the community as possible on the net effect of having Customs and Boarder Patrol point located on Orcas. As far as the Island Community goes I think we as Islanders at least need to know the answer to the US Customs entry port question or who the new tenants might be, so we go in with our eyes open." I am concerned about the costs of reconfiguring the docks at Brandt's Landing as indicated in Figure 6.Clark Cundy states, "Figure 6. Brandt's landing is heavily impacted by the plan with regard to property acquisition, and at the last public meeting DOWL stated that some agreement might be attained with the owners of the landing to facilitate the taxiway and dig more

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			ditch to move the docks. The Airport commissioners have evidently signed a document stating and stored by the state that they will not use Eminent Domain for the airport property acquisitions. They should post a copy. For me if the landowners are willing then that's a zero sum deal. The Brandt landing business will remain with new dock space. Again, all of this is for FAA spec's of a two foot wingspan violation supposedly and creating a taxiway to the north end of the runway with the runway built to spec. I haven't heard any figures as to how much all of this will cost the US taxpayers but it will be pretty substantial. And keep in mind that the Customs and Boarder Patrol Boats will probably be moored there with any security and fencing that goes along with that too." Thank-you for your attention.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Ms. Menacho, Thank you for the comments that you submitted to the project website. Your comments included a substantial amount of narrative from Mr. Clark Cundy and Ms. Janet Alderton. In addition to responses to their public comments, we have clarified numerous questions Mr. Cundy has asked us directly. Although an exhaustive response is not provided, all comments are considered in development of the master plan. Some pertinent responses are provided below.Traffic lights on Mount Baker Road, activated by aircraft taking off or on approach, may cause more problems than the ones they are intended to solve. The section of Mt Baker Rd that crosses the RPZ is a major traffic artery for Orcas Island. It is also adjacent to the fire station. Restricting traffic on it would increase traffic congestion and hinder response by emergency services.In addition, airplanes in Aircraft Approach Category B (AAC-B) are coming in to land at 105 – 140 mph. At 140 miles per hour, an airplane will travel a mile in just under 26 seconds. The detection network that would be required to identify multiple distant airplanes in various weather conditions and determine their intentions to land in time to activate a traffic control mechanism would be so complex that its practicality would be questionable.The total runway pavement is not being increased. It is being shortened and re-marked to correctly reflect the way it is currently being used. That includes re-designating blast pads on each end as displaced thresholds because they are currently being used by Cessna Citation CJ2 and CJ3 airplanes, Beechcraft King Air airplanes, and others. The Port is not in favor of preventing use of the airport for any of its current users. The Cessna Caravan does not need to use the blast pads for additional takeoff or landing capability, and removing runway pavement beyond the current threholds would not affect their operations.There are no plans for Customs and Border Protection to establish a presence on Orcas Island. The Port does not believe that a CBP office is needed, nor does the Port plan to incur the expense of setting up a CBP office on Orcas Island.The FAA does not dictate to airport sponsors the size and capacity their airports should have. However, the FAA requires that grant assurances be complied with when federal tax dollars are used for airport improvements. Those grant assurances include provisions for the safe operation of aircraft at the airport, regulation of obstructions that penetrate the airspace surrounding the airport, etc. Thank you again for your involvement in the public comment process. Eric

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
277	10/4/2018	Melanie Thea Patten	To Leah Henderson of DOWL and to the Orcas Island Port Commissioners: I have been a resident of San Juan County for 47 years; I have lived on Orcas for the last 16 years. My property is on Mt. Baker Road around half a mile east of the airport. My family has kept a slip for a boat at Brandt's Landing Marina since it opened for business in the 1970's. Several aspects of the proposed Airport Expansion concern me greatly. I do not believe that the "Preferred Alternatives" as detailed by DOWL would be of benefit to Orcas Island at all. I responded to an earlier request for comments by supporting the original "Alternative 1 – No Build." The Port Commissioners were then instructed by Airport Manager Tony Simpson to ignore comments supporting Alternative 1. I understand that the FAA wants us to increase the runway and taxiway width, separation and "object-free" safety zones by a total of 240' because the Cessna Caravans now using our B-1 airport have wingspans that exceed the B-1 maximum by 3'. Rather than opting to expand to FAA standards for a B-2 airport, I believe that a variance should have been sought, and should still be sought. The possibility of trying to get a variance from the FAA for a limited expansion was never seriously explored or presented to the public as a valid alternative, as it should have been; the only "choices" (and the "Preferred Alternatives" designed by DOWL) would knock out a large part of the only marina on the north side of the island, require moving a County road into a wetland area, increase the noise from airplanes onto residential areas by moving the planes closer to homes and businesses, and slow down emergency response time for fire and police by making emergency vehicles go around the newly expanded airport. DOWL's "Preferred Alternatives" would satisfy FAA requirements by sacrificing all other considerations to FAA rules. I believe that rather than enact the intrusive "Preferred Alternatives" the Port should try to get a limited expansion from the FAA that would not impact the marina, the wetlands, or the neighbors. Along with most Orcas Island residents, I do not want increased airport use by larger airplanes, helicopters and jets, which would increase noise and other impacts. A predictable, if "unintended" consequence of creating an airport acceptable to larger aircraft is that they will actually choose to use it. Keep it small! if at all possible. One of my great concerns is that the proposed airport expansion would eliminate a large part of the already limited moorage at Brandt's Landing Marina, the only available year-round mooring facility on the north side of Orcas Island. I understand that the Port is negotiating the acquisition of a portion of Brandt's in order to be able to increase airport width. The speaker at the September public meeting told us that somehow this would enable Brandt's to expand the marina eastward to provide more mooring spaces. That sounds to me like a pipe dream. If there is any way to ensure increased, rather than decreased moorage, I would like that to be included in the Port's plan. The Port of Orcas is not just for the airport! It is also supposed to support water access!I do not favor the kind of expensive, upscale airport terminal that the DOWL presenters seemed to think would be a good idea. I do not favor having jet fuel available on Orcas. It would only encourage jets to land here. We don't need the noise! We don't need the risk of spills and pollution! Lastly, I was told by two different Orcas Port Commissioners that the proposed Master Plan would never actually be built out; it was only intended to satisfy the FAA's requirement to create a 20-year Master Plan. Each aspect of the Plan would then be impossible to actually fund or get permits for. I was supposed to be reassured by this. I am not.Thank you

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
278	10/4/2018	Matt Fikse	The proposed Port of Orcas Airport Master Plan took a lot of work by many to get to this point. Thanks to the Port staff, commissioners and all participants for their efforts as it's not easy work. But the Master Plan "preferred alternative" (of the 3 proposed) is troubling. There is much more work to do before it should be approved. From this longtime airport user and aviator's viewpoint, adopting the largest growth option conceived for the airport is completely unnecessary in order to properly support general and commercial aviation.And also from this Orcas property owner's viewpoint, adopting this mega-development Master Plan for the Airport is totally out of sync with balancing healthy Island growth and far out of scale with aspects of island history and life that are unique and worth protecting. Most importantly, the public outreach and input process for the development of the Master Plan was inadequate given the radical effect this plan will have as a growth blueprint impacting the entire Island.Port commissioners should pause the process, work harder at public outreach and get far fuller public input to striker a better balance between external-driven growth and island-driven healthy growth. Here's the main thing to get more input on: this plan as proposed would effectively shift the Airport from a role of serving the Island to one of leading the Island in terms of promoting and accelerating commercial development. Rows and rows of new hangars on both southeast and west sides, wider (someday longer?) runway, acres of new tarmac, a new terminal, and all of that will without a doubt serve as a jet-fueled accelerant to development of the Island as a commercial tourism and resort style destination—with all of those impacts. I say "jet-fueled" because there are at least 6 models of very light jets (VLJs) [single landing gear, less than or about 10,000 pounds takeoff weight planes, below the runway limit of 12,500 pounds] now in service, including several that can use a runway of slightly more than 3,000 feet at sea level. The plan's growth projection should include a specific analysis of expected VLJ traffic, especially if lengthening the runway by using the displaced thresholds occurs, otherwise the plan is simply not realistic. With more facilities, more tarmac, real estate development and growth, the jet traffic will absolutely come to Orcas, as quickly as an enlarged airport facility can handle it, especially if the airport ever serves up Jet-A fuel. So, the community needs to debate this plan in that larger Island-wide context before coming up with a consensus on how to move forward.Master Plans are important. They pave the way for future assumptions and policies. That's why it's vital to get it right now, instead of naively assuming parts of it won't happen because people say "we're never going to do that."If it ends up in the Master Plan, it's possible—even likely, eventually. Port Commissioners should pause the process and get a far wider set of community input before proceeding. Otherwise they will end up with a Master Plan that is divisive, contentious, and ultimately, unsuccessful in earning broad community support.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Matt, Our blast pads are already used as displaced thresholds (contrary to our minimum standards) and the overall pavement length is 3,388. In the current paradigm, the FAA would remove our blast pads to 125' max and reduce our overall pavement length to maybe 3,150'. Some current users, including those in Columbia 400s, CJ2s and CJ3s, King Airs and even Moonies already use them as displaced thresholds and losing the overall length would push them away... current users. It is not commercially viable and many insurers limit private use of VLJs into airports based on Balanced Field Length, etc. The implications for useful load make operating in here very limited. So, published length goes up minimally...but overall pavement length gets shorter...NEVER LONGER.I'm not interested in a plan that pushes current users away...even the limited number of jet users.We also don't have a plan that materially enables more VLJs to operate in here. This plan is effectively the minimum impact plan that complies with FAA standards, something that is required for us to remain in the AIP program.I have an Airman's perspective. When you view the airport from above on final to 16 or 34 and visualize an overlay the totality of this plan on the existing airport in context of the entire island, it has nowhere near the "radical effect" that Air BNBs, VRBOs and hundreds of thousands of car-driving tourists on the ferry do. If you looked at the plans from 1998 and 2003, many of the same features and plans are contained in there.My job will be advertised soon and you can apply for it. Perhaps you can right the ship, since you think it needs doing. Tony
Response 2			Hi Tony, Many thanks for the additional info — it is much appreciated. I'll share it with anyone who asks me about it. I realize it's a complex balance to strike. Thanks for your work. Matt
279	10/5/2018	Russell Borgnin	October 5, 2018 Dear Port of Orcas and Airport Commission, Yesterday I learned of the airport Master Plan and that public comment was ending today, Oct 5th. I'm a pilot that has been an aviation user of Orcas Island Airport for 20 years. Starting in 1998 I was the initial organizer of the annual Cascade Flyers Fly-In every July. I'd like to offer input and comments to the Master Plan proposal since I eventually hope to become a resident of the Island and perhaps a tie-down or hanger tenant. 1 Firstly, the public comment period was grossly under advertised. I understand there were a few hand written signs, some postcards, a notice and that was about it, for a very short and non-inclusive comment period. The notices certainly did not include extended airport users or the local aviation community. I implore that the comment period be significantly extended and much more thoroughly advertised. Were notices sent to all the area flying clubs, aviation organizations such as EAA and local AOPA chapters, and general aviation airplane owners in the area? Such notices could have easily and readily been sent using such organizations, the public aviation database, and social media. It's actions such as this – the apparent ram-rodding through of huge proposals - that destroy the credibility of public facility managers and public commissions such as yours. 2. I'm sure the Master Plan did take a lot of work and time –but this does not mean it is any good. In fact the full plan appears to be completely overdeveloped and soulless without any consideration or enhancement to the Orcas airport as a geographic place or a community. 3. A question is if any stage of the plan will reduce the airport's instrument approach minimums? Reduced minimums will certainly have a significant effect on the type and quantity of airplane traffic. 4. I'm all for the purchase of the north end private land between the runway

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			and the beach, especially if this becomes open space. 5 I'm extremely troubled by the 240' taxiway expansion on the east side. It appears a new taxiway would go through the existing terminal and destroy the large grass tie down area between the fuel pump and the AWOS/beacon. 6. The grass tied down area is where we hold our annual fly-in and camp-under-the-wing event. It's also where the EAA holds their annual aviation event. Where would these functions occur if the Master Plan is implemented? 7. The grass tied down area actually is one of the very few such places that exist in the state, country and indeed the world – for such low key fly in camping under the wing. I would vote to improve this area rather than destroy it – it's a rare jewel in the aviation community . 8. I'm also very troubled by the large new hanger and terminal area in the SE corner of the airport. The widening of the airport to such an extent and the creation of such a new commercial area goes completely against the idea of keeping Orcas a rural area full of open space. The design of the paving, hangers and terminal by the plan – do nothing to enhance Orcas Island in anyway but degrade the airport, landscape and island into a nasty commercial operation. 9. Orcas Island is a rural island. The fact that it's hard to get to is keeping Orcas Orcas. This is becoming ever so difficult because it's sandwiched between the Seattle and Vancouver megapolises. The rural, environmental, small town, country feel of Orcas should be preserved in every way. It does not appear this was a consideration in the Master plan. 10. Also, there are rumors of Oprah coming in and "buying up the town". Is this influence somehow effecting the development of the airport? This should be thoroughly investigated and realized to the public. 11. The large new hangers proposed in the master plan seem to be targeted toward large turbine and jet powered aircraft. Jet aircraft in particular would vastly change the nature and the environment of Orcas Island, the Airport and the San Juan Islands. The Very Light Jet (VLJ) trend is continuing and perhaps accelerating. The VLJ's are under 12,500 pounds criteria that would be allowed at Orcas and include such models as: Cessna Citation Mustang Eclipse 500 Embraer Phenom 100 Cessna Honda HA-420 Honda Jet Cirrus Vision SF50. The new SE corner and terminal area it appears is all designed to be commercial and a turbine & jet operating area. This is not keeping with what Orcas currently represents. 12. I'm totally against the 240' taxi expansion on the east side. I would support tearing down the existing terminal and building a very small, simple well-designed terminal in its place. This would greatly facilitate the addition of more commercial single engine planes, turbine powered Caravans and passenger traffic. 13. If the cargo tenant needs a bigger facility the port should support a new facility for them at or near their existing location as well. 14. I would support some enhancement to the grass tie down area that can be better used for fly in camping and transient aircraft . 15. And of course any enhancement to the airport perimeter to enhance the environmental quality of the area is definitely supported. There is much more to say and to consider with this Master Plan. I hope the airport will extend the time for input and vastly expand and explain the plan to the aviation community, residents of Orcas and the San Juan Islands, and to the citizens of the Northwest at large.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Mr. Borgnin, I take strong exception to your characterization of what we have done here and it starts with your characterization of our advertising. We sent mail to every address on this island and invited participation. That mailing noted information on our website which has been there and updated for a year. We submitted and were printed in our local paper numerous times. We've held public meetings and then held additional Special Meetings of the commission to take comment and answer questions. I have personally volunteered to meet with, discuss over the phone or answer by email questions and comments about specific elements.If anyone would understand Balanced Field Length, the requirements thereof in commercial operations and the resulting useful load limitations with respect to a 3,255 TODA, I would expect it to be someone with "Boeing 737-BBJ" in their signature block. But, your comments suggest you don't.This master planning process has been conducted comparably to every master planning process in the country. We have far exceeded our allocated budget for public engagement in excess of any other airport in the region or Alaska. We will not extend the comment period.I think you don't understand the master planning process or what an Airport Layout Plan represents. Just because hangars are shown on the drawings does not mean they ever get built. It is the way the FAA permits us to build anything… from 1 hangar to 100. There is very limited demand for new hangars and I expect that in the next 40 years, we might build 10…and they'd probably be T-hangars sized for GA aircraft. Finally, since you herald your association with the group, I personally discount your inputs based on how the Cascade Flyers treat this airport when they are here. As a group, you trash the facilities, abuse and overuse limited resources like water, electricity and toilet paper in the bathroom, consume excessive amounts of alcohol, do nothing to dispose of or remove your trash and have taken actions counter to our rules, like bringing additional campers without aircraft and having burn pits on our grass tiedown area. Resigning this winter, I look forward to not cleaning up after your group next year. Thank you for your comments from Portland, OR. They will be included for the commissioners to review and they are CC'd above. Tony Simpson

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
280	10/5/2018	Levi Cross	To Whom it May Concern; Our tiny island is going through enough growth. In my opinion to fast, to much and not sustainable for such a small mass of land. That said I do not believe the expansion of the airport to be a well considered or definitive progressive work for the 21st century, for "we the people" that reside here year round. I was told at one of the meetings the noise study will not be inclusive to the upper part of the mountains, sound travels UP, and especially In a landing strip set below and across water. I have my doubts as to why this must be done, heavy doubts as I have lived here 30yrs. and fed-ex was never a top priority until now….Also more hangers, more traffic and the revision of the road are expensive, and in some plans and downright ridiculous. The placement of our airport will never be big enough for the larger "private tourist" planes I believe are the real reason for these modifications. I don't trust DOWL an independent contractor to right by us as I have studied other jobs you have done. I would also question the validity of FAA statements and the laws governing a national monument, which we are! I hope we can all keep moving ahead to find a common ground in this monumental change to the place I call home and will defend with all my heart & soul. Regard's, Orcas Citizen
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
281	10/5/2018 .	Thomas Baillie	To Whom it may Concern: I am writing to express my strong support for the draft Eastsound Airport Master Plan. As a general aviation pilot who uses the airport frequently to commute between Orcas Island and the mainland, and as an occasional passenger on the Kenmore commercial service between Eastsound and Boeing Field, I depend heavily on the facilities at Eastsound Airport. Moreover, I feel that it is essential that the airport is developed, in a responsible manner that takes into consideration the concerns of the local community, such that the existing facilities are continually improved to meet the needs of both the aviation community and the FAA. I believe that the key elements of the Master Plan address these goals, and I am happy to support the draft proposal to enhance this critical island facility over the coming years.
Response 1			Dr. Baillie, Please accept my sincerest thanks for your comment. We get very few positive comments and it is heartwarming to know that somebody "gets it" and is willing to state so publicly. Tony

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
282	10/5/2018	Paul Hamilton	Port of Orcas Manager, Board and Master Plan Consultant, Thank you for the latest update to the proposed Port of Orcas Master Plan. I was able to attend the public meeting the end of July but not again in September. Thank you also for the opportunity to provide this input.Overall, I think that the proposal has a reasonable balance and schedule. It meets the primary objective of needed safety upgrades.There is one element that I do not see addressed by the latest Master Plan and that is the considerable diminishing of capacity and access for the Brandt's Landing Marina. I see that it is proposed that the Port encroach upon and take over land on the Southwest marine basin and western parking and access but do not see any further discussion as to how this is to be replaced.Like the Port, the marina is a major asset for the north side of Orcas. Docks there are used for commercial ventures including sightseeing and charters, State vessels, private moorage and boat launching. It is the only such facility on the north of our island and allows access to Sucia Is., Matia Is., Patos Is., Waldron Is. and beyond. Loss of these capabilities and facilities are unacceptable and must be addressed within any Master Plan. I have marked up and attached a portion of a map to show the changes I would make while still allowing the Port to expand it's eastern property line. I would propose that a new basin be constructed on the southwest side (area circled in yellow), extend parking on the south side of the basin (outlined in green) and would build an access road along Port property to allow access to the western docks.I think it reasonable for the Port to include in their cost estimates the funding for the comparable basin and parking and westside access road. Brandt's should also be compensated for loss of property. Given the sensitivities around the granting of new land use and shoreline environmental permits, I think it is incumbent upon the Port to fund the environmental assessment and securing of new permits as part of the Master Plan work.Finally, as shown on the map below, I would simply move the large hanger at the south of the map to the eastern side of the same property plot, as opposed to eliminating this facility and the cost of rebuilding elsewhere. Regards Paul T. Hamilton, P.E.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
283	10/5/2018	Jim Ellis	Hello Leah, I attended the open house and presentations on September 19, 2018 regarding the Port of Orcas Master Plan project. As a resident at 247 Nina Lane, I have concerns with the plans you presented.1. The closure of Nina Lane across the north end of the airport. We have enjoyed the safety factor of a passage across the north end of the runway from the Eastsound Water Users (ESWU) property to the Brandt's Landing property. In times of storms this has been our evacuation route when Nina Lane was impassable. The Ports interest in removal of Nina Lane is understandable however, for the safety of the Nina Land residents and for continue maintenance work by ESWU, I hope the road remains available for limited use. 2. The purchase of ESWU property east of the north end of the runway via a land exchange. it's been understood that ESWU is interested in this property for siting a desalination plant should that be required. The Ports plan proposes that the property be acquired by the Port in a land exchange that would provide land in the forest, adjacent to wetlands, for locating such a plant. The connection to north shore would be needed via easements. As resident on Nina Lane, I am opposed to this land exchange and would further be against the location of the plant on Nina Lane in the forest several hundred feet from the shore.3. Relocation of cargo services to the Westside Development to be accessed by Seaview Street. Several persons at your presentation voiced opposition to this proposal for Seaview Street. I agree with those persons who spoke against it. I cannot see any reason to relocate the cargo handling to the west side of the airport. I believe those services should be in proximity to the airport terminal. I think consolidating those services with visitor and passenger services on the east side and minimizing any additional traffic on Seaview Street is much more logical.4. Westside Tent Camping. I'm against any camping on the west side of the airport next to the proposed turf tiedown area. It will create more impacts on Seaview Street. I believe tent camping should be consolidated to the east side of the airport.5. Southeast Development. I hope in the next eight years this is only a line on the drawing as I believe further acquisitions should be identified that point to a better location for expansion of hangars, cargo services and passenger and visitor services. The current terminal location allows for the best view of incoming and departing planes. Your proposed site is at the far south end of the runway, It's on a sloping site. It's near both churches and schools and residences. It borders on the village of East sound. I feel the visual and noise impacts will be intrusive and the practicality of the site, other than in current Port ownership, is questionable. All those factors increase with increased plane traffic.It’s not yet clear what is envisioned for the terminal to be a "showcase". It should be functional. I think one important function is visibility of the runway. I don't believe it needs to be a attraction showcase in close proximity to Mt. Baker Road and very near the intersection with North Beach Road. I believe the Master Plan should add an alternative location which may require future acquisitions.6. Relocate Taxiway through Brand's Landing/Relocate Mt. Baker Road. I'm highly skeptical that either of these lines on the plan will see reality. I can hold my opposition based on the environmental issues of each through the years to come. Thank you for you fine presentation and the opportunity for us, the residents who will live with the results of this plan, to comment. Jim Ellis

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
284	10/5/2018	Matt Vaccarella	To Airport Planning Committee Members; I am very opposed to building a bigger airport terminal, and placing it close to the road within the old Dog Park land. We do not need a larger terminal, as a user of the current terminal I have never experienced over-crowding in the terminal - not even in the summer busy season. Nor have I ever had a problem finding a parking spot. During the public open house held on 19 September, the women giving the presentation mentioned it was the intention to design and build a larger airport terminal - she even mentioned a desire to build "a destination terminal, one that people will want to drive to see, and even stop at for a coffee". This is ridicules, we do not need or want a large 'destination terminal', it is not needed, it is a waste of money, and it will be an eyesore on the island. The current size and low-key design we now have is perfect for our island. Do not build a bigger terminal close to the road! Thank you, Matt Vaccarella
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
285	10/5/2018	Tricia Erly	Dear DOWL and commissioners, My comment on the Port of Orcas Master plan is to begin again with full community involvement. I respectfully implore the commissioners not to move Mt Baker Road, remodel the existing terminal, not develop the old dog park and to keep our Airport rural. Isn't that partially why we all moved here, the rural charm of Eastsound Village? I can't honestly understand why you would continue forward with a plan that is so contrary to the reason why the majority of us moved here. Thank you, Tricia Erly
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
286	10/5/2018	Alexander Conrad	I'd like to record my support for the work of the airport manager and port commission. I believe they are taking prudent and reasonable steps to enhance the safety of current operations, while preparing a financially responsible plan for the future that respects the relationship between growing aviation demands and the rural character of our community.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
287	10/5/2018	Nancy Reas	I hope this is the correct place to send this letter. I want to state that I am against the Master Plan as it stands now. First of all, Orcas Island is rural. That is why we all live here. We do not want "bigger and better." We do not need or want a "showcase terminal." We do not want bigger planes than already come here, and we do not want jets. Here is what I do not want to see: 1. Cargo plane hangar close to Seaview Street. It is already very noisy over there. They do not need more of it. In addition, more traffic on Seaview would change the neighborhood, as well as the safety of it. 2 A lot of new hangars. Who are they being built for? People with nice fancy jets? Why do we need to cater to them? We have enough tourists without them. Keep the airport as rural as it has been. 3.The moving of Mt. Baker Rd. It would destroy the wetland. I think it would endanger the coming and going of fire department vehicles that we depend on A simpler and logical solution has been suggested by Clark Cundy.4. Although there seem to have been mixed messages about the runway being lengthened, it appears from the Plan and what has been stated by DOWL that it will not need to be lengthened. I am against lengthening it if it will mean moving Mt. Baker Rd.Here is what I am in favor of: 1. Widening the runway at the MINIMAL to safely accommodate the size of planes we now have landing here.2. Providing a cargo hangar for FedEx and the like in as unobtrusive a place as possible.3. Jet-A Fuel.If someone really wants to come to Orcas in a jet tha requires that kind of fuel, he can take the ferry instead. We do not need to make it easy for the world to come here just because they want to.Since the airport has been here for many years and was evidently out of compliance, I'm wondering why the FAA apparently did not mind the violations before. I know I do not understand a lot about the situation, but I LIVE here. My husband and I spent 25 years visiting Orcas before moving here 7 years ago, and we did so because we loved so much about Orcas, including its rural nature. I know I sound like an old person who "just needs to accept the changing world." Yes, some things we do need to accept, but this huge redesign of our rural airport is not one of them, in my opinion.
Response 1			Ms. Reas, Thank you for the comments that you submitted to the project website. When I made the statement about a showcase terminal, I assumed that island resident would want a terminal building that would fit in with the San Juan County Comprehensive Plan and the Eastsound Vision, and something that would make a good first impression on visitors. The airport terminal is the front door of a community for visitors arriving by air. However, Orcas Island doesn't need to have a showcase terminal building. The only objection is that the current building is inside the Runway Object Free Area (ROFA)—a safety hazard. A phone booth would do, as long as it's outside the ROFA. 1. Currently, the cargo facility is located within the ROFA—a safety hazard. Locations outside of the ROFA are limited, and acquiring additional property elsewhere appears to be a less desirable option. The preference is to make the best use of land the Port already owns. 2. No new hangars are being built, and if they are not shown on the master plan in locations that don't conflict with other facilities, they

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			can't be built. In addition, they won't be built unless private individuals want to pay for their construction. That prospect does not seem very likely. 3. The proposal by Mr. Cundy is to install traffic signals on Mount Baker Road to stop traffic during aircraft operations over the road. Traffic lights on Mount Baker Road, activated by aircraft taking off or on approach, may cause more problems than the ones they are intended to solve. The section of Mt Baker Rd that crosses the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) is a major traffic artery for Orcas Island. It is also adjacent to the fire station. Restricting traffic on it would increase traffic congestion and hinder response by emergency services. In addition, airplanes in Aircraft Approach Category B (AAC-B) are coming in to land at 105 – 140 mph. At 140 miles per hour, an airplane will travel a mile in just under 26 seconds. The detection network that would be required to identify multiple distant airplanes in various weather conditions and determine their intentions to land in time to activate a traffic control mechanism would be so complex that its practicality would be questionable. 4. The current runway length is 2,901 feet with blast pads on both ends. Even if all that blast pad pavement were removed, Mount Baker Road would still be in conflict with the RPZ. The runway would have to be shortened to approximately 2,170 feet to get the RPZ off of the road. That length of runway would be unusable to all commercial operators and many general aviation operators. Thanks to the diligent efforts of the FAA, the U.S. airspace system is the safest and most efficient in the world. When they spend U.S. taxpayer funds to improve an airport, they expect it to comply with safety standards. If island residents prefer to opt out of the FAA Airport Improvement Program, they are certainly welcome to do that. The funds provided by U.S. taxpayers that have been planned for Orcas Island Airport and the funds that have already been invested in it that will have to be repaid can be more effectively used elsewhere. Orcas Island Airport can be supported by local taxes to the extent that island residents are willing to fund it. Thank you again for your involvement in the public comment process. Eric

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 2			Thank you for your response. It might be a good idea to post your statements on Orcas Issues. As you know there are strong opinions here about the Master Plan. It is easier to "hear" what you're saying in a written format than in an oral presentation in an emotionally charged atmosphere. No one has addressed my question about why the FAA did not appear to mind the safety violations in all the previous years that the airport has existed. Nancy Reas
Response 3			Thank you for your kind reply. As much as we have been tempted to respond to posts on Orcas Issues, we have refrained in order to maintain professionalism and a degree of detachment from strong emotions. Our challenge is to consider all the requirements, requests, and desires, attempt to determine the priorities, then propose solutions that we hope are the optimum of a lot of competing and conflicting criteria. That certainly hasn't been easy. "Safety violation" is not really accurate, as it implies that some rule or regulation has been transgressed. What the Orcas Island airport has experienced is enough normal growth and technological change such that operations there have outgrown the safety standards that used to apply. The previous master plan documented that the Cessna 402 was the aircraft used for airfield planning. Now, it is the Cessna Caravan, which operators have switched to for a variety of economic reasons. The planned improvements for the airport are simply to bring it into compliance with standards applicable to the way it is now being used.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
288	10/5/2018	Susan Malins	In early 2018 many of us assumed that the Orcas airport was running smoothly, keeping it simple and providing good services. The Port of Orcas is loved and valued in this community, though our confidence is now shaken. The Master Plan process came to my attention in the early summer of 2018. Of course I went to the Port website to learn more, expecting to find a variety of Port documents, and information about the Master Plan. Documents were sorely lacking, as was any current information. I became concerned, knowing how the Port had mishandled earlier wetland changes, and that they were now mid-way in the MP process without providing sufficient public information. So I went to a public meeting, where it was explained that the Port was saving money by not keeping its website information current. That did not seem plausible. Neither did it seem plausible that, after repeated public requests over many months, the Port was still dragging its feet about releasing the names of the Master Plan Advisory Committee members. Today we know that they are almost exclusively owners and representatives of companies that do business with the Port, & told that they had four meetings. Where are the minutes or actions recommended by the Advisory Committee to our Port Commissioners? Unfortunately the answer to this and many questions are available to the public only through a Public Records request. We the public are apparently not considered stakeholders in this matter? The consultant DOWL, for the Port, requested public input about four options moving forward, from “no build with minor improvements” to “full buildout”. The overwhelming public response favored “no build with minor improvements”. Now we are told by DOWL, and apparently the Port, that “no build with minor improvements” was never really an option at all. They have selected, & are proceeding to formalize, basically a “full buildout”. The plans are now taking off toward FAA finalization with the speed of a jet plane. The potential ramifications for Orcas Island are beyond startling. The MP does not consider legal or other constraints, & DOWL claims that those will be considered after the Master Plan is finalized. Unfortunately it’s impossible to verify such a statement. That is truly the cart before the horse, violating common sense & constraining future public or commissioner involvement in Port decisions. I know that our neighbors the Port Commissioners are dedicated to serving the greater good of the Port of Orcas and the people you’re elected to represent. I thank you for your service! Because you are responsible for how this all moves forward, and for directing the consultant DOWL and your staff, I want to share with you some of the best advice I’ve ever received: “When in doubt, pause.” There are many doubts and valid public concerns about the current trajectory of the Port Master Plan. The irregularities in this process have been and are significant! I understand that your Executive has resigned, and this may be a window of opportunity to shift gears. The Port has caught our attention. We the public care about the Port, and public support can be a wonderful thing. So, Please. Pause. And save us all a lot of grief. Sincerely, Susan Malins PS I have tried to send this to all port commissioners, but am told that their addresses are incorrect. Tony Simpson has said that he copies commissioners on all letters, so I entrust this communication to him for forwarding. Thank you!

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Ms. Malins, If you accuse us of irregularities, you should send your complaint to the FAA. Jennifer Kandel is CC'd above. We have complied with all requirements and have far exceeded the public engagement of probably any master plan accomplished in this region or Alaska in the history of the AIP program for an airport of any comparison. Possibly, nationwide. I am not in doubt about the correct course of action and I don't think the commissioners are either. As such, you should expect no pause. I have lived my whole life committed to honesty, excellence and service before self and to be accused of "irregularities" is the main reason I am leaving public service. Tony
289	10/5/2018	Pierrette Guimond	Keep Orcas Airport as it is right now for a small rural community. No Mega Airport or Terminal. No tunnel. Do not change Mt Baker Road. Expand terminal and freight terminal in the same location. Add parking in the former dog park area. Please listen to the public Minor changes only Thank you
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
290	10/5/2018	Bret Thurman	Hi Tony, Nice to chat today. I was looking over public comments for the master plan as well as the master plan diagrams after reading your letter below. I am in in full support of the Port's efforts to plan for the future. Tradeoffs must always be made and nothing is perfect. This is the productive part of planning and it must be done. Kudos for the undertaking. Approve it and then the Port can navigate how to bend, turn and change to make it possible as the realities of the plan come forth. All must recognize two vital factors: First, safe reliable commercial and private aviation is vital to this community and second, it is not free and never will be. On three specific aspects, two cents: Has the Port considered obtaining waterfront properties acceptable to the Gerard's and performing a swap? I do not like and never have liked the cloud over his property nor the situation. Further, I agree that eminent domain is not an option in this community. Funding is always an issue and perhaps a sale of "non-essential" property would be the ticket. On Mt Baker road's proximity to the threshold. It should be moved away from the threshold. Perhaps this video of a collision in Texas would tell the story to those opposed: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3CXVt2OpcGY I have witnessed some close calls over this road over the years and hope it never happens. As a pilot and a passenger this is always in my mind as the threshold nears. As a driver I am always looking up. The ditch is a valuable marine resource and it should be expanded and improved. Can lemonade be made with a Public/Private partnership? On controversy: Unfortunately, some in the community do not do change and are most vocal without knowledge or a serious alternative. Failure to seriously recognize the Port's position with the FAA and its obligations to the Orcas taxpayer are disappointing. Courage is essential for those who wish to forge ahead. Growth is inevitable change is optional. Good luck. Regards, Bret Thurman

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			We are actively working with Brandt's landing to try and achieve a Win-Win. Land for taxiway and run-up area and solutions to expand total number of slips, services and possibly even fuel. It wouldn't be easy or inexpensive, but the FAA may fund the "cost to cure" impacts to the marina and that could be a boon to the owners. Tony
291	10/5/2018	Kevin White	Port of Orcas and all operators of the Orcas Airport; I want to say thank you for being there for businesses, deliveries, family, friends, tourists and just hobby enthusiasts. We have a great island and the airport is an integral part of our success and life style as we see fit in today's world. You have done a great job with extending the useful life, but it sounds to me like we need to support a minor change which includes a master plan (that gives you guidance) so you can get up to code to save potential payback of previous grants and continue to operate. We need to continue to operate safely, and within guidelines that the FAA has given you over the years. As a manager of a tourism destination which operates all year, we do have visitors that fly in, but it also gives us the ability to safely live on this beautiful island for property owners to come and go as they desire. Without the funds and plans there is potential that it would all be lost at some point in time. I am writing this as an individual with a passion for the community and to see the continued success, but maintain the integrity of what has been established. There are ways to work around the guidelines, but we need to support a move in the direction to maintain proper funding and operations.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
292	10/5/2018	Becky Griswold	Because the option presented do not offer an adequately low impact option I would prefer the no change option provided. If you can come up with something that doesn't involve condemning property or destroying wetlands and rerouting Mt Baker RD then I might be convinced otherwise
Response			Thank you for your comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
293	10/5/2018	Chris Hensel	Dear Ms. Henderson, Others have said this more eloquently than myself, but I agree with most of the community here on Orcas Island that you really need to scrap the current plan for the airport expansion and let the community decide on the sizing of the airport and its needs. The current plan will impact so many people here and the environment in a negative way. The community should be able to pick the level of capacity that the airport should run at and what islanders are willing to accept as the safety risks, noise, air, light, water and wetland pollution, et. all that goes along with that. There are many aspects in your plan that are unnecessary like, changing Mt. Baker Rd, lengthening the runway when the runway is long enough. We don't a US Customs presence on Orcas Island. There are so many issues not addressed that you need to go back to the drawing board and work with community on this. If you go ahead with this plan there is no turning back. You do this and this small community will be lost and it will facilitate more and more change in the wrong direction. We want to preserve this town as it is with only the smallest necessary changes and keep our footprint small in all aspects. PLEASE start over and work with the Public on a new plan. Thank you, C. Hensel
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
294	10/5/2018	Sadie Bailey	Thanks for the deadline to midnight for commenting on Orcas Master Plan. Please include any attached documents sent for this deadline as part (or all) of comments along with any email intro, and please post all previous attached documents sent for the August 3 deadline that were not posted for Public access;as discussed with DOWL representatives on Sept. 19th. This should be accessibile to the Public in perpetuity - in appendices or wherever it's easy for us to find and read them. I have also included my comment letter as a PDF. I haven't known what to say that I haven't tried to say politely in many ways -that this Master Plan feels like a juggernaut and noose around our throats. New people are finding out - too late - and coming up with new concerns and questions not previously asked, or still not satisfied by the answers given. Public resistance and displeasure is only bound to continue and increase. What is being done to this community (reference to Russ Borgnin's recent Orcas Issues letter entitled "Port Ramrodding this Master Plan") is not sitting well with many people who feel shut-out of the process. I think of this Master Plan as a type of violence done to our community against our will - and that hurts us and tears the fiber of our community. The gravest insult to us, in my opinion, is that the whole flawed and at times disrespectful and rude process of drafting this Master Plan feels like a railroading of the Public. Changes this important and comprehensive should have been far more transparent and inclusive - it was only at our insistance that, to their credit, the Port Commissioners decided to hear our questions and concerns, and have a special meeting and longer Public Access times. I appreciate that the Commissioners have done this, and engaged us, and I plan to stay involved. It's hard to know what to say after the hammer-blows the Public has received and continues to receive; but we have to keep trying to come to solutions that respectsafety compliance issues and constraints around them.My many comments to Orcas Issues and letters to both Orcas Issues and the Sounder speak in detail of some of my concerns and questions, but I'll be lining them out here, and will probably miss some; this has been a long and exhausting 3 months. 1) Short of a natural or manmade disaster, will we be able to remove any of the"safety" components of this master plan when it's time to review or re-do? (my guess is NO). What about the "capital improvement" things like hangars? (myguess is MAYBE, since they are not required by the FAA - in fact, most of what's proposed, isn't.) 2) M.O.S. - What happened to applying to the FAA for a M.O.S.? Who decided that this prudent and cost-saving path to slow the process wasn't going to be pursued? (please don't use Friday Harbor as an example again - our geographic limitations alone are nothing like Friday Harbor Airport's higher, dryer, more extensive land mass.) 3) MINIMUM RUNWAY SEPARATION: Why maximum buildout for a single master plan? All you had to do is show the FAA you were working toward some safety compliance issues; nowhere do I think they specify that ALL of this at once is mandated, expecially since the airport is run at odds with their own guidelines by allowing the larger Caravans in the first place. 4) MT. BAKER RD SAFETY DILEMMA/RE-ROUTE PROPOSAL: I support Clark Cundy's far less costly and egregious solutions than rerouting Mt Baker Rd; a low to the ground "traffic light" system (no gates.) Due to wetland, village density, and traffic constraints that keep being ignored, this could save us many millions of dollars and satisfy the FAA, once they see for themselves what our constraints are, especially if the County refuses to move the road, which was here before the airport and is THE truck route around the village. I'm perplexed as to why no firefighters and EMTs are weighing in on their discomfort with increased response times if Mt. Baker Road is relocated; maybe they are waiting until the project gets funded, but the time to express concerns about

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			this is now, and I hope that some of them have. 5) HELIPAD POTENTIAL MOVE: It looks like it is moved south quite a ways, almost to Mt. Baker Rd. and closer to affecting Eastsound Swale Creek. Is it being enlarged from the original footprint? What are the existing and proposed footprint and weight capaciies? How many feet south is the proposed move? Have the neighbors directly south been notified of this intent? What kind of noise mitigation can possibly spare close neighbors and the town? There are churches, schools, and clustered residences in the helicopter approach and takeoff path that will be worse affected if this happens. (Helicopters are already deafening residents at Lavender Hollow - the approaches and departures go right over our rooftops.) 6) NOISE - there are no mitigation plans in place for noise for the various projects and increases you propose; and none would be sufficient if the footprint enlarges to allow more category B-2 aircraft, lightweight jets, and helicopters.7) HAZARDS - larger wingspans with the 240' separation put us all more at risk. Some noted hazards are: above-ground fuel stations and bulk propane tanks, the electric transfer station on Lovers Lane, all fire hazards if struck. Eastsound is a severe wind tunnel that can blow planes off course. 8) WETLAND INFRINGEMENT AND DAMAGE: The vegetation (Tree) removal project done last summer is a classic example of the Port Manager doing what he wants, with no public notice or input; then getting upset and angry with us for being upset. The work bulldozing was started and halfway done on a weekend before the contract was even scheduled to begin. The continued exclusion of the Public and proper regulatory bodies such as DOE is appalling and unacceptable. I see this "vegetation" removal as a a perfect segue to Mt. Baker Rd relocation; intentional or not. The original mitigation plan was flawed in several major ways and thankfully, someone caught them and brought in Ecology, but still the Portwants to cut corners on having the mitigation be successful. For instance, you will need a rabbit-proof deer fence around the entire perimiter of the mitigation area... Well, at least the grant will pay for a nice fence - maybe! 9) I'm concerned about the whole 240' separation for various reasons: Once it'sdone south of the storage units, that forces cargo and the terminal to move and the SE corner to be developed in an ugly commercial "park" that will affect nearby neighbors. This also moves the helipad south. It also forces northern separation to the same standard. 10) TERMINAL/CARGO FACILITIES: I'm for enlarging the terminal, and building up-to-date cargo facilities in their current locations, and dispensing with the 240'separation idea and going for minimum separation. Cargo facility would be least impactful if put near to Schoen Lane and that same road used for access and egress - NOT North Beach or Mt. Baker Rd - both major collector roads. 11) NEW PROPOSED HANGARS: If any new hangars are built, they can go west - but NOT cargo buildings that increase car trips up to 200 per day - not on dead end Seaview St. with no outlet and no alternate emergency exit. I don't understand the need for this many hangars this big - which plane makes and models would they be built to serve? I think Russ's letter speaks some to that andlists the aircraft.12) BORDER PATROL, HOMELAND SECURITY, ETC - The slightest hint or intentionof bringing border patrol to this port is something we don't want - please listen to us. We don't want it in any new or expanded terminal; not at all. 13) EELGRASS BED PROTECTION - in fishing bay and off the north shore; these are crucial to chinook salmon recovery and possibly keeping southern resident orcas from going extinct. Nothing the Port does should harm them in any way. 14) INFRINGEMENT/ NON-COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY ORDINANCES AND VISION: The Port's proposed Master Plan is out of compliance and out of sync with the CAO, SMP, Marine District, Eastsound Vision, and Comp Plan as well as existing densities surrounding the Port, which will only increase; as will public resistance. 15) RURAL CHARACTER: We don't want a "showcase" terminal. Fly-in pilots don't want the east tiedowns gone... and neither do we. We

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			want to keep this airport a SMALL, low-key, charming, welcoming, and rural destination... Not some ugly commercial place to just park a plane or helicopter or pick up Amazon packages.16) Any changes in the "timelines" proposed need to be made transparent to the public so that the Public can help direct the conversation and weigh in with comments and suggestions. Since the runway separation design is slated for 2023, and environmentals for 2020, with funding ALREADY improved, we should be starting the dialogue now. 17) SOIL LIQUEFACTION ZONES: Have these been mapped? Earthquake/tsunami preparedness if the airport is an evacuation zone? What infrastructure is built on liquefaction soils and what new infrastructure is being proposed to be built or replaced on them? 18) SEA LEVEL RISE: Does it make sense to be putting all of our eggs into a master plan with max buildout? What alternative plan do you have in the event of an emergency? 19) "Banking" of discretionary funds - now that I have found out that it can be done by loaning our $1 million (or whatever amount)a year to other airports if we're not going to spend it in the allotted 3 year period, and that the Port can ask for the funds back from those airports when they want to do a big project, I'm uncomfortable with that, and the Public will be, too, I think. That means that the present or future Port Manager could use this strategy to push through a big project that the Public is against. What checks and balances are or will be in place, when we become Primary, to protect the Public? I wish I had time and energy for more, because there is so much more, but time and energy runs out for me for this comment period. There is much to discuss with the Public. As in the letter I wrote to Orcas Issues today, this is my recommendation concerning this Master Plan: SCRAP IT. Start over. Pay another $half-million now; get a "second opinion" because maybe the patient is not as sick as is thought. Do the 2nd MP with public inclusion from the start this time, and save many millions of dollars, and a lot of unnecessary time and effort later. If this Master plan is pushed through, there will probably be lawsuits. People have sued the Port before and will consider it again if they have to protect their lands and interests. The FAA has ruled that the Public and/or affected landowners have the right to sue a Public airport for not representing Public Interest. I hope for everyone's sake that it does not come to that; nobody wants to sue a taxing district! - but if you don't remember and honor who you represent, check the history of lawsuits. Please remember who you represent, and do the right thing by us. Lastly, you all keep saying that if the Port chooses "no build," we'll be liable to paying back the AIP monies; but are we absolutely, with certainty, sure? I'm not sure why but I don't buy it, and I don't believe the FAA and Public were brought together regarding the many constraints of this geography and density; thatdiscussion was never pursued. We the Public should have pursued it - and we will. So, I'm still hopeful that if the FAA were alerted to all that the Public has endured with this entire process, and were shown proof of our very real constraints, they may be sympathetic to our concerns. Maybe it's a naive pipe-dream: I for one, intend to find out.I hope that we find win-win-win solutions for the People, for the Port, and for the FAA. Thanks for your consideration;B. Sadie Bailey

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 1			Violence and a noose? Your letter implies I am a liar. I have discussed the AIP implications with our program manager and engineer and they have told me my interpretation of the implications of no-build are accurate. Elimination from the AIP program and liability to repay. It offends me that you think I am a liar and I have literally addressed every one of the repetitive misperceptions multiple times and yet, nobody seems to hear or listen. Tony

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
Response 2			Ms. Bailey, Thank you for the comments that you submitted to the project website.Since January of this year, three public open-house meetings and a Special Meeting of the Port Commission have been held in support of this planning process. In spite of mailings to all island residents, notification on the Port website, and in local news outlets, the January and June meetings were poorly attended. It was difficult trying to determine the desires of the community with such little input. 1.The safety requirements being considered in the current master plan are for Airplane Design Group II (ADG-II) aircraft, as those are what are operating at Orcas Island in significant numbers. If the operations of those airplanes decrease substantially, a subsequent master plan may conclude that the present safety area dimensions are adequate. Forecasts determined using recent operational data, however, indicate that current operations will continue and grow at a moderate rate, and that is what we have to plan for. No new hangars are being built, and if they are not shown on the master plan in locations that don't conflict with other facilities, they cannot be built. In addition, they will not be built unless private individuals want to pay for their construction. That prospect does not seem very likely. 2. We have looked at several options in which a Modification of Airport Design Standards might be applied. However, there is no such thing as a permanent MoS. Every MoS gets reviewed at least every five years, and there is no guarantee that subsequent applications will be approved. Also, there are no options in which an MoS is useful or cost-effective. Why spend several million dollars to move the taxiway over six feet, ten feet, twenty feet, when that doesn't get it out of the Runway Object Free Area (ROFA)? 3. The implementation schedule for meeting the runway/taxiway separation distance requirement is expected to take more than 20 years. That is hardly "ALL at once". We have proposed a schedule that includes only property acquisition and environmental studies in the short-term, improvements on currently-owned airport property in the mid-term, and compliance with all safety standards in the long-term. The FAA has expressed a willingness to agree to that time frame. 4. The proposal by Mr. Cundy is to install traffic signals on Mount Baker Road to stop traffic during aircraft operations over the road. Traffic lights on Mount Baker Road, activated by aircraft taking off or on approach, may cause more problems than the ones they are intended to solve. The section of Mt Baker Rd that crosses the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) is a major traffic artery for Orcas Island. It is also adjacent to the fire station. Restricting traffic on it would increase traffic congestion and hinder response by emergency services. In addition, airplanes in Aircraft Approach Category B (AAC-B) are coming in to land at 105 – 140 mph. At 140 miles per hour, an airplane will travel a mile in just under 26 seconds. The detection network that would be required to identify multiple distant airplanes in various weather conditions and determine their intentions to land in time to activate a traffic control mechanism would be so complex that its practicality would be questionable. We have had several meetings in the fire station. If the firefighters and EMTs are not aware of what is going on, please let them know. If they have concerns, please ask them to contact us. 5. The existing helipad is 45'x45'. The new one would likely be the same dimensions and designed to accommodate the helicopter most often used by Airlift Northwest—the Eurocopter EC-135 (now Airbus). The existing helipad pavement would be removed

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			and replaced with grass. The landowners adjacent to the airport are welcome to provide comments on the proposed plans. The helicopter approaches are expected to be made to the runway as they do now, after which they will hover-taxi to the helicopter parking area. 6. The proposed improvements are to bring the airport into compliance with current standards. Although moderate growth in the numbers of existing aircraft is expected, the types of aircraft are not expected to change, and the noise signature is not expected to change appreciably. 7.The surrounding hazards are the reason for the requirement for meeting increased safety standards. The larger dimensions of the safety areas required for the airplanes that are currently operating there are intended to reduce the hazards to those airplanes and their passengers, and vehicles, people, and property on the ground. 8. Phase 1 of the 2017 tree removal project was to remove trees that were encroaching 12 to 15 feet up into the approach surface to the runway. That was a serious safety hazard. Phase 2, which will start next summer, will be to replace the "forested wetland" vegetation with "emergent wetland" vegetation at a 2:1 ratio (twice as much vegetation will be planted as was removed). The emergent wetland vegetation will not be tall enough at maturity to encroach into the approach path of airplanes. The Washington Department of Ecology is involved with the review of those plans. 9. Development of the southeast area is intended to be in accordance with the architectural and streetscape standards of the San Juan County Comprehensive Plan and the Eastsound Vision.10. The current cargo facility and terminal building are located within the ROFA—a safety hazard. Locations outside of the ROFA are limited, and acquiring additional property elsewhere appears to be a less desirable option. The preference is to make the best use of land the Port already owns. 11. [See response to #1 above.] 12There are no plans for Customs and Border Protection to establish a presence on Orcas Island. The Port does not believe that a CBP office is needed, nor does the Port plan to incur the expense of setting up a CBP office on Orcas Island. 13. There are no airport improvement plans that include anything beyond the shoreline. 14. Every attempt has been, and is being, made to propose plans for the airport that comply with the San Juan County Comprehensive Plan, the Eastsound Vision, and other development plans. The intention is for the airport improvements to complement, and be in harmony with, the surrounding area. 15. When I made the statement about a showcase terminal, I assumed that island resident would want a terminal building that would fit in with the San Juan County Comprehensive Plan and the Eastsound Vision, and something that would make a good first impression on visitors. The airport terminal is the front door of a community for visitors arriving by air. However, Orcas Island doesn't need to have a showcase terminal building. The only objection is that the current building is inside the Runway Object Free Area (ROFA)—a safety hazard. A phone booth would do, as long as it's outside the ROFA. Most of the east grass tie-downs and most of the grass there would remain, but airplanes cannot be parked inside the ROFA. The grass tie-downs removed from within the ROFA on the east side would be replaced by an equal or greater number of them on the west side. 16. The implementation timeline is transparent and on the Port website. The dialogue has been going on since January of this year. 17. Soil liquefaction occurs when the stress applied to a saturated soil (such as shaking during an

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
			earthquake) causes the pore water pressure to increase to the point where it forces the soil particles apart, and the soil then "flows like water". Soil liquefaction most often occurs in loosely compacted, sandy soils, or low density soils. Buildings are the infrastructure most susceptible to damage from liquefaction. Airport pavements and grassed infield areas are less likely to sustain damage. Geotechnical investigations and building designs will have to take into account local geologic conditions. 18. If some catastrophic event occurs that renders the island's marine facilities unusable, the airport may be the only means by which emergency services are provided. 19. Orcas Island Airport is currently eligible for Non-Primary Entitlement (NPE) funding of $150,000 per year. An airport can accumulate its NPE funding for four years (a maximum of $600,000). Unused funds do not roll forward. To prevent loss of NPE funding, some airports enter agreements with others to "loan" their unused NPE funding with the intention of getting it back for future projects. There are FAA limits on such agreements, and discretionary funding cannot be "loaned". All of this funding involves only the 90% of federal money granted by the FAA. If the airport sponsor cannot provide the matching funds—the remaining 10%—the project will not move forward.Thanks to the diligent efforts of the FAA, the U.S. airspace system is the safest and most efficient in the world. When they spend U.S. taxpayer funds to improve an airport, they expect it to comply with safety standards. If island residents prefer to opt out of the FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP), they are certainly welcome to do that. The funds provided by U.S. taxpayers that have been planned for Orcas Island Airport and the funds that have already been invested in it that will have to be repaid can be more effectively used elsewhere. Orcas Island Airport can be supported by local taxes to the extent that island residents are willing to fund it. Thank you again for your involvement in the public comment process. Eric

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
295	10/5/2018	Sandi Friel	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the commission's "preferred" alternative Port Master Plan. The plan is directly in conflict with San Juan County's recently adopted vision statement. The plan is not commensurate with the island's rural character and the residents' stated vision for the future. The plan is receiving strong opposition from residents. The Eastsound swale, critical for stormwater infiltration and recharge, has already been compromised far too much. Any further encroachment is unacceptable. Mitigation does not work.The length of the runway is adequate, including according to specs for Cesna 208s. There will always be risk. This is a tiny island with an airport sandwiched between residential areas.The projected 32% increase in airport traffic in 20 years is the tail wagging the dog. The scale and services of the airport need to remain small so as to constrain and not encourage growth in airport traffic.The airport is functioning as it is. We are getting and sending packages and people without major incident and have been for decades.If non-essential services need to be scaled back, so be it. The Port needs to find another way to balance its budget rather than accept FAA funds that direct changes the community does not want.The minutes on your website are greatly lacking substance. There is no detailing of discussions and debate or weighing of alternatives on any matter that I could see, not just this proposed expansion. The minutes appear to be simply a roll call and outline of the sequence of the topics discussed, but no meat of any discussions. The members of the advisory board do not reflect a balanced segment of the community, only technical and commercial interests. Please do better. Thank you, Sandi Friel
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
296	10/5/2018	Rick Frant	I wanted to express my support for the basic airport improvements that have been discussed on the master plan process. I understand that in order to keep the airport viable (and funded) we need to comply with minimum FAA requirements. I support the expansion identified in the plan on the East side of the airport for the taxiways, terminal and hangars and believe this adds significant function and utility to the operation. I believe that expansion on the west side is subject to need - as more hangars and parking on the west side may not be needed for some time. And, I firmly believe that airport passenger and cargo operations need to be clustered and restricted to the new east side expansion.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
297	10/5/2018	Mike Parnell	I support KORS remaining eligible for airport improvement funding that comes mostly from aviation fuelTaxes that pilots pay. For safety and the ability to accommodate passengers, medical flights and supplies -I hope the port will proceed with the minimum modifications and over time to allow our island Commerce, access and safety to continue. When we built the new fire station yrs ago it was â€œto bigâ€ for our island but we have certainly grown into it and is an important part of our island safety and culture. Improving our airport will be also.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment

Coment #	Comment Date	Name	Comment
298	10/5/2018	Roger Berens	I oppose any airport expansion on Orcas Island. Our currant facility is more than adequate for the needs of our island. This proposal would benefit a very few and would be highly disruptive to the vast majority. Bigger and newer is not always better - especially in this instance. For what it is worth, I am a pilot with an Air Transport rating (ATP) and 55 years of accident free aviation experience.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
299	10/5/2018	Shawn Simpson	As one of the Port Commissioners, I am in favor of Alternate Plan 3. It would allow for widening and repaving the runway along with meeting the 240' centerline separation, for a good portion of the runway that may be able to be implemented in the next 10 years. There would be no realigning the runway, no eminent domain enacted and no allowances for bigger jets. This plan would allow the Port of Orcas to maintain the current traffic flow while improving public safety.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment
300	10/5/2018	Alyson Stepl	I support the Ports Draft Preferred Alternative for the Master Plan. It is very important to me to have a safe airport, not only for the pilots and passengers, but also for those on the ground. It's also important to keep receiving FAA funds. I understand that the Port needs to show the FAA that they are working on coming into compliance with the FAA's safety standards. I support the Port in their efforts both to keep our airport safe and to maintain our funding from the FAA.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment.
301	10/5/2018	Jane Rosevelt	I am not in favor of enabling larger planes to land on Orcas. I like the airport the way it is, and do not support expansion of the runway or the taxiway. I am a part-time resident and on demand air taxi operator (Rose Air). For 25 years I have brought up to 3 passengers at a time to and from the Portland OR area. Most of my charters have been in the summer but I have provided service all year weather permitting. I am concerned that an increase in larger faster traffic will result in more accidents. As you know the weather is often not predictable, and in winter below VFR minimums. Do you want to encourage a runway overshoot? Hmm, wet or dry? Over the years I have seen an increase in airport usage in the summer. Pilots have enjoyed the country atmosphere of the annual fly in and many enjoy camping under the wing. The current airport facility and size seems to support this. Please don't change Orcas rural, friendly and inviting nature. Please don't change the qualities that make the island special.
Response 1			Thank you for your comment