



## MANAGER REPORT NOVEMBER 2020

---

- The airport traffic is slowing down. Enplanements are on the decline due to weather and the Fall seasons.
- Food drive is up to \$90 in cash and 445 LB out of my goal of 500 LB for Orcas Island Food Bank. Anyone that wants to donate to the food bank can see info on website <http://www.orcasislandfoodbank.org/>
- No port vehicle yet. Still in the works though.
- 11/17/20 United States Geological Survey USGS installed a seismometer today to go with our current GPS. The GPS records slow moving plates in the earth, while the seismometer will record any fast movement of earthquakes. The USGS is trying to get to over 700 of these units around the world and they are halfway done. They have over 300 now. In the picture below, the tripod with the grey dome is the GPS and the small box to the right is the new <https://www.usgs.gov/>
- Anyone that would like to make a noise complaint about military jets over the islands should go to <https://survey123.arcgis.com/share/12b8ac72af94485d90086d94679d597e>



## FACILITY REPORT

- Suggestion of closing bathroom- Bea suggested. Hanger owners would like to see them left open.
- Install of Fuel tank monitor install estimated first week in December. We would usually get 30 days of no monitor, but the Department of Ecology knows we are on an island and it does not make it easy to get quotes and install.
- Old bathroom is drained and ready for Winter.
- Hanger inspections have begun but most will be the first 2 weeks of Dec for hangers 1-15 with the others to follow.

## PAPI UPDATE

- 

## ESWD INFO

- They have the appraisal work started, more to follow after that is done.

## Steve Pearson Saw Shop lease

- 10/21/20 Steve and I measured the land today. He is occupying 6400 (80'x80') of unleased space that used to be the staging pad for the wetland work in that area.
- Steve said he needs to talk with Bea and finish up with her questions she had for him. He will not be joining us in the meeting on 11/23/20.

## Wetland Mitigation

- Many questions were answered about the wetland mitigation and more with the visit and inspection from Meryl with Wetland Resources Inc. Still ongoing as to who pays for the. WHPacific and Wetland Resources Inc. say it is normal to lose plants during mitigation. The cost to the port for this change order is 10 % which equals \$929. Below is Bea's report and also follow up answers from Wetland resources Inc.

REPORT TO AIRPORT MANAGER  
ON  
MEETING WITH KIM SECUNDA AND SADIE BAILEY  
NOVEMBER 2, 2020

Kim, Sadie and I met at 1pm on November 2.

The goal of the meeting was to compile questions and concerns surrounding a change order from Squalicum Mtn Ecological Restoration, Inc.

This item had been previously discussed at the October 26, 2020 regular port meeting. At that time, some commissioners had questions about the change order, and the aforementioned members of the public had submitted their written questions which were not heard during the port's zoom meeting.

The discussion centered around several items contained in the change order and have prompted this summary for further discussion by the commissioners.

-According to the change order, an on-site visit on May 11, 2020 noted that in planting area 1b of the submitted illustrations, original plants (not named in the change order) did not grow "likely due to the higher salinity level of the ground water in this area".

The question was asked of whether a soil analysis was completed prior to development of a planting scheme. This area will not be replanted, so the original cost of failure to grow is borne by the port, and not recoverable.

-Supplemental planting areas 1a, 2b, 2c and 2d have supplemental plantings suggested of Pacific willow, Hooker's willow, Sitka willow, Ninebark and Hardhack. Are these trees any more likely to survive and thrive in areas of possible areas of ground water salinity? Should soil testing for salinity levels be completed prior to introducing these species? The total number of plantings suggested is 310 among all species. Are these species attractive to deer and/or rabbits, who have been observed in area 4?

-Evidently, anticipated growth of whatever was originally planted in area 4 did not survive and thrive as anticipated, as supplemental planting of 75 each of Ninebark and Hardhack are planned for this area, currently fenced. Since several occurrences of both rabbits and deer have been observed in this area, these additional plantings may not survive as well. They will likely have plenty of water to absorb over the upcoming winter.

-In wetland restoration area 5/supplemental planting area 5, soft rush and slough sedge are noted as suggested plants, in a total of 150 plants. Only a portion of this area is fenced, which will allow deer and rabbits to feast as available on the southern portion, even though the change order affirms that these herbaceous plants "will not need fencing to survive."

-Additional observations and questions:

-Is it possible to obtain a mortality map of plantings and their species for all areas?

-We would like to know what spray(s) might have been used during site preparation and to date.

-We would like to know what type of mulch is anticipated to be used.

-Since gravel was moved into the area for uses presently unknown, we would like to know whether it will be removed to return the area to its previous condition.

- Information compiled by Bea vonTobel, Commissioner and Secretary
-

**General notes/comments about the mitigation plan:**

Vegetation clearing on the site south of the airport totaled 2.38 acres of wetland area. Mitigation for this impact was required at a 2:1 mitigation to impact ratio, resulting in the need for 4.76 acres of wetland enhancement. Options for mitigation area locations were limited by the total amount of area available on the property owned by the Port, the opportunity for enhancement within the wetland areas on the property, and the restrictions on vegetation height related to the distance from the runway. The plant species included in the mitigation plan were required to be plants that would minimize wildlife-aviation risk.

The Year 1 performance standard requires 100 percent survival of planted species. Mitigation areas always have a certain percentage of mortality in the first couple of years due to soil conditions, wildlife, hydrologic conditions or plant stock quality. Therefore, it is extremely rare for a mitigation planting to meet this standard, even with regular maintenance and irrigation. Outside of the area with high salinity, the mitigation areas' survival rate for Year 1 averaged 95 percent. As the species included in the supplemental plantings are those that are currently doing well on the site, it is anticipated that they will have a high survival rate.

During the fall planting/maintenance visits, the existing deer fencing will be checked for damage and repaired as necessary. Wetland Resources, Inc. and Squalicum Mountain Ecological are currently reviewing options for additional measures to protect the plantings from deer and other animals.

- *Whether a soil analysis was completed prior to development of a planting scheme*

No formal soil testing was completed for the site. Information gathered during the delineation of Wetland A (including soil pits in several areas of the site) indicated that saltwater within the wetland occurred further north than the planting location, north of the ditch that runs along the north edge of Planting Area 1.

- *Supplemental planting areas 1a, 2b, 2c and 2d have supplemental plantings suggested of Pacific willow, Hooker's willow, Sitka willow, Ninebark and Hardhack.*
  - *Are these trees any more likely to survive and thrive in areas of possible areas of ground water salinity? Should soil testing for salinity levels be completed prior to introducing these species?*

Hooker's willow is the most salt tolerant of the five species. The other four species are not known to tolerate salt water. The supplemental planting areas 1a, 2b, 2c, and 2d are not within areas influenced by salt water. The Pacific willow, Hooker's willow, Sitka willow, ninebark, and hardhack that were installed in the fall of 2019 within those areas survived and are currently doing well. These species were specifically chosen for the supplemental planting plan because they are doing well in those areas.

- *The total number of plantings suggested is 310 among all species. Are these species attractive to deer and/or rabbits, who have been observed in area 4?*

In general, deer do not prefer to eat ninebark or hardhack, which are the shrubs within Area 4. Hardhack is on WA State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife's "close to" deer proof list. Rabbits typically prefer herbaceous plants to woody plants for food.

- *Evidently, anticipated growth of whatever was originally planted in area 4 did not survive and thrive as anticipated, as supplemental planting of 75 each of Ninebark and Hardhack are*

