

**Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC MEETING #3 (10/28/20)**

Code for Response Action:

1. Concur that changes are or may be needed to the Master Plan report.
2. Disagree with intent or context of comment, no changes recommended.
3. FAA decisions required or additional information necessary from King County, FAA, etc.
4. No action necessary within the Master Plan report (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)

AWG Comment I.D. & #	Page	Section or Issue	Comment as Noted	Response to Comment	Action
John Haynes/#1	NA	Future availability of the recorded meeting.	Will the recording be shared later?	Yes, the recorded meeting will be available on the project website: <a href="http://kingcounty.gov/KCIAMasterPlan">kingcounty.gov/KCIAMasterPlan</a>	4
Deirdre Curle/#1	NA	Sound mitigation options to residents resulting from potential 1.5 DNL increase.	If there is a 1.5 DNL increase in noise, what will King County Airport do to provide mitigation to residents affected by the noise?	That would likely depend upon whether the residential property is located within the previous Part 150 noise mitigation boundary for the 65 Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) contour and was sound attenuated as part of the resulting sound insulation program. If the answer is yes, the residence may already meet the specified interior noise reduction level requirements and no new noise mitigation would be required. If the residential property is located outside the previous Part 150 noise mitigation boundary for the 65 DNL contour, but inside the new 65 DNL, and would experience a 1.5 DNL increase resulting from the new project, then the property would likely be eligible for noise mitigation improvements.	4
Ahmad White/#1	NA	Risk of additional noise impacts to Georgetown residents resulting from the RW 14R threshold shift.	Considering that the airport has already had to provide noise mitigation features for the residential Georgetown, what is the risk to noise levels based on moving the runway north and/or additional projected takeoffs and landings of larger aircraft?	Prior to the implementation of the RW 14R threshold relocation project, a detailed noise analysis will be conducted as an element of the environmental screening/documentation for the project. The potential impact of repositioning the RW 14R takeoff noise 300 feet north of the existing threshold will be identified in the noise analysis. Due to the significant reduction in size/coverage between the previous 65 DNL contour generated for the Part 150 noise study compared to the new MP Update 65 DNL contours, it is likely that many of the residential properties in Georgetown that are located within the new 65 DNL contour have already been sound attenuated or were new construction that may already meet the specified interior noise reduction level requirements.	4
Sherell Ehlers/#1	---	Noise and land use evaluation	In assessing noise and land uses, is the study using actual land use or zoned land use? The study should be using actual land use and not zoned. The zoned land use does not accurately reflect the actual use and therefore noise	The existing land use mapping for the Master Plan Update (MPU) is generalized and was compiled from the planning documents prepared by the surrounding jurisdictions in the vicinity of the Airport (i.e., King County, City of Seattle,	4

<b>Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC MEETING #3 (10/28/20)</b>					
Code for Response Action: 1. Concur that changes are or may be needed to the Master Plan report. 2. Disagree with intent or context of comment, no changes recommended. 3. FAA decisions required or additional information necessary from King County, FAA, etc. 4. No action necessary within the Master Plan report (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)					
<b>AWG Comment I.D. &amp; #</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Section or Issue</b>	<b>Comment as Noted</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>	<b>Action</b>
			mitigation/analysis would be lacking.	City of Tukwila, City of Burien, and City of SeaTac), as well as Google Earth mapping. The environmental screening documentation that will be prepared for the individual projects of the MPU will include a comprehensive analysis of the actual existing land use that could potentially be impacted by the project prior to the implementation of the project.	
John Haynes/#2	NA	Project cost estimates.	Is there a detailed budget to be shared?	Yes, a listing of the recommended projects from the MP Update and their associated planning-level cost estimate is presented in Chapter G of the Draft Report, entitled <i>Financial Implementation Plan</i> .	4
Sherell Ehlers/#2	---	Extent of Georgetown that is visible on Airport base map.	It appears that north Georgetown neighborhood and the Georgetown playfield north of Michigan is missing. Only south Georgetown seems to be shown on the map.	You are correct that the Generalized Existing Land Use map (see Figure A15 of the Inventory of Existing Conditions chapter) needs to be updated to include the Georgetown Playfield and adjacent residential land uses.	1
Anonymous/#1	---	Threshold crossing height (TCH).	Why not just raise the glideslope to meet the threshold crossing height requirement rather than moving the with all its accompanying noise issues?	Increasing the angle of the glide slope antenna to raise the TCH was one of the first potential solutions that was investigated by the FAA. However, this option was found to negatively impact the south flow arrival stream into SeaTac due to the existing airspace constraints caused by the close proximity of the two airports.	4
Holly Krejci/#1	---	Potential noise impacts on new residential development.	A number of properties within the 2008 contour have been demolished and new multi-family townhome developments have been built in those locations. How would these changes be addressed in new noise assessment?	Typically, existing property owners or developers who redevelop noise sensitive properties within a previously defined noise mitigation boundary that was a product of an FAA Part 150 Noise Study are recommended and sometimes required to incorporate noise mitigating construction improvements into the new project to achieve the desired interior noise reduction guidelines. Thus, depending on the findings of the new noise analysis, the developers of these new townhomes would likely not be eligible for any federal funding assistance of new sound attenuation projects.	4
Anonymous/#2	---	GA relocation from existing Southwest GA	Where do the GA airplanes from SW parking move to? And more generally, what is the growth plan for GA?	Airport Staff is currently investigating how some of the existing Airport property that is being used by Boeing for temporary overflow B-737 MAX parking could potentially	4

**Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC MEETING #3 (10/28/20)**

Code for Response Action:

1. Concur that changes are or may be needed to the Master Plan report.
2. Disagree with intent or context of comment, no changes recommended.
3. FAA decisions required or additional information necessary from King County, FAA, etc.
4. No action necessary within the Master Plan report (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)

AWG Comment I.D. & #	Page	Section or Issue	Comment as Noted	Response to Comment	Action
		development area.		<p>be used for displaced GA aircraft parking. This evaluation also applies to a few small airport leaseholds that may soon be available for new leases to support additional GA aircraft apron parking facilities.</p> <p>There are 32 T-hangar spaces and 30 apron tiedowns provided in the existing southwest GA development area that could potentially be displaced by the future Southwest Air Cargo facility. However, King County has not yet acquired the adjacent Woods Meadows property that would be required for the development and won't until it becomes available for purchase. Also, King County continues to explore several options on or near the Airport for future aviation development. No specific location has yet been identified to accommodate the displaced GA tenants, if the area is redeveloped, but it is an issue BFI is aware of and the process is ongoing</p> <p>Regarding a growth plan for GA at BFI, the decline in GA operations at BFI was steady between 2000 and 2015, with average annual reductions of 4.9% for itinerant GA and 7.1% for local GA operations. 2015 was the base year of the forecasts for the MPU and GA operations later recorded recent year lows in 2016. The GA operations forecast for the MPU reflect a projected growth in the Business/Corporate and Air Taxi sectors with a corresponding decrease in recreational/training activity. However, even though fewer small GA aircraft operations have been recorded at BFI in recent years, the Airport still maintains a high based aircraft occupancy rate for both T-hangars and apron tiedowns.</p>	
Tony Eayrs/#1	---	Air Cargo demand.	Does the Master Plan Update incorporate a 20-year regional air cargo demand forecast?	Yes, Chapter B of the MP Update includes forecasts for both air cargo weight and air cargo aircraft operations (see pgs. B.32 thru B.35 of the Draft Report.	4

<b>Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC MEETING #3 (10/28/20)</b>					
Code for Response Action: 1. Concur that changes are or may be needed to the Master Plan report. 2. Disagree with intent or context of comment, no changes recommended. 3. FAA decisions required or additional information necessary from King County, FAA, etc. 4. No action necessary within the Master Plan report (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)					
Warren Hendrickson/#1	---	NE GA tiedown ramp.	The impact of the relocated 14R RPZ on the fuel farm was noted. What will be the impact, if any, on the NE general aviation tiedown ramp already within the RPZ and relocated RPZ?	Ultimately, the existing Northeast Tiedown Apron will have to be decommissioned to accommodate the larger Runway Protection Zone (RPZ). The proposed schedule for decommissioning of this aircraft parking area has not been identified, but all of the parked aircraft within the boundary of the RPZ will eventually need to be relocated.	4
Sherell Ehlers/#3	---	Landscape buffer north of the Airport.	What is the plan for increasing the landscape buffer between the Georgetown neighborhood (specifically along Ellis Ave. S.) and the airport property? There is currently little to no buffer and the lighting from the airport property shines into neighborhood windows across the street.	King County is currently coordinating with the City of Seattle regarding the relocation of a segment of Airport fencing to improve the existing pedestrian connection between Georgetown and South Park neighborhoods of Seattle. This project could also include a combination of artwork and a landscape buffer along a segment of the Airport's perimeter fencing.	4
Ahmad White/#2	NA	Future air cargo facility expansion.	You mentioned that one of the goals of the plan was to add capacity for an additional shipping operation. How does your master plan account for additional ground to air transportation needs to accommodate another UPS shipping operation?	Prior to the development of a new air cargo operation on the west side of BFI, a comprehensive vehicular transportation study will have to be conducted as an element of a detailed environmental review/analysis of the project. A determination of the potential level-of-service impacts and any capacity constraints to East Marginal Way would be documented in the environmental study.	4
Jonathan MacKenzi/#1	---	Runway 14L/32R strengthening.	Is there plans for runway 14L/32R to be strengthened during the resurface project to allow heavier business aircraft to it when 14R/32L is closed?	The existing RW 14L/32R pavement strength is very similar to the pavement strength of the primary runway. However, at just over 3700', runway length and existing design standards would be the limiting factors for operations of heavier/larger business aircraft operating on RW 14L/32R during the resurfacing project for the main runway.	4
Sherell Ehlers/#4	---	Future neighborhood sound mitigation.	If the airport is making changes that will increase noise in the neighborhood, will the airport be retrofitting the new construction in the neighborhood since those projects do not have access to the sound mitigation program?	Typically, existing property owners or developers who retrofit property within a previously defined noise mitigation boundary that was a product of an FAA Part 150 Noise Study are recommended to incorporate noise mitigating construction improvements into the project to achieve the desired interior noise reduction guidelines. If the impacted property is located outside the previously defined noise mitigation boundary, then the property may be eligible for funding of sound attenuation projects.	4

<b>Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC MEETING #3 (10/28/20)</b>					
Code for Response Action: 1. Concur that changes are or may be needed to the Master Plan report. 2. Disagree with intent or context of comment, no changes recommended. 3. FAA decisions required or additional information necessary from King County, FAA, etc. 4. No action necessary within the Master Plan report (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)					
Sherell Ehlers/#5	---	Future neighborhood sound mitigation.	No new infrastructure is required to be built to the higher noise standards. The City does not require that.	That may be the case in some or all of jurisdictional boundaries surrounding the Airport, and is why it's the responsibility of the property owner to include the appropriate noise reduction construction improvements to meet the recommended guidelines within the defined noise mitigation boundary.	4
Greg Ramirez/#1	---	Georgetown outdoor noise mitigation.	The Georgetown community has been actively advocating for more outdoor open space (off leash dog park, a connection to south park via bike lanes and pedestrian walkways). How could the King County Airport mitigate the noise pollution in those scenarios? We can't expect the community members to only stay inside to be protected by the sound attenuation.	King County is currently coordinating with the City of Seattle regarding the relocation of a segment of Airport fencing to improve the existing pedestrian connection between the Georgetown and South Park neighborhoods of Seattle.  Regarding the outdoor noise levels in the vicinity of the Airport, resulting from the operation of aircraft (e.g., aircraft taxi, takeoff, and landing operations) the Airport Sponsor is really limited in what can be constructed to effectively minimize outdoor noise levels. The Boeing Company has constructed an elevated wall system adjacent to several of their aircraft parking positions on the west side of the Airport that likely serve multiple purposes related to jet blast and noise mitigation, as well as provides a visual barrier. It is possible that some variant of this wall system could be constructed at the north end of the Airport, in conjunction with the current artwork and a landscape buffer project that is being planned in this area.	4
John Haynes/#3	NA	Existing fuel farm remediation.	Does KCIA expect that remediation tasks will be required for the relocation of the fuel farm?	Yes, it is likely that some degree of remediation will be required given the age of the underground tank facilities. However, this will need to be confirmed following the decommissioning/removal of the existing facility.	4
Holly Krejci/#2	---	Georgetown Apartments.	A community member was concerned about potential impact of RPZ on the Georgetown apartments at the northeast corner of the field - as these are affordable housing units. Can you speak to how these might be impacted.	The answer to this question was excerpted from the following FAA website: <a href="https://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/relocation_assistance/land_acquisition_under_aip/">https://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/relocation_assistance/land_acquisition_under_aip/</a> "Land acquisition necessary for Airport Improvement Program (AIP)-assisted airport development or noise compatibility purposes must be accomplished in accordance with Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property	4

**Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC MEETING #3 (10/28/20)**

Code for Response Action:

1. Concur that changes are or may be needed to the Master Plan report.
2. Disagree with intent or context of comment, no changes recommended.
3. FAA decisions required or additional information necessary from King County, FAA, etc.
4. No action necessary within the Master Plan report (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)

				<p>Acquisition for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs (49 CFR Part 24). This is the implementing regulation for the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act). The Uniform Act is the Federal law that provides minimum real property acquisition policies and requires the uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of a Federally assisted project".</p> <p>In accordance with the Uniform Act, families and individuals displaced from their dwellings may be eligible to receive two kinds of relocation payments: one to cover moving and related expenses and one to assist in obtaining a replacement dwelling.</p>	
Laura Wright/#1	---	Final details on Airport MP Update recommendations.	When will we have concrete details on this plan including buildings you are buying, fuel farm relocation determination, and how high planes will be flying over the neighborhood in the new taking off zone? Numbers and facts would be most helpful.	<p>The specific projects recommended in MP Update and tentative phasing plans are presented in Chapter G of the document. The timing of the property acquisition projects is typically driven by the seller of the property. The details on the new fuel farm project will not be known until the final site location is selected and the final design is completed by the chosen operator. Regarding the RW 14R shift project, the majority of the aircraft landing to RW 14R will be at the same altitude over Georgetown as they are today since the Instrument Landing System (ILS) and GPS approaches will not be changing. However, the RW 14R takeoffs will begin at the new threshold location, 300 feet further north. A comparison of Figures E2 and E3 in the Environmental Overview chapter does provide some reference to how the runway threshold project could reposition the DNL noise contours.</p>	4
Adam Malone/#1	---	Planning for future light GA parking.	Since the 737MAX is close to re-entering service in 2021, will this extra space be accounted for when planning light GA parking relocation in this Master Plan Update? If not, why not?	<p>Airport Staff is currently investigating how some of the existing Airport property that is being used by Boeing for temporary overflow B-737 MAX parking could potentially be used for displaced GA aircraft parking. This evaluation also applies to a few small airport leaseholds that may soon be available for new leases to support additional GA aircraft apron parking facilities.</p>	4

<b>Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC MEETING #3 (10/28/20)</b>					
Code for Response Action: 1. Concur that changes are or may be needed to the Master Plan report. 2. Disagree with intent or context of comment, no changes recommended. 3. FAA decisions required or additional information necessary from King County, FAA, etc. 4. No action necessary within the Master Plan report (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)					
Sherell Ehlers/#6	---	Future impacts to Steam Plant.	Could you explain in plain language what impacts there may be to the Steam Plant?	The existing RW 14R RPZ currently overlays a portion of the off-airport property associated with Steam Plant. The proposed RW 14R threshold relocation project would slightly reduce the amount of the Steam Plant property that is impacted by the RPZ. King County is in ongoing negotiations with the Steam Plant representatives for a new access road from Ellis Ave., including the operation of the facility as a museum. However, the final approval of the agreement must include a balance of the FAA’s safety guidelines for land uses located within the RPZ -both people and property on the ground and the operation of aircraft.	4
Greg Ramirez/#2	---	Community coordination on future fuel farm design/relocation.	Can King County agree to engage with the community about the fuel farm co-design and relocation? We continue to hear a lot of concern about this aspect of the master plan.	The environmental documentation process for the new fuel farm design will include several opportunities for public comment and meeting participation prior to receipt of the environmental clearances and permitting that would be required before construction of the project.	4
Anonymous/#3	---	Existing fuel farm location.	Where is the existing fuel farm?	The existing fuel farm is located at the north end of the Airport, southwest of the intersection of S. Hardy St. and 15 <sup>th</sup> Ave. S.	4
Holly Krejci/#3	---	Fuel Farm relocation process.	Following up on Greg’s question, how might community be a part of the relocation process in advance of SEPA, NEPA?	Airport Staff, through its interaction with the Airport Roundtable, postings on the Airport’s website, and community involvement presentations with various neighborhood associations surrounding the Airport, is able to disseminate information regarding upcoming projects at BFI. The site selection and ultimate design process for the Airport’s new fuel storage facility is the type of project that would be coordinated with the various on- and off-Airport stakeholders.	4
Laura Wright/#2	---	Community impact of the MP Update.	What are you doing to make KCIA reflect the communities it is impacting the most? Are there any efforts to have some cultural or gender diversity in your group or to hire people from the Duwamish Valley for jobs that hold decision making power? There seems to be some serious equity problems with this presentation.	The King County HR department maintains a rigorous program and protocols to promote nondiscrimination and equal employment opportunities for both its Staff and the contractors that are selected to provide services for King County. These requirements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nondiscrimination in Employment and Provision of Services</li> </ul>	4

**Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC MEETING #3 (10/28/20)**

Code for Response Action:

1. Concur that changes are or may be needed to the Master Plan report.
2. Disagree with intent or context of comment, no changes recommended.
3. FAA decisions required or additional information necessary from King County, FAA, etc.
4. No action necessary within the Master Plan report (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equal Employment Opportunity Efforts</li> <li>• Equal Benefits to Employees with Domestic Partners</li> <li>• Nondiscrimination in Subcontracting Practices</li> <li>• Compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws, ordinances, executive orders and regulations that prohibit discrimination</li> <li>• Compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 504) and the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 as amended (ADA)</li> </ul> <p>The Airport is also working upstream of the job pipeline to create substantial, meaningful opportunities to engage local youth. BFI partners with local high schools to host a day of activities called Discover U and partners with the Museum of Flight on Women Fly events. These events educate students on the wide variety of careers at an airport and sparks an interest in the broader aviation field. BFI also has a robust internship program that sponsors interns at all levels from high school, community college, university and graduate school. This program helps to reduce the barriers to entry for careers in aviation and the County.</p>	
John Haynes/#4	NA	General.	Great job John and Team!	Comment noted.	4



<b>Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC MEETING #3 (10/28/20)</b>					
Code for Response Action:					
1. Concur that changes are or may be needed to the Master Plan report.					
2. Disagree with intent or context of comment, no changes recommended.					
3. FAA decisions required or additional information necessary from King County, FAA, etc.					
4. No action necessary within the Master Plan report (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)					
Warren Hendrickson/ #2	---	Typo on pg. F.4 of Chapter F.	Just a note as the draft documents are reviewed and finalized: Chapter F, on page F.4, discusses Runway 14R. However, in the “Dimensions” section of that page, this runway is labeled 14L. Just a minor typo to be aware of...	Comment noted. Correction will be reflected in Final Report.	1

