

Comments and Responses: The Boeing Company - received 11/30/20

Code for Response Action:

1. Concur that changes are or may be needed.
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 (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)

Comment I.D. & #	Page	Section or Issue	Para/Line/ Sentence	Comment as Noted	Response to Comment	Action
#1	1	Potential impact of future Runway 14R RPZ on stall A6.	---	The North RPZ no longer affects the Boeing large aircraft stall, A6, as it did in prior reiterations. Boeing would like to verify this does not change as this project progresses and into construction.	Comments noted. Yes, the future RW 14R RPZ will be repositioned off of the existing A6 stall, but the stall could still be potentially impacted by the aircraft parking limit line, which measures 500 feet from the RW 14R/332L centerline.	4
#2	1	Future taxiway access by wide body aircraft to future RW 14R departure threshold.	---	Since the removal of the B1 access ramp is in the plan, verification by an outside firm will be needed to determine if the proposed north access ramp will allow our wide body aircraft (767, 777-x) to make the required turns to access runway R14. Boeing would like the opportunity to review the dimensioned Construction Documents and the associated construction schedule for this project to determine the impacts, if any, to our production capacities. If reconfiguration of our existing stalls, B15 and B16, is imminent, then Boeing and KCIA will need to discuss how this will affect our business.	Comments noted. Yes, confirmation of taxiway access by Boeing's wide body aircraft to the future RW 14R departure threshold will be verified during the design/engineering phase of the project.	4
#3	1	Direct taxiway access to the Runway 32L threshold from the MDC apron.	---	The B10 rolling gate entrance at the MDC is no longer an issue in this Master Plan.	FAA's review of the Airport Layout Plan Drawing Set for the MP Update did not include any comments on the existing direct taxiway access from the MDC apron to the runway using the TW B10 connector. However, the existing taxiway access restrictions, to and from the MDC apron, will need to be included in a finalized "Through-the-Fence" access agreement with BFI Staff.	4
#4	1	Future purchase and development of the Jorgensen Forge property.	---	The future intentions of King County purchasing the Jorgensen Forge property and constructing a fuel farm and new FAA control tower, may affect the Boeing Thompson site, which is directly south of the Jorgensen site, along with the Plant 2 site located to the north. Boeing's concerns are around the demo and construction of these proposed projects regarding possible vibrations and demolition dust for both the Thompson P8 assembly site and the Plant 2 laboratories located to the north. We have additional	Comments noted.	4

Comments and Responses: The Boeing Company - received 11/30/20

Code for Response Action:

1. Concur that changes are or may be needed.
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 (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)

Comment I.D. & #	Page	Section or Issue	Para/Line/ Sentence	Comment as Noted	Response to Comment	Action
				concerns around possible electronic interference from Boeing, and to Boeing, if a new FAA control tower is constructed nearby. Boeing would like to be kept informed on the status of the intent of this property if purchased by King County.		
#5	1	Future construction of new airplane stalls on Lot 12.	---	The construction of additional airplane stalls on Lot 12 is currently in Boeing's Capital Plan. If the control tower relocates, we assume the ARFF station will relocate with it. If this holds true, Boeing may alter our existing plans for the Lot 12 build. Boeing would like a better idea of which out years this relocation could occur so educated decisions can be made on our future projects.	Comments noted. The potential relocation of the ATCT has been identified as Phase II project (i.e., the 6 to 10-year timeframe) in the MP Update. Also, there are no current plans to relocate the existing ARFF facility, as they have a very strict response time requirements per the FAA and need to be as close to the center of the main runway as possible.	4
#6	1 & 2	West side airport service road reconstruction.	---	The West Service Road may be reconstructed and could lessen Boeing's ability to use certain airplane stalls (Lot 12). The project may also include the relocation of the Boeing Pump Station for the mitigation of the Object Free Area of Taxiway B. Boeing would like to be included in discussions and design reviews, if this project moves forward.	Comments noted. The Airport has a project on the books in 2023 timeframe to look at the impacts of the FAA's new Airport Design Advisory Circular (Draft AC 150/5300-13B, Airport Design) that is currently being reviewed. Based upon the initial review of the draft, it appears that some of the current taxiway OFA impacts may no longer be an issue if the revised criteria is published as presented.	4
#7	2	BFI operational impacts during reconstruction of Runway 14R/32L.	---	The main runway repaving project could interfere with Boeing's ability to conduct flight tests and to deliver aircraft during the construction period. Boeing would like to be closely involved in the project approach, phasing and construction scheduling to ensure Boeing's business is not adversely affected.	Comments noted.	4
#8	2	Stormwater management of airport property during	---	Due to the large list of KCIA Master Plan projects, Boeing is anxious with how KCIA plans on protecting our existing stormwater systems during all construction phases. Boeing would like to be kept current on any groundwater/stormwater plans being considered.	Comments noted.	4

Comments and Responses: The Boeing Company - received 11/30/20

Code for Response Action:

1. Concur that changes are or may be needed.
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 (i.e., an opinion given, or only clarification requested, etc.)

Comment I.D. & #	Page	Section or Issue	Para/Line/ Sentence	Comment as Noted	Response to Comment	Action
		construction of MP projects.				