

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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 Sarah Shiftly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		Table E2 "Greenhouse Gas Emissions" (in Chapter E) appears to show metric tons of CO2 emitted during various legs of flights in and out of KCIA. However, there's no explanation in the chapter of how those numbers were calculated. Did you take a percentage of total emissions from fuel pumped, or use a different methodology? And could you provide whatever source data and formulae were used to calculate these numbers.	<p>There are two methods used at airports to calculate airport-related emissions, and they are slightly different: Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP) Report 11, and the Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA). The method used should be tailored to the inventory purpose and the data available. In the case of the BFI MP Update, a hybrid was used given the information available (Appendix Six of the MP Update references the data used for the noise analysis, which was the same data used to calculate emissions using the AEDT.</p> <p>The evaluation of greenhouse gases focused on aircraft emissions, which represent the significant majority of aviation emissions and were calculated using the FAA's Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) Version 3b. The AEDT model calculates aircraft fuel burn in the landing and takeoff phase which is basically operation of the aircraft on arrival from a 3,000-foot altitude above ground to the airport and then on departure to 3,000 feet. This is referred to as the LTO (Landing and Takeoff cycle). The AEDT model then takes fuel burn and calculates CO2 emissions based upon the type of fuel used by the individual aircraft (recognizing that Jet A fuel has a slightly different carbon content than Aviation Gas (100LL). The MP Update did not prepare a forecast of future fuel that might be dispensed which is dependent on the distance that aircraft would travel. However, to evaluate aircraft noise, future aircraft operations (number of operations and aircraft type) enabled the evaluation of aircraft noise and emissions in the LTO. The LTO approach is consistent with ACA protocol, which is one of the intermediate calculations noted in ACRP Report Greenhouse gas emissions and were not estimated for other sources. While somewhat dated, King County prepared an inventory following the ACRP Report 11 protocol for KCIA</p>	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
					<p>in 2011 identifying emissions in 1990, 2007, and 2020.</p> <p>Radiative forcing was also not calculated as there is no industry consensus of the specific forcing that aviation contributes. FAA continues to do research in its center of excellence about the radiative forcing nature of aviation.</p> <p>Sources about the airport greenhouse gas calculations can be found at:</p> <p>ACRP Report 11 https://crp.trb.org/acrp0267/acrp-report-11-guidebook-on-preparing-airport-ghg-inventories/ Note that there is a section of this report that discussed radiative forcing.</p> <p>ACRP Report 11 https://crp.trb.org/acrp0267/acrp-report-11-guidebook-on-preparing-airport-ghg-inventories/ Note that there is a section of this report that discussed radiative forcing.</p> <p>ACA https://www.airportcarbonaccreditation.org/</p> <p>FAA Aviation Emissions https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/policy_guidance/environ_policy/media/primer_jan2015.pdf</p> <p>Example radiative forcing article: https://journals.ametsoc.org/bams/article/97/4/561/216221/Impact-of-Aviation-on-Climate-FAA-s-Aviation</p>	
#2 Sarah Shiftly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		Could you confirm that the Master Plan Update reports do <i>not</i> consider any non CO2-caused climate warming from aviation emissions (often referred to as radiative forcing)?	As noted above, there has not been industry acceptance of an approach to capturing radiative forcing, and it's potential impact was not included in the MP Update report.	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
com						
#3 Sarah Shiftly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		Chapter E also includes this statement in the Environmental Justice section: "None of the Proposed Projects are anticipated to have a disproportionately high and adverse impact on the minority or low-income populations." Could you please provide all substantiation that KCIA has for this statement?	Based upon the overlay/comparison of the baseline environmental inventory documentation with the recommended project list from the MP Update, we believe that the statement above regarding potential Environmental Justice impacts is correct. A definitive conclusion would have to be either confirmed or mitigated through a NEPA and SEPA evaluation prior to the development of any specific airport development project. If a project is determined to have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on the minority or low-income populations then mitigation measures may be required. As an example, the future noise analysis as an element of the NEPA process may need to include a census tract analysis to identify potential impacts on any minority or low-income populations.	4
#4 Sarah Shiftly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		What, if any, analyses were done to determine the impact the forecasted increase in flights and proposed projects would have on the achievability of the GHG emission reduction targets set by Seattle, King County, and Washington State?	The MP Update only documented a snapshot of the aircraft operations-related GHG emissions data for the years 2018, 2023, and 2035. Any analysis of the Airport's future role in meeting GHG emission reduction targets set by the City of Seattle, King County, and Washington State would need to be based on a more comprehensive evaluation of the greenhouse gas emissions for the overall operation of the Airport.	4
#5 Sarah Shiftly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		The "Executive Summary" references a "strategic vision established by King County" (p. xxiii). Could you please provide me a copy of that "strategic vision"?	This information is in reference to the County's Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives, as defined in the King County Strategic Plan and the King County International Airport Strategic Plan 2014-2020. This document was to serve as an Airport Management business decision-making tool (i.e., the roadmap) for the development of capital projects, sustainability, and customer service.	4
#6 Sarah		Environmental Concerns –		The "Executive Summary" states that the plan's basic assumptions were formulated with input from "stakeholders,	At the beginning of the master plan a group of stakeholders was developed which created the airport working group. You	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
Shiftly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		airport staff, and the FAA." Could you please provide a list of all stakeholders who participated in this formulation and the input provided by each stakeholder? Could you also explain how stakeholders were identified and selected?	can find the working group charter and meeting notes on the master plan update page of our project website. https://www.kingcounty.gov/services/airport/master-plan-update.aspx	
#7 Sarah Shiftly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		The "Executive Summary" states that the basic assumptions "include a commitment for continued airport development that supports ...sustainable planning objectives in the region." Could you please provide me a copy of these "sustainable planning objectives" and an explanation of where and how they are included in the assumptions?	A listing of the planning goals and supporting objectives defined in the King County International Airport Strategic Plan 2014-2020 are presented on pages A.2-A.3 of the Inventory of Existing Conditions chapter of the Master Plan Update. Additionally, as a County Agency we will be aligned with the King County Strategic Climate Action Plan (SCAP). Outside of the Master Plan we are working on an Airport Carbon Accreditation Program through the Airports Council International , managing fleet emissions, Using Green Building Scorecards for project planning, and participating in County task forces (green building energy, and climate preparedness). The County SCAP is located at the link below. It is still under County Council review. https://www.kingcounty.gov/services/environment/climate/actions-strategies/strategic-climate-action-plan/2020-SCAP-update.aspx	4
#8 Sarah Shiftly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		Have you looked at more recent research on radiative forcing? The sources you provide don't appear particularly current.	As presented below in your response, we have not been actively reviewing this since there has not been industry acceptance of an approach to capturing radiative forcing.	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
#9 Sarah Shifly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		Is it correct that the last GHG emission inventory completed by KCIA was in 2011? (I think I may be misreading your response.)	Please see the draft environmental section on the Master Plan website (link) page E.2 for the table on aircraft operation emissions inventory conducted for the master plan. The master plan is not an in-depth GHG study. The last full GHG emissions inventory in was done in 2011 however it will be updated through Airport Accreditation program through Airports Council International which we have just begun.	4
#10 Sarah Shifly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		Can you provide a copy of the most recent GHG emission inventory completed by KCIA?	A copy of the report was sent to you via email.	4
#11 Sarah Shifly sarah.shifley@gmail.com		Environmental Concerns – part of 350 Seattle Aviation Team		Can you provide an explanation of how the master plan update -- and KCIA generally -- is "aligned" with the SCAP? I'd also appreciate any supporting documentation.	There are instances in the King County SCAP that discusses the Airport's actions that include fleet and climate preparedness. Please see the King County SCAP document (link) page 269, 270 and 290 for documentation.	4
#1 John Hallock hallock.john@gmail.com		Environmental Impact Concerns		Hi I'm a resident who lives just north of the runway in Georgetown. I'm concerned that the extension of the runway will significantly impact the health and safety of my family. The planes come in low and loud enough and the extension of the runway will only make that issue worse. I would suggest the airport consider offering the impacted residents potential buyouts of their property if the airport intends to expand the runway and expand operations it doesn't seem like a long-term viable place to live for my family.	Comments noted. The potential noise impacts of repositioning the RW 14 threshold 300 ft to the north on airport property will have to be evaluated in separate environmental review documents (i.e., specified NEPA and SEPA studies) and receive environmental clearance prior to implementation or construction. In addition, the updated existing and future noise contours that were generated for this Master Plan Update are significantly smaller than the previous contours generated for the KCIA Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study, and would likely result in a much smaller Noise Mitigation Boundary if the Study were updated today. This current reduction in the KCIA-related noise footprint is the result of	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
					both fewer aircraft operations being conducted at the Airport and changes in the fleet mix of those operations due to the retirement of many older/noisier aircraft, along with the continued advancement of quieter engine technology.	
#1 Robert Ferry robert.ferry@gmail.com		Potential Ruby Chow Park expansion		<p>Below is the area of land I was referring to in my question today about using vacant land to double the size of Ruby Chow park</p> <p>In fact the traffic on Hardy and 13th Ave S is so little that it could be closed to provide a contiguous park that is more than twice the size of Ruby Chow. I would note that Ruby Chow is also already within the protection zone and a passive park use should be compatible with the nature of the protection zone</p> 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>As specified in FAA’s Airport Design Advisory Circular (AC 150/5300-13A) “The RPZ function is to enhance the protection of people and property on the ground. Where practical, airport owners should own the property under the runway approach and departure areas to at least the limits of the RPZ. It is desirable to clear the entire RPZ of all above-ground objects. Where this is impractical, airport owners, as a minimum, should maintain the RPZ clear of all facilities supporting incompatible activities.”</p> <p>Since a public park is not an approved recommended land use within the RPZ boundary, the proposed expansion of Ruby Chow Park on Airport Property (into the future repositioned boundary area of the RPZ) would not be approved by the FAA.</p>	4
#1 Richard Gelb		Aviation fuel flowage fees		<p>Hi John,</p> <p>I’m following up to see if you might be able to summarize leaded fuel vendor sales volume per day/per week.</p>	<p>Hi Richard,</p> <p>This is Tony E from the Airport. We’ve met during ESJ interdepartmental trainings on Equity Impact Review Tool</p>	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
Richard. Gleb@kingcount y.gov 206-477-4536 Healthy Communit y Planning and Partnering Team Document ation Unit Lead, COVID-19 Response Public Health Seattle/Ki ng County				Thank you for any info you can provide on this topic.	<p>implementation for capital projects.</p> <p>The Airport receives fuel flowage fees for two types of aviation fuel:</p> <p>\$0.08/gallon for Jet-A (kerosene-based fuel for turbine engines); & \$0.055/gallon for 100LL (Avgas 100 octane low-lead fuel for reciprocating piston engines)</p> <p>Please let me know if either or both of these fuel types meet criteria for your Duwamish Valley Air Quality meeting discussion. The Airport has monthly reporting data received from six fuel providers for these two fuel types; to break down this data more granularly into daily/weekly fuel quantities would be a manual “heavy lift.”</p> <p>Followed up on 11/17/2020 Listed below are the Airport’s fuel flowage numbers as reported by BFI fuel providers (i.e., Air BP, AvFuel, World Fuel Services, etc.) from 2017 thru SEP-2020.</p> <p>Source documents for this data are the Airport’s fuel audits. (to big of a file to include here)</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.</p>	
#1 Adam Malone				<p>This is feedback in response to the Update Summary and Q&A during the Open House sessions regarding the planned removal of a large portion of light General Aviation (GA) parking:</p> <p>A statement should be added to the Master Plan that</p>	<p>Adam,</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback.</p> <p>Airport Staff acknowledges the challenges of planning for the future development of an airport that is severely site</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>identifies that the impact to light GA parking due to the planned removal of NE and SW Parking is an issue for which mitigation plans are needed and creative solutions are being sought (e.g. parking at Lot 13).</p> <p>Perhaps this could be stated in the Airport Development Plan portion of the updated Master Plan.</p> <p>Although addressing this issue will be a challenge due to airport size constraints, stating it in the Master Plan would indicate the willingness of KCIA to collaboratively look for creative solutions.</p> <p>Light GA is still forecasted to be the largest category of airport operations through 2035, and providing access for the light GA pilot community that lives in King County is an important and appreciated part of the airport's mission.</p>	<p>constrained, but has high demand for facilities to serve all sectors of aviation. However, we are 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 (e.g., the existing Lot 13 area located on the west side of the Airport, directly south of the existing ATCT facility) that may soon be available for new leases to support additional GA aircraft apron parking facilities.</p>	
#1 Maureen Sánchez LDW Site Manager Washington State Department of Ecology NWRO		Proposed fuel farm relocation site.		<p>Hello,</p> <p>The Jorgensen Forge Site is located at 8531 E Marginal Way S Seattle and adjacent to the Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW) Superfund site. This is also the location of the Jorgensen Forge Corp contaminated site which cleanup is overseen by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). Because of the historic upland contamination present at this site as well as the potential risk for additional contamination into the LDW that may result during and after the cleanups are conducted; siting of a fuel farm at this location is not recommended. The potential risks to human health and the environment that may result from spills and other activities known to be associated to fuel farms make this location an undesirable choice for the community and the environment. Please take this under consideration during plan revisions and contact Ecology for additional information regarding this contaminated site.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The MP Update has identified the Jorgensen Forge Site property as a potential redevelopment site for the Airport's existing fuel storage facility. However, the property would still need to be acquired by the Airport (following the completion of an Environmental Due Diligence Audit) to support the project, and the potential environmental impacts associated with the future development of this site (e.g., existing site contamination) would have to be evaluated and receive both NEPA and SEPA environmental clearances prior to development.</p>	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
We had – number of people with the same comment. See attached list.		Environmental Concerns		<p>Dear Planners and Outreach,</p> <p>The King County International Airport (KCIA) Master Plan Update lays the groundwork for an untenable increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate warming from new aviation activity. In King County, aviation is already a major contributor to climate warming. Before the Master Plan Update goes forward, KCIA should perform a full GHG emission inventory, including total emissions from all fuel pumped and factoring in radiative forcing. The Master Plan Update should also include concrete steps for meeting the emission reductions goals laid out in King County's Strategic Climate Action Plan: a 50% reduction from 2007 levels by 2030. We need a decrease, not an increase, in aviation emissions for there to be any possibility of meeting our climate goals!</p> <p>The proposed Master Plan Update also clears a path for greater harm to neighboring communities. Aviation is a major source of air and noise pollution, and the communities closest to the airport that take the brunt of this pollution are far more diverse and poorer than King County as a whole. The plan trivializes serious noise impacts and ignores adverse health effects from ultra-fine particulate pollution. This is classic environmental racism, and we can't let it happen.</p> <p>Please amend the Master Plan Update to align with King County's climate goals and commitments to equity and environmental justice (as laid out in written comments submitted by 350 Seattle), and incorporate the demands of impacted communities! We need a moratorium on all aviation growth.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>KCIA is one of the few airport's in the country that has prepared a comprehensive GHG inventory (entitled, <i>King County International Airport Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory: 1990, 2007 & 2020</i>), which was published in 2011.</p> <p>Also, as a County entity, KCIA is aligned with the King County Strategic Climate Action Plan (KCSCAP). Specifically, KCIA supports the KCSCAP by managing GHG emissions (that they can control), conducting climate preparedness, and promoting climate/community resiliency. These include, but are not limited to, initiating an Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) program, managing fleet emissions, Green Building Scorecards for project planning, mitigating the impacts of climate change to Airport assets, participating in County task forces (green building, energy, and climate preparedness), and optimizing the involvement of interns and disadvantaged business to participate in capital projects. In addition, following KCIA's confirmation in the ACA program, the County will be required to prepare a current GHG Emissions Inventory that meets the ACA protocols.</p>	4
#1		Environmental Concerns		Dear Planners and Outreach,	Comments noted.	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
Aisha Sial				<p>I am horrified to think anyone would make plans to grow air travel in King County. This is unjust to the point of criminal even suicidal to our region. Our family lived near Boeing Field, my grandchildren breathed the flumes left behind by the many small planes using leaded fuel! Now they live near Renton airport. Families of Black, Indigenous, and all people of Color have fewer educational employment, and housing options because of our deeply embedded ideas of White supremacy. Racist culture supports lies (both huge and small) and the illegal antisocial crimes of powerful wealthy people are destroying us all. Whites who remain apathetic and selfish will reach a bad end sooner or later. I warn you now make plans to shrink aviation and provide more equity.</p> <p>For my personal reasons and all the reasons listed below by 350 Seattle...</p> <p>DOWNSIZE AVIATION!</p> <p>The King County International Airport (KCIA) Master Plan Update lays the groundwork for an untenable increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate warming from new aviation activity. In King County, aviation is already a major contributor to climate warming. Before the Master Plan Update goes forward, KCIA should perform a full GHG emission inventory, including total emissions from all fuel pumped and factoring in radiative forcing. The Master Plan Update should also include concrete steps for meeting the emission reductions goals laid out in King County's Strategic Climate Action Plan: a 50% reduction from 2007 levels by 2030. We need a decrease, not an increase, in aviation emissions for there to be any possibility</p>	<p>King County does not have the authority limit or restrict the operation of aircraft to and from the facility. We concur that a projected increase in aircraft operations, as outlined in the Master Plan Update, would result in an increase in aircraft noise at KCIA, which was documented in the Environmental Overview chapter of the MP Update (see pgs. E.10-19).</p> <p>However, the potential environmental impacts associated with any of the proposed projects in the MP Update (e.g., noise and air quality impacts) would have to be evaluated and receive both NEPA and SEPA environmental clearances prior to development.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the updated existing and future noise contours, generated for this Master Plan Update, are significantly smaller than the previous contours generated for the KCIA Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study, and would likely result in a much smaller Noise Mitigation Boundary if the Study were updated today. This current reduction in the KCIA-related noise footprint is the result of both fewer aircraft operations being conducted at the Airport and changes in the fleet mix of those operations due to the retirement of many older/noisier aircraft, along with the continued advancement of quieter engine technology.</p>	

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>of meeting our climate goals!</p> <p>The proposed Master Plan Update also clears a path for greater harm to neighboring communities. Aviation is a major source of air and noise pollution, and the communities closest to the airport that take the brunt of this pollution are far more diverse and poorer than King County as a whole. The plan trivializes serious noise impacts and ignores adverse health effects from ultra-fine particulate pollution. This is classic environmental racism, and we can't let it happen.</p> <p>Please amend the Master Plan Update to align with King County's climate goals and commitments to equity and environmental justice (as laid out in written comments submitted by 350 Seattle), and incorporate the demands of impacted communities! We need a moratorium on all aviation growth.</p>		
#1 Amy Marks		Environmental Concerns		<p>Hello. I am writing today with a comment on the King County International Airport Master Plan. I will keep my comments simple.</p> <p>Aviation activity in our region has been increasing in recent years, and with it comes an increase in climate pollution, noise pollution and air pollution. Hopefully I don't need to explain the importance of lowering global climate pollution. Air and noise pollution from KCIA effect some of the county's least economically advantaged residents.</p> <p>I would like to suggest that the master plan focuses on decreasing these environmental pressures, rather than increasing them. This would be more in line with our county's values and goals.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Aisha Sial comments noted above on pg. 10.</p>	4
#1 Daniel		Environmental Concerns		<p>Dear Planners and Outreach,</p> <p>CARBON HAS 30-50 YEAR LAG TIME BEFORE</p>	Comments noted.	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
Ferra				<p>MOLECULE REACHES ITS FULL POTENTIAL IN HOLDING HEAT MASS</p> <p>METHANE NATURAL GAS HAS 10 YEAR LAG TIME AND IS 130 TIMES HOTTER THAN A CARBON MOLECULE</p> <p>WE ARE LOCKED IN TO</p> <p>EXPONENTIAL HEAT</p> <p>EXPONENTIAL RAIN</p> <p>EXPONENTIAL SNOW</p> <p>COMING OFF OF GREENLANDS 20 FEET OF SEA LEVEL RISE METHANE NATURAL GAS INDUCED WINDS CAN BRING RECORD HEAT RAIN OR SNOW ANY WHERE</p> <p>US FEDERAL RESERVE BANK NUCLEAR FOSSIL FUEL MONOPOLIES</p> <p>BITCH SLAPPING HOME GLOBE IN WARRING SLAVE MINERAL OIL AND GAS EXTRACTION TERRITORIES</p> <p>ARRESTING SHOOTING BURNING DROWNING AND KILLING us</p> <p>IN THEIR EXECUTIVE EXTINCTION EXECUTION LYING AND DENYING GLOBAL WARMING ABRUPT CLIMATE CHANGING</p> <p>SEA LEVEL RISING OVER 220 FEET WITH IN 36 MONTHS</p> <p>444 Nuclear Reactors</p> <p>450 Nuclear Facilities</p> <p>Over 1,300 Nuclear Fuel Rod Pools</p> <p>Over 2,000 Nuclear Detonations</p> <p>Over 14,000 Nuclear Weapons</p> <p>Over 250,000 Toxic Tons Of Radiated Nuclear Waste Globally</p>	See response to Aisha Sial comments noted on pg. 10.	

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>NAKASAKI HEROSHIMA FUKUSHIMA</p> <p>SINCE 2005 GLOBAL WARMING FEED BACK LOOPS SEEPING SPEWING AND VENTING METHANE NATURAL GAS PERMA-FROST METHANE HYDRATES MANTLE METHANE FROM ISOSTATIC REBOUNDING AND PINGOES NATALIA SHOVKHOV GUY MCPHERSON AND KEVIN HESTER FEEL THEY ARE GETTING READY TO EXPLODE THIS SECOND MINUTE HOUR DAY</p> <p>20 FEET OF SEA LEVEL RISE IN GREENLAND 200 FEET OF SEA LEVEL RISE IN ANTARCTICA MELTING CALVING GETTING READY TO COLLAPSE WITH IN 36 MONTHS</p> <p>LAST TIME PARTS PER MILLION OF CARBON WAS 410PPM SEA LEVEL WAS 130 FEET HIGHER THAN RIGHT NOW CARBON IS AT 415PPM</p> <p>ANTARCTICA HAS MELTED MORE IN THE PAST 4 YEARS THAN WHAT THE ARCTIC MELTED IN THE PAST 34 YEARS</p> <p>STRATOSPHERE IS 65C HOTTER THAN 4 YEARS AGO AN GETTING HOTTER</p> <p>ONLY MEASURING CARBON</p> <p>ADD 2.0C METHANE NATURAL GAS</p> <p>ADD 2.0C NITROUS OXIDE</p> <p>ADD 2.0C WATER VAPOUR</p> <p>ADD 2.0C CARBON</p> <p>= 8.0C GLOBAL TEMPERATURES RISE since the 1700S</p> <p>21 JUNE 2020 SIBERIAN ARCTIC 100.4F</p> <p>RECORD HEAT RECORD FIRES</p> <p>RECORD RAIN RECORD FLOODS</p> <p>YEAR AFTER YEAR EVERY YEAR</p> <p>ALLOW RESIDENCE TO SELL THEIR SOLAR</p>		

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>BATTERIES AND ELECTRICAL VEHICLE POWER TO THE UTILITY aka FEED IN TARIFF</p> <p>https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpetitions.moveon.org%2Fsign%2Flet-california-home-owners&data=04%7C01%7CKCIACommunityOutreach%40kingcounty.gov%7C590124d2247845066bd608d893bd7a3d%7Cbae5059a76f049d7999672dfe95d69c7%7C0%7C0%7C637421789297573380%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sd=0wMA4LjhgZgOLXgFVZE3%2Fnxx%2FwHSrpy1UTD8VbNbwl%3D&reserved=0</p> <p>SOLAR + ELECTRIC VEHICLE + AC UNIT = SAVED LIFE WHEN GRID IS DOWN</p> <p>BAN FRACKING</p> <p>https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.youtube.com%2Fwatch%3Fv%3Dv9GRkZMTqCs&data=04%7C01%7CKCIACommunityOutreach%40kingcounty.gov%7C590124d2247845066bd608d893bd7a3d%7Cbae5059a76f049d7999672dfe95d69c7%7C0%7C0%7C637421789297573380%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sda=PsWxN8uhK%2BOK9BrVsE5Y%2FBE2pGEmh95QXYfkQKioaSc%3D&reserved=0</p> <p>When Will Greenland and Antarctica Collapse ?</p> <p>Great Lakes Lake Levels Rising Because of Record Rain an Greenland Melting</p> <p>All That Ice an Snow Is Heavy</p>		
#1 Robert Braunstein		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA		<p>Dear King County International Airport/Boeing Field -</p> <p>It has come to my attention that the current proposal and</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The MP Update does identify a potential demand scenario for</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
		aircraft storage facilities		<p>master plan of Boeing field includes the “redevelopment of the Southwest area”, which is another way of saying “the elimination of approximately 75 general aviation hangars and tie down spaces”. I do not see any firm plans in the current proposal for the relocation of these spaces on the field.</p> <p>I have lived in West Seattle for the past 30 years and have had a small airplane (single engine land) located on Boeing Field since 1996. It is not just a hangar but a way of life for me.</p> <p>According to FAA Airport Compliance Manual 5190.6B, Chapter 9, Section 9.1.a and Section 9.7, this current proposal is in direct violation. Here are the excerpts:</p> <p>Federal Grant Obligations. Grant Assurance 22, Economic Nondiscrimination, requires the sponsor to make its aeronautical facilities available to the public and its tenants on terms that are reasonable and without unjust discrimination. This federal obligation involves several distinct requirements. First, the sponsor must make the airport and its facilities available for public use. Next, the sponsor must ensure that the terms imposed on aeronautical users of the airport, including rates and charges, are reasonable for the facilities and services provided. Finally the terms must be applied without unjust discrimination. The prohibition on unjust discrimination extends to types, kinds and classes of aeronautical activities, as well as individual members of a class of operator. This is true whether these terms are imposed by the sponsor or by a licensee or tenant offering services or commodities normally required at the airport. The tenant’s commercial status does not relieve the sponsor of its obligation to ensure the terms for services offered to aeronautical users are fair and reasonable and without unjust discrimination. (See An</p>	<p>the future redevelopment of the existing southwest GA T-hangar and apron area to accommodate a new air cargo facility. However, the site will be identified on the Airport Layout Plan as a Future Aviation Redevelopment Area. The future development boundary for this site would exclude the existing twelve apron tiedowns located north of the Museum of Flight (MOF) and positioned within the existing access corridor defined by the current MOF Through-the-Fence agreement. The future development boundary of the proposed new Aviation Redevelopment Area will be revised as described above on the updated draft Airport Layout Plan.</p> <p>Please note the proposal to redevelop this area of the Airport was introduced in the previous Master Plan, with the planned removal of the three T-hangars and the acquisition of the adjacent Woods Meadow property being reflected on the current 2007 Airport Layout Plan. For this MP Update, the Airport Staff’s initial recommendation to propose the new Southwest Air Cargo Area originally included a provision for the development of a new North General Aviation Aircraft Storage Area to accommodate the relocation of displaced based aircraft. Schematic layouts for these new GA facilities were presented in the draft Working Paper Three document and meeting notes on this topic are presented on the MP Update website, under the tabs: Master Plan Update – Meeting 3 Summary and Master Plan Update – Meeting 4 Summary. However, FAA’s decision to no longer support the Threshold Crossing Height (TCH) waiver on Runway 14R landings for large aircraft, which was received late in the study process, resulted in the required 300-foot relocation to the north of the Runway 14R threshold. This threshold relocation then eliminated the potential development of the new North General Aviation Aircraft Storage Area. This information is presented in Draft Chapter D Alternatives Development and Evaluation (see pgs. D.95 & D.96).</p>	

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>air carrier that assumes the same obligations imposed on other tenant air carriers shall enjoy the same classification and status. This applies to rates, fees, rentals, rules, regulations, and conditions covering all the airport's aeronautical activities.</p> <p>Availability of Leased Space. The sponsor's federal obligation under Grant Assurance 22, Economic Nondiscrimination, to operate the airport for the public's use and benefit is not satisfied simply by keeping the runways open to all classes of users. The assurance federally obligates the sponsor to make available suitable areas or space on reasonable terms to those willing and qualified to offer aeronautical services to the public (e.g. air carrier, air taxi, charter, flight training, or crop dusting services) or support services (e.g. fuel, storage, tie-down, or flight line maintenance services) to aircraft operators. Sponsors are also obligated to make space available to support aeronautical activity of noncommercial aeronautical users (i.e., hangars and tie-down space for individual aircraft owners). This means that unless it undertakes to provide these services itself, the sponsor has a duty to negotiate in good faith for the lease of premises available to conduct aeronautical activities. Since the scope of this federal obligation is frequently misunderstood, the following guidance is offered:</p> <p>a. Servicing of Aircraft. All grant agreements contain an assurance that the sponsor will neither exercise nor grant any right or privilege that would have the effect of preventing the operator of an aircraft from performing any services on its own aircraft with its own employees. This does</p>	<p>Regarding the comments in reference to compliance with Grant Assurance 22, BFI is a significantly space constrained facility that has historically experienced a greater demand for aircraft storage facilities than could be accommodated within their limited development footprint. Given these existing site development constraints and the ongoing changes in aviation demand, Airport Staff are sometimes required to make difficult choices regarding future planning recommendations through the Airport Master Plan process, and have those changes reflected on the updated Airport Layout Plan. As noted above, the existing southwest T-hangars were identified for removal in the previous planning study, as reflected on the existing ALP. In addition, the designation of this area as a future Aviation Redevelopment Area that could include air cargo facilities is not a violation of the grant assurances. BFI Staff had no input into FAA's decision to revoke the existing TCH waiver that eliminated the option for the proposed new GA aircraft storage area at the north end of the Airport. However, they have committed in recent public meetings on the MP Update to continue the evaluation of other locations on the west side of the Airport (e.g., the existing Lot 13 area located on the west side of the Airport, directly south of the existing ATCT facility) to accommodate some of these relocated based aircraft, as existing leaseholds expire.</p>	

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>not, however, federally obligate the sponsor to lease space to every aircraft operator using the airport. It simply means that any aircraft operator entitled to use the airfield is also entitled to tie down, adjust, repair, clean, and otherwise service its own aircraft, provided it does so with its own employees and conducts self-servicing in accordance with the sponsor's reasonable rules or standards established for such work. Accordingly, the assurance establishes a privilege of selfservice, but it does not, by itself, compel the sponsor to lease the facilities necessary to exercise that privilege.</p> <p>Furthermore, general aviation (GA) has a rich history at Boeing Field, providing jobs, flight training, aircraft charter, maintenance, repair, recreation and more. GA activity at Boeing Field generates significant economic impact to King County – both at the airport and in the surrounding community. Other airports in the area do not have the additional capacity to accommodate the displaced aircraft, forcing many owners to base their aircraft several hours away, or sell.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest tiedown and hangar area unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size, can be located on the field. GA deserves a continued presence on Boeing Field.</p>		
#1 Brian Janssen		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>t and user of the sw parking tiedown and hangar area. I am strongly opposed to the redevelopment of this space, unless it is redevelopment of the existing spaces and uses. General aviation is a critical part of the history and future of boeing field. Repurposing these spaces would leave no hangaring options for small plane owners. This would leave King County catering to the private hangaring needs of a half dozen or so local billionaires. If this is a revenue generation</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				issue then increase the current rents for sw parking and hangars, but if that is done the facilities would require significant renovation.		
#1 NJ Morgan		Environmental Impact concerns		<p>Dear Planners and Outreach,</p> <p>Having lived in locations that were significantly, and negatively, affected by increases in aviation activity, I strongly urge you to decrease air traffic at the King County International Airport.</p> <p>In addition, it is essential that you amend the Master Plan Update to align with King County's climate goals.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>King County does not have the authority limit or restrict the operation of aircraft to and from the facility. We concur that a projected increase in aircraft operations, as outlined in the Master Plan Update, would result in an increase in aircraft noise at KCIA, which was documented in the Environmental Overview chapter of the MP Update (see pgs. E.10-19).</p> <p>However, the potential environmental impacts associated with any of the proposed projects in the MP Update (e.g., noise and air quality impacts) would have to be evaluated and receive both NEPA and SEPA environmental clearances prior to development.</p>	4
#1 Kevan Yalowitz		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Dear King County,</p> <p>I am a general aviation pilot based on Vashon Island. Boeing Field is a critical safety destination for me. Recently, my wife was pregnant, and using tie downs at Boeing Field allowed me to rush my wife to the hospital and see my child be born. Please continue to welcome general aviation at BFI and consider the implications beyond GA as simply joy flights and training.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Wesley Hebert		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Rumor has it you're considering removing some GA parking spots at the SW corner of the field? This is a horrible idea! There is not enough General Aviation parking near Seattle as it is. Hangar wait lists are years long and ridiculously priced, and this is only going to make it worse. BFI has a history filled with GA, please don't push</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				it away like so many great airports have. If anything, more GA parking should be built. In case it isn't clear, I'm vehemently opposed to tearing down ANY GA parking unless it's to build MORE GA parking.		
#1 Bob Carpenter		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		Please do not eliminate the 75 tie down and hanger parking spaces for GA aircraft at Boeing field in the SW corner. As a pilot, I like to fly to the Museum of Flight and park in those spaces. There already are too few GA spaces at the field. Thank you!	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 Jack		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		I feel there is a theme around the Seattle area at the main airports. There are changes overall being made that discourage GA. From the numerous problems at Renton to tie downs at risk on Boeing field. It is slowly dying when i compare it to what it once was.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 David J Krall		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		We need all available tie downs for GA use. Thank you and please keep me informed of progress on this issue.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 N13489		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		Boeing field general aviation parking cut backs: STOP! It's hard to get parking already! Seems there's no plan to move the lost parking anywhere!	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 Michael Angiulo		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		Hello, I am writing in support of continued GA operations at Boeing Field. I am a commercial pilot who has been active in the local aviation community for the past 25 years. Over that time, I have hangered airplanes at KBFI, purchased	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				avionics and maintenance on the field, and have rented and chartered both fixed wing aircraft and helicopters. The redevelopment of the Southwest area will eliminate important GA capacity, and I strongly oppose the proposal unless new hangar and tie down areas can be located on the field which compensate for the loss. I have owned ten airplanes and finding suitable tie down and hangar space has always been difficult. Please do not make it more difficult to be able to have access to these general aviation services in the future!		
#1 Mark Masciarotte		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I am traveling and just learned that a proposal is being considered to eliminate the general aviation (GA) ramp at the southwest section of the airport as well as the apron and tiedown area at the northeast end. As a pilot and long-time aircraft operator I should like to go on record to say that I oppose eliminating any space for GA parking or storage.</p> <p>It should be remembered that GA has long played an important role at BFI. Indeed, almost the entire eastern side of the field has been supported by GA aircraft — from large, transport category private jets to small trainers and helicopters — and a number of small GA-related businesses. To my knowledge, the hangars on the west side south of the Boeing facility are leased entirely by owners of GA aircraft as are the tiedowns adjacent to the air museum and the tiedowns on the northeast side.</p> <p>I can see from the Mead and Hunt draft document and drawings that some new FBO space is planned. Nevertheless, unless a plan is adopted that would replace the existing hangars and tiedowns somewhere on the field without a net loss of existing capacity, the proposed redevelopment should not be pursued. As the prime GA reliever for SEA, BFI is the only airport within many miles that can accommodate locally owned GA aircraft. The</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>economic impact of BFI's GA-related operations is substantial, and the loss of based GA aircraft and related businesses will impact jobs, rents and revenue.</p> <p>The need for hangar and tiedown space is real and the availability nationwide is dwindling. Please consider a plan that will not reduce the number of based GA aircraft at Boeing Field.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>		
#1 Ted Millar		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>King County Commissioners,</p> <p>We strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest tiedown and hangar area at Boeing Field unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size can be located elsewhere on the field !!</p> <p>Our company and many of our businesses from Oregon use Boeing Field constantly in our Interstate Commerce activities which generates significant economic impact to King County – both at the airport and in the surrounding communities.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted,</p> <p>Ted Millar</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Christopher Carey		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I'm an on field tenant. Please count me as against taking away more hanger space. KBFI is the safest approach in the Seattle area and GA needs this field. Also, once lost GA will not return. I hope this is not KC intent.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Christopher Carey</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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 Michael Tanksley		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Greetings.</p> <p>It has come to my attention that King County is considering significant reductions in parking facilities for general aviation aircraft (GA) at BFI.</p> <p>I am opposed to this proposal as presented.</p> <p>GA is a fundamental element of our aviation community yet it is under tremendous pressures from many angles. Not the least of these is availability of hanger and tie-down facilities in and around large urban centers such as King County. BFI offers a crucial public service in this regard, as it has for many decades.</p> <p>Looking back on my 35 year career as a commercial pilot, perhaps the pinnacle of which was over 15,000 hours in the B-747, it all started with my first lessons in a Piper Cherokee. Civilian aviation is a fundamental building block for aviation in our country and should be afforded the appropriate respect and accommodations.</p> <p>If this location is crucial for some sort of redevelopment, this should proceed only after replacement facilities are secured and developed at BFI for the displaced GA operators.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Alan Gureivch		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>General aviation is a valid part of KBFI and has contributed financially to the airport's finances for decades. As the airport is a County asset, meant to benefit all King County residents and taxpayers, cutting General Aviation out of the picture, as will be done to large extent by the development of a cargo facility in the Southwest corner, goes counter to that charter responsibility.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>As airport management so disingenuously states, 'further development of areas to provide for general aviation is being explored'. Given the presentations made by them and their consultants, where they repeatedly say the airport footprint is severely constrained with very little ability to expand, I anticipate their final statement being "Further parking for general aviation uses can be found at other airports in the area" and washing their hands of what the impact of closing the SW area will be.</p> <p>I am already at one of those "other general aviation airports" and there is already zero room for more tie-down parking/hangaring.</p> <p>Improving BFI is absolutely needed and overdue. But it must be done as a County facility serving <u>all</u> users, not just "big airplanes" and commercial functions. General aviation users pay our taxes to support the county airport. We should reap some benefit from this as a matter of course.</p>		
#1 Deirdre Curle		Environmental Impact concerns		<p>Hello,</p> <p>I attended the community meeting in October. I wish to submit comments regarding the King County Master Plan. I live on Beacon Hill, about 1 mile from the airport. I am concerned about the effects of increased noise on local homes and businesses near the airport, as well as the effects of the runway expansion. Do you have plans to make an environmental impact statement that takes into account communities within a 2 mile radius of the airport? How will you measure and mitigate the environmental effects on the community of the extension of the runway on the north side?</p> <p>I appreciate the information you have provided through community meetings and your website, and the efforts you</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The potential noise impacts of repositioning the RW 14 threshold 300 ft to the north on airport property will have to be evaluated in separate environmental review documents (i.e., specified NEPA and SEPA studies) and receive environmental clearance prior to implementation or construction. In addition, the updated existing and future noise contours that were generated for this Master Plan Update are significantly smaller than the previous contours generated for the KCIA Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study, and would likely result in a much smaller Noise Mitigation Boundary if the Study were updated today. This current reduction in the KCIA-related noise footprint is the result of both fewer aircraft operations being conducted at the Airport</p>	4

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				made to make the information available in the multiple languages spoken by community residents. Thank you for your time.	and changes in the fleet mix of those operations due to the retirement of many older/noisier aircraft, along with the continued advancement of quieter engine technology.	
#1 John Haug		Environmental Impact concerns		<p>Hello,</p> <p>I attended the community meeting in October. I wish to submit comments regarding the King County Master Plan. I live on Beacon Hill, about 1 mile from the airport. I am concerned about the effects of increased noise on local homes and businesses near the airport, as well as the effects of the runway expansion. Do you have plans to make an environmental impact statement that takes into account communities within a 2 mile radius of the airport? How will you measure and mitigate the environmental effects on the community of the extension of the runway on the north side?</p> <p>I appreciate the information you have provided through community meetings and your website, and the efforts you made to make the information available in the multiple languages spoken by community residents. Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to comments noted above.</p>	4
#1 Unknown		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		I use Boeing Field as a professional pilot and I want to fly my private plane to the field to visit the museum. The spaces being considered to be eliminated should be saved or relocated to provide all GA pilots access. The usefulness of BFI will be greatly diminished if this proposal is adopted.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 John Sandvig		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft KCIA Master Plan Update.</p> <p>The development goals and the underlying assumptions shown on pp D1-D4 make good sense. I support them. I believe, however, there is a fatal flaw in the draft update</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>having to do with general aviation (GA) aircraft stowage which is manifested in at least two ways.</p> <p>1) The GA storage requirements stipulated on pp C61-C66, specifically in table C20 are inadequate to the need. The estimated need provided by Mead & Hunt analysis reduces the number of tiedowns required in 2020 by 60% from the actual use in 2015. No basis is provided for this dramatic reduction. The central metro area of Seattle is already squeezed for GA hangar and tiedown space. The wait list for hangar space is years long and will undoubtedly get worse as Renton airport management has plans to raze a number of T-hangars in the SW corner of that airport. Even if those T-hangars are replaced with large hangars, fewer GA aircraft will be able to be accommodated. As Boeing 737 production comes back on line they will not be eager to return space for T-hangars or tiedowns. Central metro Seattle needs <u>more</u> GA storage space, not less. BFI is the best place to provide it.</p> <p>2) Development of the proposed SW air cargo facility appears to presume approximately 75 GA hangars and tiedown spots will be relocated elsewhere on the airport but without specifically stating where. This amounts to an unsecured promissory note. As such it is unacceptable. If specific and definite plans to relocate these facilities were defined and committed as part of the plan, that might be acceptable.</p> <p>It is obvious from the draft airport authorities are planning to provide excellent to outstanding support to corporate GA (i.e., bizjets) and to air cargo providers. Such an orientation is supportive of the prosperity and well being of King County but to do so at the expense of lighter GA is a huge mistake and should not be allowed. GA also provides huge economic benefit to the county and is an essential and adaptable component of our regional transportation system. KCIA planners may believe light GA can be shunted to</p>	<p>Also, additional information is required for the existing and projected apron storage data presented in Table C20. The table's 2015 based aircraft and itinerant aircraft tiedown counts/area requirements (e.g., 159 spaces and 11.1 acres) reflect the existing baseline counts for those facilities at that time, but not the existing demand for those facilities in 2015. For example, the estimated demand for based aircraft tiedown spaces in 2015 was identified at 96 spaces, and this information will be added to the table to better present the forecasted projections. Thus, the MP Update does project a modest increase in based aircraft tiedowns (i.e., from 96 to 106) through the 20-year planning period.</p> <p>As noted in the response to Robert Braunstein comments on pg. 16, both this projected additional demand for based aircraft tiedowns and the relocation of the existing southwest GA tiedowns and hangars was to have been accommodated by the development of the new North GA aircraft storage area.</p>	

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				other outlying airports but that is not true. Do not sacrifice light GA hangar and tiedown space for the SW air cargo development area without a realistic and committed plan to continue to support light GA storage requirements.		
#1 Sam Cordell		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>My name is Sam and I am a Seattle based private pilot. I have just learned of the proposed master plan changes to BFI. I am writing to express my opposition to what seems to be the removal of dozens of general aviation parking spots at the southwest ramp north of the Museum of Flight — point #2 in your Master Plan Update. There is no apparent accommodation for replacing them elsewhere on the airport grounds.</p> <p>Parking for small aircraft has long been difficult to find throughout the Seattle area. Dozens of airports have been closed over the decades, and few options remain within a reasonable distance of the city. Hangars and tie-downs and are proposed to be removed from both Boeing Field and Renton. The introduction of TSA restrictions to Paine Field and the airport management's seemingly near-sole focus on scheduled operations is turning PAE from a very GA-friendly airport to something entirely different. These three are the only airports in central Sound offering IFR landing options in low ceilings and are therefore a near necessity for many pilots.</p> <p>Aside from those aircraft owners who need parking – and who pay rent, for services, and taxes which partially fund the airport and its business – would be the loss of museum visitor fly-in parking and space for aviation events held at the museum. Past events include hosting EAA's B-17 Aluminum Overcast, Olde Thyme Aviation's biplane rides, and specific flight and youth aerospace education events</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p> <p>Also, the decline in GA operations at BFI was fairly steady between 2000 and 2015, with average annual reductions of 4.9% for itinerant GA and 7.1% for local GA ops (see pgs. B.8-B.9 of the forecast chapter). 2015 was the base year of the forecasts for the MPU and GA ops later bottomed-out in 2016.</p> <p>The GA operational forecast presented on pgs. B.35-B.36 of the forecast chapter reflect the projected growth in the Business/Corporate and Air Taxi sectors with a corresponding decrease in recreational/training activity. We agree that the projections for the GA recreational/training activity are pessimistic, but that outlook for those users was not unique to BFI, and the projected ops are still higher than the latest FAA TAF estimates for BFI that have local GA operations leveling off in the 55k range over the next 20 years.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>held by local organizations such as Cascade Warbirds and Civil Air Patrol.</p> <p>In your own update/feedback doc above, GA is shown to represent over half of all aircraft operations at BFI. Your forecast showing a sudden decline in GA activity is in stark contrast to the continued growth of GA in our region (short-term economic factors notwithstanding). One can only speculate this sudden reduction would be due to pushing more GA out of Boeing Field. FAA's own "Air Traffic Activity System"</p> <p>(https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Faspm.faa.gov%2Fopsnet%2Fsys%2FAirport.asp&data=04%7C01%7CKCIACommunityOutreach%40kingcounty.gov%7C6f43b79e1bec4ee4d82b08d89f2381a0%7Cbae5059a76f049d7999672dfe95d69c7%7C0%7C1%7C637434322150999286%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlJoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&data=rb7F4OfRnV9irO4Y4tFZQHBNbsJXovWsjUPRhoT%2Fjw%3D&reserved=0) shows increases in itinerant GA plus local civil operations from 124,050 in 2015 to 149,316 in 2019.</p> <p>While many of us recognize that commercial interests dominate the revenue generation and thus policy making at the county and the airport, we "little guys" should not be swept away with little thought to the negative impact on our avocations, small businesses, volunteer work, and commercial transactions. I request that you either reconsider the proposed redevelopment of the southwest ramp or only take on that work with equivalent GA parking elsewhere on the airport grounds.</p>		
#1 Melanie		Displacement/ Loss of		<p>Greetings,</p> <p>I am a general aviation pilot who enjoys flying into BFI. I</p>	Comments noted.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
Miller		Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		have flown to the airport and parked for business and personal reason's for a duration of a few hours per trip. I typically park in the Northeast parking area. There are only three spots there and I have been lucky to park in the last open spot when visiting. The spot closest to the gate has been vary challenging to get into. I'm trying to figure out why the transient parking is being eliminated when in fact more transient spaces are in need at this airport. I hope the masterplan changes to accommodate general aviation transient parking.	See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	
#1 Martin Makela		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		I strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest tiedown and hangar area unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size, can be located on the field.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 Larry Becker		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		I'm a current WA state pilot. I strongly urge you not to change the GA tiedown area on the southwest corner of Boeing Field.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 Don Goodman		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Hello – My name is Don Goodman, small GA owner/operator. I am concerned with the possible loss of small GA parking/hangars in the subject Master Plan. The area in question is the SW complex. While not currently a tenant at KBFI I have been in the past and I am well aware of the pressure on small GA facilities in the greater Puget Sound.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small GA is critical to the aviation community.....literally the foundation of the aviation community - Significant economic benefit is derived from small GA operations/presence - Loss of the SW facility, without any plan to 	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>relocate such capacity at BFI, would be a serious blow to small GA at BFI</p> <p>It is for the above reason that I strongly oppose the elimination of the SW small GA facilities without comparable (or larger) facilities being developed elsewhere on the field. The demand is clearly present.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>		
#1 Donald Madonna		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Hi -</p> <p>I am writing in support of continued GA operations at Boeing Field. I am an active pilot who has been active in the local aviation community for the past 15 years. Over that time, I have hangared airplanes, purchased avionics and maintenance on the field, and have rented aircraft on the field. The redevelopment of the Southwest area will eliminate important GA capacity, and I strongly oppose the proposal unless new hangar and tie down areas can be located on the field which compensate for the loss. I have owned 5 airplanes and finding suitable tie down and hangar space has always been difficult. Please do not make it more difficult to be able to have access to these general aviation services in the future!</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your consideration.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Jim Claypool		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Hi,</p> <p>As one of the residents of the SW Airpark, I just want to express how important it is that we have a solution that provides AT LEAST as many hangar and tie down spaces as might be displaced prior to the demolition of the existing</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>spaces. I had to wait 2 years to get a hangar and that time period is growing. There are no other alternatives. Renton has an 8 year waitlist the last time I checked. My aircraft is just slightly too big for tiedown and small hangars. None of the other Seattle area airports have hangar space that will accommodate a 43 ft wingspan. PAE is also about 2 years, but it's a much longer drive and weather is often well below BFI making the ability to get home that much more precarious. I know corporate aircraft that have moved to TIW because of the lack of availability at BFI along with the outrageous costs. They pay pilots to commute for them to bring the plane into BFI or PAE to pick them up but its housed and serviced and fueled at TIW, causing Seattle and King County to miss out on revenue as a result. And pilot/owners don't have the luxury of sending their corporate pilot to fetch the plane so locating it so far away makes it unrealistic. This could also be indirectly leading to a decrease in safety as pilots forced to travel farther just to get to their plane may fly less than they would if their aircraft were stored closer. We know that less flying time leads to rusty pilots and that is not good for our busy airspace.</p> <p>I know that GA isn't the most lucrative user of the airfield, especially if you can attract a new cargo hub, but nonetheless, it is a critical part of the aviation community and the history and purpose of BFI. I learned to fly at BFI over 30 years ago and since then I've seen the several flight schools and flying clubs all get squeezed out, save one. We can't let the billionaire's club force out any more GA space. All of the fancy private hangars on the east side have displaced so much that used to be thriving GA businesses. The cost of hangar space is already outpacing people's ability to afford it and not because of real value increases in the land, but because the billionaire's club has no care how much things cost and have unrealistically driven up the</p>		

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>cost. But the purpose of government is to balance the needs of all of the constituent users which is why it's important that King County maintains its purpose in planning for BFI. This proposal to develop a cargo base is just another sign of this same problem. Now that the east side is so built up with luxury private hangars we have pushed more GA users to the West side, away from FBOs and fuel services. This increases costs as we have to pay delivery fees or taxi our aircraft further in order to get fuel and other services.</p> <p>That said, I would not be opposed to relocating, as long as a reasonably priced alternative was provided prior to the loss of the existing hangars and tie downs.</p>		
#1 Bruce Porter		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>King County Commissioners, We strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest tiedown and hangar area at Boeing Field unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size can be located elsewhere on the field !! Our company and many of our businesses from Oregon use Boeing Field constantly in our Interstate Commerce activities which generates significant economic impact to King County – both at the airport and in the surrounding communities. Respectfully Submitted,</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Bob Wyzenbee k		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		I am against the reduction of GA tiedowns at boeing field!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
Multiple responders around 10		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Hello,</p> <p>I wanted to submit my feedback on the proposed BFI airport changes.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>General Aviation (GA) has a rich history at Boeing Field, providing jobs, flight training, aircraft charter, maintenance, repair, recreation and more</p> <p>GA activity at Boeing Field generates significant economic impact to King County – both at the airport and in the surrounding community</p> <p>The redevelopment of the Southwest area will eliminate an estimated 75+ general aviation hangar and tie-down spaces at the airport, with no firm plan for relocation on the field for these aircraft</p> <p>Other airports in the area do not have the additional capacity to accommodate these aircraft, forcing many owners to base their aircraft several hours away, or sell</p> <p>You/I/we strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest tiedown and hangar area unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size, can be located on the field</p> <p>GA deserves a continued presence on Boeing Field!</p>		
#1 S Hughes		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Dear KCIA Decision Makers:</p> <p>I hope that you reconsider your Boeing Field Master Plan to remove general aviation tie downs and hangars to make room for expanded air package facilities at Boeing field without providing adequate and similar general aviation alternatives at Boeing Field. King County general aviation pilots are a critical part of King County well being and there are insufficient and inadequate alternative facilities in King County.</p> <p>I should know. I kept my Cessna 182 in a hangar at KBFI for 8 years. But I was displaced by two such shortsighted Boeing Field actions in the 1990's. My first County hangar was demolished to make way for high-net-worth Gulfstream and Global Explorer owners at the northeast corner of the field. Then I was displaced by the destruction of the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>hangars at the SW corner of the field to make room for non-general aviation hangar use. Although I was given an alternative location to move to, it was irrelevant because I had to wait years to obtain the replacement space and the cost was significantly more. In fact, 20 years later, I'm still on the list for a replacement hangar.</p> <p>I live in Seattle a stone's throw from the Space Needle. I work on Airport Way a mile north of Boeing Field. I learned how to fly at Boeing Field and I obtained my Instrument and Commercial ratings at a KBFI flight school.</p> <p>But my airplane is now at Paine Field 30 miles to the north. It has been for over 20 years. And I don't see any path to have my single engine Piper airplane closer to where I work and live. Like I did this weekend, I have to drive 45 minutes to my plane and go flying and then drive 45 minutes home.</p> <p>Paine Field has added hangars over the last 20 years to make up for the lack of public duty shown by Boeing Field for King County aviation enthusiasts. The people I know live in King County, but park their planes at Paine Field because King County executives don't plan to have a vibrant and healthy private pilot community.</p> <p>King County has two airports that can accept air freighter airplanes: Sea-Tac and Boeing Field. Add the air freighter capacity to Sea-Tac. Or let Snohomish County add air freight services to their plan as Paine Field loses Boeing's manufacturing over the next 20 years. Or even better, create alternative hangars and tie-downs NOW at Boeing Field.</p> <p>Otherwise, the KCIA master plan's failure to provide adequate alternatives for the existing general aviation</p>		

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>footprint now, not “TPD”, is only going to make more King County pilots move their planes to other counties like Snohomish County.</p> <p>Adding more air freight capacity is one thing. But removing general aviation parking without adding comparable and timely replacement solutions is irresponsible and short-sighted.</p> <p>I think you can make a better decision: keep King County pilots at Boeing Field, don’t force them out like you have me and my airplane.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>		
#1 Denise Steconci		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Please do not eliminate SW parking for GA. There are practically no places to park GA in the field already and this is the only airport that is close to Seattle. I see why a cargo ramp is desirable but then is there another place we could use to replace this parking? GA is important for the community too, Many thanks, D</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Tom Roberts		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>It is stated in your Master Plan that you intend to tear down the hangers of SouthWest Parking to put in a cargo facility. I am a tenant of a SW parking hanger. I strongly object to this plan. General aviation has long been a large part of the role Boeing Field has supported. GA parking has slowly disappeared across the greater Seattle area leaving long waiting lists for any hanger space availability. By razing the hangers at SW parking do you intend to simply throw these tenants out with no provision to house these airplanes in another part of BFI? I have no doubt this is financial driven but each and every one of us not only pays hanger rent we also pay taxes to keep and maintain Boeing Field. Treating this community like this is simply unacceptable. We simply would have no where else to house our</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				airplanes. I would appreciate it if your master plan included some accommodation for hanger space to be created to house these aircrafts before the cargo facility is created. Again, I strongly object to this master plan.		
#1 Carlo		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		I was informed by AOPA and WSPA that there is a plan to reduce GA parking in the museum parking. I currently have a plane there. I had to move my other plane to KPLU because I m still waiting for other spot to open up. Reducing any areas of parking at Boeing will not only make it worse for several pilots such as my self and others that we are having a hard time finding Justine downs for our planes. I do see the GA community growing. Planes have become much more affordable and accessible. If anything, thinking long term. We will need more parking for more planes. It would be nice to add covered areas with access to electricity. Thank you.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 Pat McFadden		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		To Whom it concerns, I strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest tiedown and hangar area unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size, can be located on the field . Please endeavor to find an alternative for the GA community instead of simply eliminating access	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 Marty Duke		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		Please do not eliminate the General Aviation parking on the southwest corner of Boeing Field, without providing an equal or larger capacity location at the airport. We need more not less spots. Also, this has already happened at Renton, and caused great problems with trying to find places to park GA aircraft in the Seattle area. Thanks,	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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 James Brocksmit h		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Greetings,</p> <p>As a BFI hangar tenant, GA & Commercial flyer and active Flight Instructor, the footing of GA at BFI is critical for the overall training of pilots and business commerce in the Seattle area.</p> <p>Any expansion of cargo at the expense of GA is unnecessary as cargo has space at SEA to expand, and they could use larger aircraft to meet their demand, simply gauge up. UPS and Fedex could also share their ramp space with other cargo operators like many airports in the country.</p> <p>Any removal of GA should be mitigated by building new hangars at other area airports, such as Auburn, Renton, Snohomish or others. A few more points, 1) hangars are essential for high dollar assets in our climate, 2) hangar space is extremely tight in our market and 3) you are removing one customer to serve another, all while GA pays its fair share of aviation fuel taxes.</p> <p>Lastly, Billionaire row on the east side takes an enormous amount of space while only serving 3-5 airplanes. These operations could consolidate while opening precious space.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Phillip Rissel		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest tiedown and hangar area at Boeing Field unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size can be located elsewhere on the field !!</p> <p>Our company and many of our businesses from Oregon use Boeing Field constantly in our Interstate Commerce activities which generates significant economic impact to King County – both at the airport and in the surrounding communities.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				Respectfully Submitted,		
#1 Austin Wood		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Greetings Boeing Field Authorities –</p> <p>I am writing in response to the published master plan – specifically the plan to destroy the South East museum parking to build a new cargo terminal.</p> <p>For as long as I have been aware, Boeing Field has become increasingly unfriendly to the Piston GA pilot. I think the reason for this is clear: Piston planes don't spend six figures on a fuel stop. I'm sure the numbers all make sense: get rid of the little planes. But the plan is unsustainable – I've spent my entire life and career in aviation – both big and small – and one thing is clear: you can't have the big planes without the small ones.</p> <p>It's not a training problem; it's a people problem. The MoF has an honored place at Boeing Field and in the community. Its mission is to inspire the next generation to join in the great miracle of the modern aviation industry. The GA community at Boeing Field is the same – only there's no place to write it down. It's two sides of the same coin. You wouldn't put the Museum in Arlington or Puyallup. Access to aviation has to be where the people are. If you take away general aviation in Seattle, you take away an entry point to a staggeringly large, vital, and magical career field.</p> <p>I can trace my love affair with aviation (and my career) to a flight I took in a piston plane at a very young age. The small airplanes based at the field have no doubt springboarded thousands into their career field. Nobody goes for a friendly hop on a sunny Saturday in a 767. Nobody keeps their small piston airplane to themselves –</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>we GA pilots love nothing more than sharing the joy of flight. By slowly eroding the presence of small airplanes at Boeing Field, you erode the wonder, opportunities, and futures of local youths.</p> <p>The costs may be measurable, but the benefits are less so. All aviation must start small and work up. There would be no jumbos if there were no Cessnas for pilots to get their start. Boeing field has an opportunity to preserve this precious resource. What are the alternatives? Shall we tell the kids at Raisbeck, South Lake, Cleveland and Rainier Beach to ride the bus to Auburn to go for their EAA Young Eagles flight?</p> <p>We understand our place in the ecosystem – piston airplanes are at the bottom of the food chain. But it's clear that without piston airplanes, there is no entry to aviation as a career. Is that something King County wants to remove?</p> <p>My voice is one of many. Please listen to my brothers and sisters in this vibrant and active community. All the pilots who fly into Boeing Field - the elite Boeing test pilots in the T-38s, the sports team charters, the UPS widebodies, the crews of both of Howard Shultz's Gulfstreams - got their start in a 2 or 4 seat airplane. Do not deprive Seattle and King County of the magic of flight.</p>		
#1 David Acklam		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>The changes to the airport master-plan are extremely disturbing.</p> <p>Specifically, the removal of general-aviation parking/transient parking near the Museum of Flight, which may-well eliminate the usefulness of Boeing Field as a destination (rather than a home-base).</p> <p>Specifically, without transient parking along to the Marginal</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>Way side of the airport – near a large parking-lot & within walking distance of bus service (or in some cases, walking distance of your workplace), it becomes very hard for non-based aircraft to actually go anywhere after landing at BFI.</p> <p>Even if you pay to park your plane at one of the FBOs, you are now stuck on the ‘wrong’ side of the airport (Airport Way) - unable to go anywhere unless you use Uber or Lyft.</p> <p>Please consider leaving space for transient GA parking near the museum, or at least on the Marginal Way side of the field....</p>		
#1 Jon Counsell		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I am terribly dissapointed, but not the least bit suprised at the resonding stupidity and short sideness of your proposal. While 99.9% of the world will never be the ultra rich, elite that operate business jets, or CEO’s of major coorporations, your plan caters to that 0.01% at the cost to the oher 99.9% whom’s taxes pay for your job and BFI. You can’t support big dollar aviation by eliminating the small, affordable general aviation access to your airport.</p> <p>I have very little faith that anything presented to this board or group will be taken seriously, the fact that you have even recommended the solution you have tells me you are beyond stupid, incompetent or criminally bribed by BIG BUSINESS.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Reggie Smith		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I am deeply concerned about the proposed redevelopment of the Boeing Field general aviation (GA) tie-down and hangar area in the southwest corner of the airport next to the Museum of Flight for an air cargo ramp. The concern lies in what appears to be a lack of planning for the relocation of the GA fleet, some 75+ parking spaces and hangars.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>Until a development plan to relocate the general aviation parking and hangar space on Boeing Field with equivalent or greater capacity is created and approved, I must strongly oppose the current redevelopment plan.</p> <p>Surrounding airports cannot handle the increased demand precipitated by the proposed closure of the GA facilities at Boeing Field. Virtually all airports within a reasonable driving distance of KBFI have no GA space available with long waiting lists for any that might open up. For example, a phone call to the City of Renton Airport Manager's office today revealed a long waiting list for GA space, the manager indicated a 3-4 year waiting time based on the length of their list as of today (12/14/2020). A call to the Auburn Airport Administration office shows a similar situation with a waiting list for GA space with 90 names on it, so long that they could not even give an estimate as to when a space might open up.</p> <p>Boeing Field has a rich history of GA presence and enjoys the positive economic impact GA activities has on the surrounding community.</p> <p>Please give strongest consideration to providing for the many owners, operators, and customers of general aviation at Boeing Field first before proceeding with any new redevelopment that negatively impacts GA aircraft based at the airport.</p>		
#1 Bill Ayre		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>John- Here are my thoughts on the Master Plan. I appreciate the opportunity to provide comments.</p> <p>General aviation plays a critical role in America's</p>	<p>HI Bill. Thx for the input. More discussion to follow to attempt to find a solution.</p> <p>Currently KCIA/BFI does not meet the full needs of any segment of the aviation industry. GA, Corporate, FBO,</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>infrastructure, and is part of an ecosystem that benefits all segments of aviation. A robust general aviation presence fuels aviation's future. And at KCIA, general aviation contributes significantly to the economic base of King County. Flight training and humanitarian missions are just two key GA activities at Boeing Field that require space and facilities in order to function.</p> <p>The development assumptions in the Master Plan establish the foundation for the plan itself. The second development assumption states that "...the Airport will continue to safely accommodate the existing variety of aviation users and activities...all sectors of the existing general aviation users...with facilities properly sized to accommodate the projected forecast demand."</p> <p>In 2015, 62% of the based aircraft at KCIA were piston-powered GA airplanes. The FAA demand forecast ("FAA TAF") shows a growth in total based aircraft, including a very slight loss in single-engine airplanes (from 188 to 165 from 2015 through 2035), a flat forecast for twin engine piston airplanes and growth for turboprop aircraft.</p> <p>The master plan contemplates eliminating 24 T-hangars and 53 tie-down spots in the southwest area of the airport in order to build a new cargo facility. That cargo facility has no current customers. In addition to these 77 airplanes, the plan also contemplates eliminating tie downs in the northeast parking area (for the runway 14R RPZ) which currently accommodates approximately 54 airplanes. There is no plan to provide parking anywhere on the airport for these 130-plus displaced airplanes. There is little to no space for these airplanes at any of the airports within a reasonable distance of Boeing Field. Also, there is a waiting list at KCIA of 70 airplanes for tie-downs, and 30 airplanes waiting for hangars.</p>	<p>Commercial Cargo and Boeing all want more room.</p> <p>Even among GA we are looking at how to best accommodate fixed and rotary wing training as well as humanitarian (medivac) customers along with recreational flyers.</p> <p>The MP Update does identify a potential demand scenario for the future redevelopment of the existing southwest GA T-hangar and apron area to accommodate a new air cargo facility. However, the site will be identified on the Airport Layout Plan as a Future Aviation Redevelopment Area. We are also 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 (e.g., the existing Lot 13 area located on the west side of the Airport, directly south of the existing ATCT facility) that may soon be available for new leases to support additional GA aircraft apron parking facilities.</p> <p>According to the stats KCIA had over 400K operations in the 07-08 time frame and is now down to about 185K. Also, the decline in GA operations at BFI was fairly steady between 2000 and 2015, with average annual reductions of 4.9% for itinerant GA and 7.1% for local GA ops (see pgs. B.8-B.9 of the forecast chapter).</p> <p>Appreciate your thoughts Bill and we are looking at innovative ways to try to do what is best for the most.</p> <p>I will say that it may not be reasonable to have a plan to mitigate something that may or may not happen. Knowing that we will have to mitigate if we do something may be the best we can do for now.</p>	

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				The Master Plan must include a plan to accommodate the displaced airplanes. The FAA demand forecast shows a clear need long into the future. Questions on what the plan is have been met with "no specific location has yet been identified" and the "process is ongoing." We need to know what that "process" is and the timing for resolution. In the meantime, we should not approve the Master Plan until it includes (with proposed funding) a plan to accommodate this important demand.		
#1 Devin Wong		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Hello,</p> <p>It has come to my attention that King County is considering redevelopment of the general aviation tie-down and hangar space on the south west side of the airport. My understanding of the plan under consideration is that it includes elimination of 75+ general aviation hangar and tie-down spaces at BFI. As someone who has been involved in general aviation for the past few years and is looking to acquire my own aircraft, this is concerning for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Physical space: Other airports in King County and the greater Seattle-Tacoma-Everett metropolitan areas currently have a shortage of space and long wait times, particularly for hangars. Elimination of spaces at BFI will accelerate this problem. - Economic impact: Elimination of spaces at BFI combined with current low inventory (and a resultant increase in prices for remaining inventory) will force many aircraft owners to base their aircraft several hours away, or sell. Both would cause a net loss of maintenance, repair, and other commercial revenues within King County. - Cultural and community impact: BFI has long been a center for aviation in Washington, and importantly, one that 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>is accessible to the public. Reducing the general aviation presence at BFI will erode this heritage and make aviation less accessible to King County residents.</p> <p>I oppose any plan to reduce the general aviation presence at BFI; I believe it is important to promote accessibility and economic diversity, while not squeezing out current citizens and participants in our communities. I would like to see BFI invest in more hangar spaces, promoting a resurgence in general aviation activities within King County.</p> <p>I recommend that King County seek more opinions and suggestions from the aviation community; I strongly suspect the proposed changes aren't well-known throughout the community or even pilots based at BFI. General awareness and a thorough discussion will lead to better outcomes that benefit everyone.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>		
#1 Nik Webb		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I am writing in response to the published master plan – specifically the plan to destroy the South East museum parking to build a new cargo terminal.</p> <p>I request that you reconsider that plan, which will effectively block out small general aviation aircraft from full use of the airport.</p> <p>I learned to fly at KBFI, and its central location was part of that choice of where to learn. It was also a great experience to learn somewhere pilots of all stripes fly from tiny piston planes all the way up to 747s and military aircraft.</p> <p>I fear that these changes in the master plan will make it much harder for aspiring young pilots in Seattle to access aviation and ultimately choose aviation for their career path. Without piston aircraft based at KBFI, students of all ages</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				will need to travel much further to access a first flight that ultimately decides the career path of many pilots. Yours very respectfully,		
#1 Bill Nicolai		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		To Whom it may concern, As a frequent user of King county public airport I object to eliminating general aviation spaces to make room for more cargo usage at the airport. Over the last 30 years we have based our two single engine airplanes on Boeing Field, used the maintenance facilities, avionics services, there at Galvin/Signature, Wings Aloft, Clay Lacey/Modern Aviation, and American Avionics. General Aviation use by small planes is involved in the employment of hundreds of skilled workers at Boeing Field. A few cargo loaders moving containers around do not provide a fraction of the economic and social benefits General Aviation provides to Seattle and the surrounding areas of King county. My Life partner and fellow Pilot Jane Nicolai and I were married beneath the wing of the Curtis Jenny at the Museum of Flight. We have both made frequent flights out of Boeing Field in support of local environmental education causes concerning salmon and waterfowl habitat on the Duwamish River and Green Rivers. So many other Washington citizens have made similar beneficial contributions to our local communities from their use of Boeing Field. Please reconsider this ill advised change.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 Duane Little		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage		Keep Small planes welcome! we don't spend as much, but this is where aviation starts I was disappointed once when I flew in just to pick up a friend and nowhere to park for even ten minutes	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
		facilities				
#1 Lonnie Duran		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		I dont like the idea of loosing so much GA ramp space. KBFI is a great place to train as a new pilot. This is because of the diversity in the Airspace at BFI due to SeaTac and Renton over lapping air spaces. We need to keep GA at BFI it is very important.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 Seth Sprinkle		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>The proposed updates to the BFI Master Plan demonstrate the clear intent of the airport leadership to make BFI inaccessible and/or undesirable as a destination for general aviation traffic. In particular, the redevelopment of the general aviation southeast parking area is objectionable to those of us who live in King County and use the airport on a regular basis for GA operations.</p> <p>I do not submit these comments oblivious to the changes that are happening in our region. Growth in all sectors in occuring at an astonishing rate. In the short time I have used BFI, I have seen the number of UPS jets and large charter aircraft at the airport increase steadily. I can appreciate that the airport is an infrastructure investment that must serve all of King County and something must be done to ensure it continues to serve that mission. However, nearly all of the changes proposed in this Master Plan will come at the expense of GA users, and that is starkly unfair to those of us who live and work in King County and are also GA users of the airport.</p> <p>I recently requested a tie down at BFI and was told the wait list is 5+ years. While there is clearly excessive demand for GA at the airport, this plan seems to ignore it and suppress it. Simply put, I live in Seattle and I want to fly in Seattle. Why not more effectively manage the existing tie down areas, raising fees to market-bearing rates that increase their</p>	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				attractiveness to the airport from a revenue perspective? If you plan to take away GA tie-down space, perhaps it is time to think about revoking leases from operators on the airport grounds to replace the lost GA space? All in all, the general disregard for and abandonment of general aviation in this plan is a disappointment to me and many others. I do not support these efforts and would urge the airport leadership to consider alternatives that are more hospitable to the preservation of general aviation at BFI.		
#1 Johnathan Alvord		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Greetings Boeing Field Authorities –</p> <p>I am writing in response to the published master plan – specifically the plan to destroy the South West museum parking to build a new cargo terminal. I am a new pilot, now flying for approximately 2 years. I started in Rural AZ and was fortunate enough to be able to afford to drive 2.5 hours from Page Arizona to St. George Utah for my flight instruction as there was no active instruction in Page. Since then I have moved to Eastern Washington where I continue to see airports favoring those that can afford to get into flying. Our local airport officials would rather demolish existing hangers than repair and provide affordable storage. I was lucky and was able to find a hanger to share but fear that time is short lived.</p> <p>Through my journey in aviation which started in the military as a airborne Medic, to skydiving, to my current Private Pilot Licence, and now working on my commercial license I have seen many small airports that have provide access to GA pilots across the country. They get smaller and smaller, but we provide a great deal to the public. As a member of Pilots and Paws, which provides transport for animals, to Angel Flight which provided medical transport to those in need. Every airport is needed.</p> <p>Regarding Boeing Field, I live in Eastern Washington and have flown into Boeing Field multiple times to provide transport for family members needed to go to Seattle for</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				health care. Taking that away from GA would be a shame. I also understand the MoF is also based there and it would be a big loss to GA pilots to lose ability to access that via air. I read about communities on a daily basis losing airport access that should provide for all, not just the corporations and wealthy. Most recently I heard about Dillingham Airfield in Hawaii, now Boeing, at least one other airport in WA which was most recently bought to build a Marijuana farm. Please preserve Boeing Field for EVERYONE and do not make it harder for smaller planes and locals to get instruction, and all of us that wish to fly there in our own little planes.		
#1 Matt Hayes		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		Good morning. I hope this finds you well. The latest version of the Master Plan has a cargo area just to the north of The Museum of Flight. Can you let me know how this proposal impacts the Blue Box and the Through the Fence agreement? Thank you.	It was good to speak with you this afternoon Matt. The MP Update does identify a potential demand scenario for the future redevelopment of the existing southwest GA T-hangar and apron area to accommodate a new air cargo facility. However, the site will be identified on the Airport Layout Plan as a Future Aviation Redevelopment Area. The future development boundary for this site would exclude the existing twelve apron tiedowns located north of the Museum of Flight (MOF) and positioned within the existing access corridor defined by the current MOF Through-the-Fence agreement. The future development boundary of the proposed new Aviation Redevelopment Area will be revised as described above on the updated draft Airport Layout Plan. We trust this addresses the questions from your email, below. Attachment was page D84 from Chapter D of the airport Master Plan. Regards,	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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 Matt Towers – President, Washington Air Search and Rescue along with a few others		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I am writing today on behalf of Washington Air Search and Rescue in regards to the proposed Master Plan revision for the King County International Airport. In particular, I would like to express my concern for the proposed elimination of general aviation parking on the southwest ramp, adjacent to the Museum of Flight.</p> <p>Washington Air Search and Rescue (WASAR) has long relied on KCIA as a base of operations for emergency operations conducted with the Washington State Department of Transportation and in partnership with Civil Air Patrol (CAP). Most recently, we coordinated and launched from KCIA emergency deliveries of hand sanitizer to regional first responders in Washington in the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>The consistent decline in availability of general aviation parking at KCIA has already forced WASAR and CAP to relocate some of our search aircraft to more distant airports. Moreover these alternate locations themselves have very limited options, and wait times for new tenants are frequently measured in years. This has necessarily had a direct impact on emergency response time as air crews are now forced to travel significantly farther to reach their aircraft.</p> <p>Should the county continue with the plan of eliminating a significant portion of the remaining general aviation parking at KCIA, further pressure will be placed on the remaining options which could result in the inability of organizations like WASAR and CAP to station emergency response assets at KCIA at all.</p> <p>Aside from the economic benefits of, and the significant growth in general aviation activity at KCIA, the availability</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p> <p>In addition, Airport Staff is committed to coordinate with organizations like WASAR and CAP to maintain the provision of emergency aviation response assets at KCIA.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				of the airport for emergency search and rescue operations is of significant importance to the overall safety of our transportation infrastructure. Please reconsider the plan to further erode the ability for this critical facility to meet that need.		
#1 Tyler Finn		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>This message is in regards to the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest parking at Boeing Field. I have intimate knowledge with Boeing Field as I have been working on the field for Boeing Flight Test for the last 15 years. When I first moved to Seattle I trained and rented planes at Galvin. Once I had my CFI, I instructed at Wings Aloft and flew young kids from the museum summer program around the Puget Sound on introductory flights. I have watched the WWII aircraft stage their visits outside the museum, the flying eye care hospital aircraft, civil air patrol and the Blue Angels. I currently own an Cessna 182 and park it in Southwest parking. I have been parking there for over 2 years now. I live just north of downtown Seattle and the proximity of my airplane to work is invaluable. The proximity of my airplane to my house is also invaluable. I cannot afford a hangar at BFI but I can afford the tiedown. I fly my plane almost daily and have met most of the people who park their planes near me. We have built a small community in our area. One of the residents helps the Aviation High School kids with their solar car project out of his hangar. I know all of the airports in the Seattle vicinity are feeling pressure from growth. This pressure cannot be at the expense of general aviation, the local community and the smaller planes. With the 777 in flight test I know we have lost the parking spots adjacent to taxiway B. If I lost my parking spot at BFI I would most likely have to move my plane to Auburn or Everett which doubles my commute to the airplane from my house and it wouldn't even be possible to fly after work as I can now. UPS and</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				Ameriflight have significant space for operations as their spots are empty half of the day. It appears that there are other options to make space for additional cargo operations. Please do not sacrifice anymore GA parking for the wealthy, commercial operations or anything else. Please continue to support the small aircraft parking and operations at Boeing Field and do not take away anymore GA parking.		
#1 Brian Davern		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Please record my opposition to proposed changes to GA parking and hangars at BFI. Their proximity to the Museum of Flight is important to the use of the museum by traveling aviators and their passengers. Moreover, King County has far too little accommodating space for GA as it is.</p> <p>Commercial aviation interests continually crowd out General Aviation... the very source of future professional aviators. Every airfield needs a welcoming home for private aircraft. BFI has a good one as is. Don't let that change.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 David Shangraw		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>As a long time aviator and frequent operator from KCIA, I need to voice my strong opposition to the proposed master plan. I have operated from this airport for the last 13 years in several capacities. I started flying from BFI with Civil Air Patrol in 2007. After flying at BFI for several years, I flew for AIRPAC airlines for several more. Recently I fly for Boeing as a test pilot operating 737s.</p> <p>I have reviewed the master plan and find the absolute disregard for general aviation an absolute travesty. GA is what built this airport, how can you turn your back on what makes this airport great! If you remove the majority of the parking for light GA you are left with an airport that only</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>serves Boeing, U PS, Starbucks, Costco, Microsoft and any other huge corporations that can afford to operate here.</p> <p>This airport has always been friendly to anyone that wishes to operate with reasonable prices and accommodations. This is slowly changing to an airport that only caters to corporate flight departments and other billionaires. A true shame.</p> <p>CAP and several of my close friends park in the southwest parking spaces. This master plan removes their parking and any other parking suitable to their needs.</p> <p>Please keep KCIA accessible to ALL! Residents of king county need access to this community jewel not just the corporations trying to drive GA out!!</p>		
#1 Alain & Marva Semet		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>We had been waiting a long time when we finally got to rent a hangar in the Southwest corner of KCIA 5 years ago.</p> <p>One of us works at the Museum of Flight and the other at Raisbeck Aviation High School.</p> <p>Our relationships with these institutions make the location of our hangar ideal as there is much interaction, visits and instruction. We give students hands on experience in aviation and other technical artifacts in the hangar.</p> <p>Because of the proximity and easy access to the field, many students are attracted to careers in aviation. Loosing this access will loose future aviation historians, pilots, medical personnel, mechanics etc. We have seen all these career choices from students.</p> <p>Please do not redevelop the Southwest corner.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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 Sean		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I wanted to express my concern over the re-development of SW parking into a cargo ramp. I understand that Boeing field serves an important role as a international cargo hub, however it has an equally important role for general aviation. The pilots to fly those future cargo jets are getting training and experience in the 75 odd airplanes parked in SW parking. I myself am one of those people. I recently completed my instrument and commercial license in our bonanza that we keep at Boeing. Please consider expanding general aviation and not removing it for all the economic, career and community that it creates.</p> <p>Without airport parking, general aviation is relegated to the drab European-style model where the only flights are strictly commercial.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Bill Craven		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I currently own or have interest in two aircraft parked at NE Parking at Boeing Field, one being a \$50,000 training aircraft that I use with a friend for fun, and to maintain proficiency, and the second being a \$750,000 airplane I use to transport my family around the area. I have been a resident of NE parking for over three years, and have enjoyed the people that are my tie-down neighbors. We are a robust community.</p> <p>As your own quick research will reveal there is already a dearth of tie-down at Boeing Field for GA Aircraft, a several month, if not years long waitlist. Though we don't provide the revenue, or cache that freight or other uses do, we do provide a community for small GA airplanes and general public good will. Because of King County's current</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p> <p>In addition, the decommissioning of the existing NE tiedown apron area will be dictated by the expansion of the RW 14R approach RPZ (the parking of aircraft is not an approved land use within the RPZ boundary).</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>practices we have already lost on field maintenance support for light GA aircraft. It's evident that the past and current administration does not realize the benefit of Light GA Aircraft.</p> <p>As an example of the public goodwill I have taken a number of kids flying for an intro flight into aviation, a few of them have gone on to become pilots themselves. Holding events, like Young Eagles, or open houses at Boeing Field could and would go the extra mile to illustrate to the public that light GA does actually provide a public necessity.</p> <p>Please keep me informed of developing events and opportunities to speak on behalf of light GA at Boeing Field.</p>		
#1 Rob Spitzer		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am writing in support of General Aviation at King County International Airport against the proposal in the Master Plan to remove over 75 parking spaces for light general aviation aircraft at the airport.</p> <p>I am a City of Seattle resident and aircraft owner, airline pilot, and aviation attorney that currently keeps an airplane hangered at King County International Airport.</p> <p>General aviation is the lifeblood of Boeing field, and currently comprises the majority of the traffic operations at Boeing Field. Light aviation operations comprise a wide spectrum of aviation services, including training flights, air ambulance flights, sightseeing flights, and charitable flights. Over the past several years, thousands of pilots have learned to fly at Boeing field, many of these individuals have gone</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p> <p>Also, the decline in GA operations at BFI was fairly steady between 2000 and 2015, with average annual reductions of 4.9% for itinerant GA and 7.1% for local GA ops (see pgs. B.8-B.9 of the forecast chapter). 2015 was the base year of the forecasts for the MPU and GA ops later bottomed-out in 2016.</p> <p>The GA operational forecast presented on pgs. B.35-B.36 of the forecast chapter reflect the projected growth in the Business/Corporate and Air Taxi sectors with a corresponding decrease in recreational/training activity. We agree that the projections for the GA recreational/training activity are pessimistic, but that outlook for those users was not unique to BFI, and the projected ops are still higher than</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>on to become airline pilots, corporate pilots, or better-informed engineers designing future jetliners. Thousands of rides for minority and disadvantaged youth have occurred because of light general aviation operators at Boeing field, and countless disaster relief and search and rescue flights have been launched from Boeing field. Critically, light general aviation flights create an opening for local members of the community to experience and participate in aviation, and use the airport.</p> <p>As it is currently slated, the Master Plan for KCIA will remove 75 tie-down spots or hangar spaces. The deleterious impact this will have on general aviation operations at KCIA is impossible to overstate. There is already a critical shortage of aircraft parking in the Seattle area. KCIA is the closest airport to downtown Seattle. Currently, it is extremely difficult to obtain a parking spot for an aircraft at any airport within an hour drive of downtown Seattle. By removing 75 parking spots and reducing the footprint of space available to general aviation operators, King County Airport management will exacerbate the already critical state of aircraft parking spot, and will likely price most light aircraft owners out of Seattle area.</p> <p>KCIA's own forecast shows a dramatic reduction in the number of light general aircraft operations at Boeing Field. This stands in contrast to the FAA's expected increase in nationwide light GA operations, indicating that the Master Plan's authors are aware that the proposed changes at the airport will essentially shut light GA operations out from the airport. The larger number of turbine aircraft will also come with a much larger noise footprint than the light general aviation aircraft that currently use the airport.</p> <p>The effects of this will be felt across the community, not</p>	the latest FAA TAF estimates for BFI that have local GA operations leveling off in the 55k range over the next 20 years.	

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>just amongst airport owners. As general aviation dies in the Seattle area, children will no longer get aircraft rides, locals will not be able take plane tours, and city dwellers will have no place to take flight lessons. As has been proven time and time again in other cities, an airport which is disconnected from the local community loses the local community's support. The overwhelming majority of community members in the City of Seattle will never be able to afford to charter a private jet, but nearly all community members can sign up for an air tour; take their child to a Young Eagles, Civil Air Patrol, or Red Tail Hawks event; or volunteer to help with general aviation-supported disaster relief. Shutting general aviation operations out from KCIA will separate the airport from the local community.</p> <p>We strongly urge the managers of KCIA to reconsider the impacts that the Master Plan will have on not only the airport but also the local community.</p>		
#1 Dan Driscoll		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Greetings-</p> <p>I'm writing to you with comments on the KCIA Master Plan produced earlier this year. While this master plan brings many welcome improvements to Boeing Field, I want to call out the plans for the Southwest parking area and proposed redevelopment into an air cargo area. I oppose this part of the plan as it withdraws necessary space for general aviation parking.</p> <p>I'm a long-time BFI pilot, and leaseholder. Boeing Field's strong historical support for General Aviation activity has been key in shaping King County as a world-class center for aviation, which extends beyond manufacturing into safety, small-business development, pilot training, repair, and more. I tell all of my flight students that BFI is the best</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>place to learn to fly, and to get the services they need to stay in the air.</p> <p>Removal of Southwest parking would increase the strain created by the removal of the central Eastern hangars a few years ago. While I welcome Modern Aviation and their growth, the airport must also serve the broader King County aviation community. The tie-down and hangar wait lists are far too long (both at BFI and nearby), indicating that the county as a whole does not have capacity for the many pilots, mechanics, and administrators that make our aviation community so active.</p> <p>Publishing a plan that retains the current, very high-quality Southwest area, or which adds new capacity equivalent to what is in the redevelopment plan, would alleviate my concerns. I always welcome the net addition of GA space but I recognize the hard work put in to balancing concerns in the KCIA master plan.</p>		
#1 Chris Seto		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I was made aware of the elimination of some GA parking in the BFI master plan. As an aircraft owner and pilot in the Seattle area, it concerns and disappoints me to hear that this parking would be eliminated under this plan.</p> <p>GA parking is already at an extreme scarcity in and near Seattle. If anything we need /more/ parking, not less. I strongly oppose this proposed redevelopment plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Justin Huff		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Hello!</p> <p>I am greatly concerned that the master plan update includes a drastic reduction in the number of GA tiedowns available at BFI. While small GA doesn't bring in serious money to</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>King County, it is heavily used by county residents and provides for flight training, transportation, etc. In the PNW climate tiedowns provide a cost and space efficient way to keep an aircraft. This is made even more critical by the lack of nearby airports with available space for small GA aircraft.</p> <p>I understand the need for the RPZ, but the master plan needs to include a relocation plan (and ideally modest growth) for the NE and SW tiedowns in addition to moderate growth of GA hangers.</p>		
#1 Jeff Katten		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I understand today is the last day for comment regarding the proposed Master Plan. I would like to voice my concern regarding the phasing out of the NE Parking (tie-downs) and the mid-field hangers on the west side without relocation to other airport property.</p> <p>As a local flight instructor (based out of Renton), I have trained countless new General Aviation pilots who have sought to expand their commitment to aviation through membership in a club or aircraft ownership. Since Renton is space constrained and there is no room for additional GA facilities, I often refer people to flight clubs based out of BFI such as Alternate Air. Some have even purchased aircraft and leased tie downs. They choose BFI because of the proximity to their homes and offices and enjoy the pride of flying out of their community airport. The reduction of light GA piston tie downs poses a significant challenge for growing our community of GA pilots in the Seattle area. Without the option of parking a plane in Renton or BFI, I have had at least 3 clients suggest they should lease hangers/tie downs in Pierce County (PLU or TIW) and relocate their families as well to be closer to a community that supports light GA aircraft. King County not only loses out on the airport revenue (tie downs, fuel, etc) but also the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p> <p>Also, thanks for your recommendation regarding the potential redevelopment of the NW development area. Airport Staff has committed to continue the evaluation of other locations on the west side of the Airport (e.g., the existing Lot 13 area located directly south of the existing ATCT facility) to accommodate some of these relocated based aircraft, as existing leaseholds expire.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>tax revenue associated with these high net worth individuals and their associated assets.</p> <p>As someone who has an interest in growing my own aviation related business, I was looking to BFI to be a location that could help support the potential launch of a new flying club that would help support our existing and new GA pilots in Seattle. Without aircraft parking remaining the same or increasing, it looks like I may not be possible any more.</p> <p>I would like to propose an alternative of utilizing some of the space around the proposed Airport Maintenance Development Area for the relocation of GA facilities (tie downs and hangers) and consider acquisition of property elsewhere for the housing of airport maintenance operations.</p>		
#1 Nancy Auth		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I am writing regarding the proposed changes to the KBFI Master plan, which appear to have significant changes to, and have a profound impact on, General Aviation at the field. I write wearing several hats, all of which offer a look at how important GA is to the local community's economy both now and in the future.</p> <p>As a pilot who bases a private aircraft at BFI for part of the season, I know that we pay significant money in fuel, hangar, and other services for our jet. We support the livelihoods of line service personnel, air traffic controllers, maintenance crews, catering and food services, and administrative support for all of these. Those who don't wish to hangar their planes, for whatever reason, depend upon the tie down spaces on the field and support the many same services as do we.</p> <p>Wearing my second hat as a pilot who began my</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>flying “career” at BFI with Galvin Aviation, I know that I supported not only the flight instructors with whom I worked, but their back office personnel at the flight school as well: my payments for aircraft rentals, fuel, flight and ground instruction certainly added to the economy of the community. The importance of a flight school’s presence at BFI cannot be understated; the proximity of the field to so many Seattle trainees makes it accessible and manageable for those who often need to work at jobs in the city to afford their training for an aviation career. While the world of commercial aviation may be in turmoil now, the future requirements for professional pilots will only increase.</p> <p>Finally, I don my hat as a Trustee on the board of the Museum of Flight, where I have seen the incredible value to visitors, students and pilots of the Museum’s accessibility. Pilots can fly their aircraft literally to the back door of the Museum, pay a visit to our amazing facility, and in the process add more dollars to the community in the form of admission fees, merchandise purchases, and by utilizing the same services on the field as above - thereby continuing to bolster the local economy. Non-pilot visitors are inspired by the sight of individuals otherwise no different from themselves, taxiing a plane up to the ramp outside the Museum. The value to young people, especially, cannot be underestimated; many of today’s engineers, technicians and aeronautical personnel have received their inspiration from a close encounter with pilots and their planes.</p> <p>I urge you to consider the importance of these and other examples of how critical it is for KCIA to continue its support of General Aviation in and around BFI. It matters today, and it will continue to matter for years to come.</p>		
#1		Displacement/		Boeing Field offers a fantastic GA experience that is unlike	Comments noted.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
Elissa Lardon		Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>any other in the world. I have personally trained and flown out of Boeing Field for the last 3 years and would be extremely sad to see this amazing opportunity to lean and fly go away.</p> <p>General Aviation (GA) has a rich history at Boeing Field, providing jobs, flight training, aircraft charter, maintenance, repair, recreation and more. Removing space for over 75 aircraft would have a dramatic impact on the flying community. Redevelopment plans at BFI, PAE and RNT have caused a dramatic reduction in available space. Airports in the surrounding areas are unable to accommodate any more aircraft. Aircraft owners, flight schools and aircraft rental clubs are out of space and out of options. Please consider the long lasting impact that this will have on our GA world. We have something incredibly special in Seattle and at BFI. Don't take it away.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest tiedown and hangar area unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size, can be located on the field.</p>	See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	
#1 Brian Makar		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I am writing you to provide my feedback on the proposed Airport Master Plan. I feel I am an important stakeholder in the following regard:</p> <p>1) I am a resident of King County. 2) I am an employee of King County, although I am writing this in my capacity as a private citizen. 3) I am a pilot. 4) I received my flight training at King County International Airport (Boeing Field) and still actively use its services.</p> <p>In reviewing the plan, I am dismayed to learn that over 75 spaces dedicated to General Aviation would be permanently</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>displaced. This would severely impact the operation of general aviation on the field. I feel that this presents an issue impacting our Equity and Social Justice values within the county. As a man of color, I have resided in South King County and experienced the economic hardship that the people in this region have statistically undergone. As a young man, I also had dreams of one day being able to fly. I realized that dream in 2014-15, as I worked on my initial pilot ratings right at Boeing Field! I cannot express the magic of flying over my community, and how such an opportunity propelled the dreams of a boy who grew up on the "wrong side of the tracks".</p> <p>Most pilots start their training with general aviation. This is true, whether you are a recreational pilot or it has become a part of your livelihood. As a whole, pilots of color, like me, are underrepresented in the United States. From personal experience, I can state that it comes from feeling that flying is "out of reach". As a pilot, I do what I can to share the joy of flight in my personal and volunteer endeavors, to make it more accessible. Part of what made flying accessible to me was to have general aviation available close to where I live in South King County. The area surrounding Boeing Field is the most diverse in the county. If a young person of color wishes to pursue their dream of flying, Boeing Field is likely the closest airport available to them. In order to be able to afford to learn flying, student pilots need a vibrant, competitive general aviation community.</p> <p>I kindly ask that the airport reconsider the real threat of reducing general aviation at Boeing Field. While general aviation may not bring as much direct economic value as other alternatives, it reflects our True North value where EVERY person can thrive. I believe that together, we can do the right thing.</p>		

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				Thank you very much for your consideration.		
#1 Bryan Thompson Managing Member Queen Anne Air, LLC		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Queen Anne Air strongly opposes the replacement of the existing GA spaces on the field with an air cargo ramp or other non-GA facility. GA is vital to the health of the aviation industry. And GA spots are extremely tight in the general Seattle area. Keeping GA alive and well at Boeing Field is important for both current and future pilots.</p> <p>Queen Anne Air has a tie down in NE parking. Our average economic impact in King County over the previous three years is \$123,000 per year. The details are broken down as follows. In addition, QAA is supporting the training of new pilots through exposure to general aviation.</p> <p>Average (2017-2019) \$1,378 -- Aircraft Parking \$6,653 -- AVGAS \$102,213 -- Maintenance \$12,500 -- Training \$122,745 -- Total</p> <p>Queen Anne Air operates an amphibious airplane. In addition to other activities, we take water samples from a variety of local waterways and seek to understand the ongoing environmental changes.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p> <p>In addition, the decommissioning of the existing NE tiedown apron area will be dictated by the expansion of the RW 14R approach RPZ (the parking of aircraft is not an approved land use within the RPZ boundary).</p>	1
#1 Michael Grenier Managing Partner Blu Ox Ventures		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>To whom in may concern,</p> <p>As a GA pilot and passenger, and someone who conducts regular business in the Seattle area, I am writing to let you know of my opposition to any reduction in GA parking or facilities at Boeing Field, specifically the proposed redevelopment of the southwest tiedown and hangar area.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>There is already an extremely limited number of GA options in the Seattle area, and certainly none that allow for practical access to the central business district. Sea-Tac is not an option and Renton is not a practical airport to reach downtown. Boeing Field is the only real option.</p> <p>I rely on access to GA facilities as part of the investments we make in the greater Seattle area, and I've also used the facility for personal and recreational use. GA activity at Boeing Field generates significant economic impact to King County – both at the airport and in the surrounding community. The redevelopment of the Southwest area will eliminate an estimated 75+ general aviation hangar and tie-down spaces at the airport, with no firm plan for relocation on the field for these aircraft. Other airports in the area do not have the additional capacity to accommodate these aircraft, forcing owners like myself to base their aircraft several hours away, or abandon the use of GA aircraft entirely.</p> <p>Feel free to contact me with questions.</p>		
#1 Mike Koss Museum of Flight board member		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Thank you for an opportunity to provide feedback on the latest proposed Master Plan update for Boeing Field.</p> <p>I have particular concerns about item #2 - the proposed Air Cargo facility. Particularly concerning are the proximity of that location to both the Aviation Highschool and the Museum of Flight. This could cause a major disruption to the activities of both entities, in the form of dramatically increased daytime noise levels as well as surface traffic in the form of large trucks on E. Marginal Way which could disrupt activities at both the school and the museum.</p> <p>As this is the first I've heard of this proposal, I don't have the details on the impact in terms of the amount of increased</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The MP Update will propose the maintenance of the existing twelve apron tiedowns located north of the Museum of Flight (MOF) and positioned within the existing access corridor defined by the current MOF Through-the-Fence agreement. In addition, the potential environmental impacts (e.g., noise and surface transportation impacts) associated with the redevelopment of this site for air cargo development or any other aviation facility would have to be evaluated and receive both NEPA and SEPA environmental clearances prior to development.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>daytime flight operations and noise level increases, nor the impact statement from surface transport being added to E. Marginal Way. I would like to see those estimates as they become available.</p> <p>I would hope that the County would give due consideration to these impacts, and work with the Museum and School to enable them to continue to serve the community without undue environmental impacts.</p>		
#1 Jason Elrod		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>King County International Airport has a federal mandate to support general aviation. The proposed elimination without relocation of the SW Hangars is in direct contradiction to this mandate. The mandate exists because general aviation is vital to the transportation, economic, and charitable infrastructure of our region and country.</p> <p>The SW hangars house general aviation aircraft and maintenance operations that support general aviation and all the economic and charitable good it provides. KCIA has a federal mandate to maintain infrastructure in support of general aviation. This general aviation support has been whittled away over the years. These hangars represent some of the last remaining infrastructure in which general aviation activities are supported at KCIA.</p> <p>The SW hangars are vital to the remaining general aviation community. Their elimination would be a devastating blow to the general aviation at KCIA and throughout the region. KCIA has an obligation to support general aviation and keep the SW hangars in place.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1		Displacement/		To whom it may concern,	Comments noted.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
Douglas Iverson		Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>My name is Douglas Iverson and I have been a tenant of KCIA for nearly 30 years in hanger E-6. I am responding to the Master Plan for KCIA concerning the demolition of all the SW hangers and placing a air cargo ramp in its place. This is a very bad idea for many reasons that should be carefully considered before going further. For me, as a general pilot, this would be devastating problem of where to keep my plane. There are no hanger spaces anywhere within 30-40 miles of Seattle and KCIA has no plans to relocate their tenants. KCIA will be demonstrating a strong anti-aviation bias, at time when general aviation is struggling, to more or less throw out 24+ airplanes with nowhere to go. A airport is intended for aircraft. There already is a cargo ramp on the east side of the airport. KCIA has been taking general aviation locations away to provide for the extremely wealthy for the last several decades and now we are told that there just isn't any space left. These large private decadent aircraft estates take up so much land with there own private fueling stations and offices that it is crazy to think that this is fair and kicking out 24+ airplanes is a justified landlord decision. As for the community, why would anyone want to put cargo ramp across the street from a STEM high school and next to our treasured Museum of Flight that we are very proud of. The hangers blend into the SW corner very naturally where a cargo ramp will be a terrible eye sore and no doubt create noise issues..</p> <p>It my hope that King County reconsiders this poor suggestion in the Master Plan,</p>	<p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p> <p>The MP Update does identify a potential demand scenario for the future redevelopment of the existing southwest GA T-hangar and apron area to accommodate a new air cargo facility. However, the site will be identified on the Airport Layout Plan as a Future Aviation Redevelopment Area.</p> <p>In addition, the potential environmental impacts (e.g., noise and surface transportation impacts) associated with the redevelopment of this site for air cargo development or any other aviation facility would have to be evaluated and receive both NEPA and SEPA environmental clearances prior to development.</p>	
#1 James Young, Manager		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage		I have a scenic tour business and flight school struggling on the field. There are nearly no services left at the airport. I do not believe the current Master plan and action is representative of the use of the airport. AOPA and other	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
www.seaplanescenics.com		facilities		organizations including Seaplane Scenics land division are trying to express concern for equitable access to our public airport.	above.	
#1 Amy Kaminishi		Environmental Impact Concerns		<p>Hello. My name is Amy Kaminishi and I live in North Beacon Hill under the flight path. I attended the October 28th virtual open house. I appreciated the staff in taking Q&A from the public after the presentation. I would like to have seen actual photos of current site and future site of the projects discussed. It was difficult to view a map to figure out where these new proposed projects are located near the highway, Airport Way and surrounding neighborhoods.</p> <p>Here are my comments.</p> <p>Hire residents who live in surrounding neighborhoods.</p> <p>Place safeguards for safety as related to the construction of new fuel storage facility. The airport is located close to freeway, businesses and residences.</p> <p>Promote the use of younger airport models to reduce airplane noise.</p> <p>Create a better airplane noise measurement for takeoff, landing and in-flight.</p> <p>Reduce flights late night and early morning.</p> <p>Mitigate environmental impacts of airport expansion to neighborhoods, business, schools, etc...</p> <p>Create alternative solutions in softening the airplane noise such as sound barriers, etc...</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The MP Update recommends the relocation of the Airport's existing fuel facility to be further separated from the adjacent residential land uses. Also, 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. Airport Staff also interacts with area schools and administers an Airport internship program that draws upon applicants from the area neighborhoods and jurisdictions in the vicinity of the Airport.</p> <p>In addition, The potential noise impacts of repositioning the RW 14 threshold 300 ft to the north on airport property will have to be evaluated in separate environmental review documents (i.e., specified NEPA and SEPA studies) and receive environmental clearance prior to implementation or construction. Also, King County does not have the authority limit or restrict the operation of aircraft to and from the facility.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				Thanks for reaching out to the neighborhoods and translating the materials. I hope you will consider the public comments that are submitted.		
#1 Mike Versstege n		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>As a King County resident (Bellevue) and pilot, I've been searching for hangar space close to home (Boeing Field, Renton, etc) and waiting lists are years and years long. I understand from the Washington Seaplanes Pilots Association that Boeing Field Airport Management is considering <u>removing</u> existing General Aviation Hangars and Tie Downs while there is a huge pent up demand for an <u>increase</u> in hagar space.</p> <p>I <u>strongly oppose</u> the proposed plan to reallocate the SE hangar areas for Air Cargo <u>unless</u> the plan includes not only a <u>replacement</u>, but an <u>increase</u> in the number of General Aviation hangars elsewhere on KBFI.</p> <p>It's important that you consider the needs of King County citizens (and taxpayers) for resources on Boeing Field and not just corporate needs for these limited resources.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Alex Wells		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I learned to fly at Boeing Field. As a private pilot, I use it regularly. I would so hate to see it become unusable. It is a jewel to private pilots who pump money into the Seattle economy.</p> <p>Please reconsider your changes and keep this jewel of an airport open and usable for all - even the little guy.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Stan Kosko		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>A fellow tenant alerted me to the proposed changes in the KCIA Master Plan, including the demolition of the SW GA hangars.</p> <p>I watched the Virtual Public Information Meeting and did not see any discussion of what is planned for</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>accommodating the GA tenants in the SW hangars. I have a hangar as well as several tie downs in this area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you share any information on what is planned for the displaced hangar and tie-down tenants? 2. Is the time-line 2023 as shown in the Information Meeting video? When will tenants be notified of these pending changes? 	Also, the projected timeline for the decommissioning of the SW T-hangar area is identified for 2023, but would be contingent upon the acquisition of the adjacent Woods Meadows property and the future development demand for new aviation facilities (e.g., a west side air cargo facility) at BFI.	
#1 Shawn Elston		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>I am writing in support of general aviation (GA) at King County International Airport and against the proposal in the Master Plan to remove over 75 parking and hangar spaces for light general aviation aircraft at the southwest corner of the airport.</p> <p>General aviation has many proven benefits to communities, and removing this many spaces would be terrible for all involved. This should NOT be allowed to happen! Aviation is part of Seattle's history and community, with Boeing Field being at its center. These spaces are important, and getting rid of them will cause permanent damage.</p> <p>I respectfully request the managers of KBFI to reconsider the impacts that the Master Plan will have on not only the airport but also the local community and either: 1)Remove the alternative to convert the southwest GA tie-down and hangar spaces to cargo operations, or2)Replace those GA spaces with an equal or greater amount of space in another location, and not eliminate the NW parking until alternative spaces are provided.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
Multiple people		Displacement/ Loss of		I am writing to convey my opposition for the master plan changes at King County International Airport – Boeing	Comments noted.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
		Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Field (KBFI) regarding the proposed removal of general aviation spaces on the southwest ramp, and to ask that you reconsider the decision. This is a bad plan for the aviation community and for everybody else. The proposed master plan has caught most of the aviation community by surprise. The impression is that this was intentional.</p> <p>For the past fifty-three years I have operated out of KBFI as a pilot, a tenant and in numerous other capacities. As a longtime board member of the Museum of Flight, and a volunteer and supporter of Raisbeck Aviation High School, I have seen firsthand the invaluable contributions made to KBFI and our community by the colocation of general aviation and these two world-class institutions. The proximity of aircraft parking to The Museum of Flight provides convenient access for educational and public event displays for visiting aircraft, with ease of access for all pilots and visitors with disabilities. There is nothing else like this in the Puget Sound area.</p> <p>General aviation aircraft currently represent half of all aircraft operations at KBFI. The Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) own "Air Traffic Activity System" data shows an increase in itinerant general aviation plus local civil operations from 124,050 in 2015 to 149,316 in 2019. Yet despite continual growth in general aviation in our region, King County's own forecast predicts a sudden decline in general aviation. Is it setting up a self-fulfilling prophecy?</p> <p>General aviation activity at KBFI generates significant</p>	<p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p> <p>Also, the decline in GA operations at BFI was fairly steady between 2000 and 2015, with average annual reductions of 4.9% for itinerant GA and 7.1% for local GA ops (see pgs. B.8-B.9 of the forecast chapter). 2015 was the base year of the forecasts for the MPU and GA ops later bottomed-out in 2016.</p> <p>The GA operational forecast presented on pgs. B.35-B.36 of the forecast chapter reflect the projected growth in the Business/Corporate and Air Taxi sectors with a corresponding decrease in recreational/training activity. We agree that the projections for the GA recreational/training activity are pessimistic, but that outlook for those users was not unique to BFI, and the projected ops are still higher than the latest FAA TAF estimates for BFI that have local GA operations leveling off in the 55k range over the next 20 years.</p>	

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>economic benefits to King County both at the airport and in the surrounding community. It is both a substantial business generator and provides jobs in everything from flight training, aircraft charters, maintenance, repair, recreation and more. Squeezing out general aviation operations from the airport is simply not acceptable. This proximity to downtown Seattle is vital. KBFI and King county have received substantial federal grants to support the airport as a joint use facility. This balance must be maintained.</p> <p>There are other more compatible areas for cargo at both SeaTac Airport and Paine Field. Cargo flights at KBFI would increase the frequency of late-night operations, which will not be well received in the noise sensitive surrounding areas.</p> <p>This is simply a bad plan. It is detrimental to the existing users of the airport and the surrounding community and is not consistent with previous master plans of the airport. It should be redone.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted.</p>		
#1 Jack Yager		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Hello BFI/KCIA Management,</p> <p>I'm writing to protest the plan to remove 75 GA tie-down spaces in the area adjacent to the Museum of Flight. General aviation is a driving force at BFI. The proposal to eliminate these tie-downs makes no sense. Please reconsider.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Frank		Displacement/ Loss of		I strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the	Comments noted.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
Sioda		Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Southwest tiedown and hangar area unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size, can be located on the field, GA deserves a continued presence on Boeing Field!</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration</p> <p>Frank</p> <p>BTW, I trained and obtained my license to fly at KBFI back in 2006, and look forward to continue to fly back to king county in the future.</p>	See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	
#1 Tod Dickey President VMI Holdings Inc., and Aircraft Owner		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>To Whom it May Concern,</p> <p>In my opinion, eliminating General Aviation parking spots at Boeing Field is not a good idea. KBFI has been a major Reliever Airport to KSEA for many years, and KBFI has flourished because of this. I liken this to the efforts of Scottsdale AZ airport to displace private aviation planes to create more space for corporate aviation. The airport then lives or dies by the corporate aviation economy. Their experience is that, once you run Private aircraft off, you can't get them back when you want them.</p> <p>If it is necessary to use the current parking spaces for other uses, then they should be replaced at another location on the airport.</p> <p>Please consider the larger picture when making your decision, not just the most convenient decision for the current situation.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Bryan Tomperi		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Subject: Boeing Field Master Plan</p> <p>Dear Mr. Parrott,</p> <p>After reviewing the proposed Airport Layout Plan, I am highly concerned about the removal of a number of GA</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				hangars that are not being replaced on the field. Buildings numbered 4,5,6,7,9, 88,87,89 are all hangars being removed. Where will all these General Aviation aircraft go? There is a shortage of hangars in the Pacific Northwest. A narrow triangular area labeled as GA redevelopment is shown but due to the geometry cannot come close to what is being taken away from the general flying public. I support making reasonable modifications to provide commercial growth, but it should not be at the expense of taking away the flying opportunities for the public. I request that you ask the planners to take another look at preserving the GA community at Boeing Field. Respectively yours,		
#1 Jim Immler		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		To Whom It SHOULD concern, As a Canadian Pilot that frequently utilizes the facilities of Boeing Field I must say that I am very concerned about the Master Plan to remove GA aircraft parking spaces from the field. Boeing Field has always played a critical role for me on business trips as well as an annual Museum of Flight day that I experience with members of my aviation group. As a Canadian I have always been impressed by the usefulness of services at American airports and it is greatly disappointing to see that this tremendous economic value becoming lost. Perhaps with most of the blame falling on bean counters that clearly underestimate the critical stepping stone that GA activity creates in their local community. Please reconsider this potentially devastating elimination of General Aviation services at Boeing Field.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1		Displacement/		Hello. I am writing to express concern for the proposal to remove GA tie-down spots in the SW parking area. I	Comments noted.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
Jim Evans		Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>currently rent a tie-down spot there, and would be displaced. There is no other facility or parking spots available in the entire Seattle metro area that provide equivalent GA access to Seattle. I understand that cargo and corporate growth needs to be accommodated, but I think that it can be done without displacing personal GA use!</p> <p>The plane I keep there is fundamental and key to my business, Bear Air Sport Aviation. Lack of a affordable outdoor tie-down space in Seattle would spell the end of this business. Please work towards a plan that accomodates all users!</p>	See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	
#1 Rachelle Ornan		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing to give feedback on the proposal to change the SW tie-downs into a cargo terminal!</p> <p>I absolutely oppose this decision, unless there is adequate additional 75+ parking spots created for people like my boyfriend who has his airplane located there. I'm a 13 Boeing veteran, Associate Tech Fellow, and I'm learning how to fly in this airplane. It's short sighted to just wipe these GA aircraft and pilots off the map of Boeing Field. It's the antithesis of what working at Boeing means to me.</p> <p>With proper planning and resourcefulness, I believe everyone should be able to benefit from BFI- ultra-rich and normal people who are just trying to enjoy the hobby and experience of flying.</p> <p>What message does this send to the Raisbeck Aviation high school students across the street? They'll have nowhere to learn themselves and furthermore you'll be putting in their heads that money is king. As if they need more reminders in</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				this town. SUCH the wrong message.		
#1 Paul Larson		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		I have been made aware of plans to remove GA accessibility at KBFI. I would like to formally express my opposition to such a plan as a current GA aircraft owner/partner who parks at Boeing Field. Please reconsider your proposition to limit GA which deserves a continued presence at Boeing Field without feeling squeezed out.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1
#1 Travis Brandt		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		King County Commissioners, I own a small local start-up manufacturing company, dealing in aluminum boats, and have been operating small marine manufacturing companies in the Seattle area since 2004. As a necessary part of our business, our customers, investors and principles, operate part 91 singles and twins in support of our business. Boeing field is known for 'big expensive corporate jets' and, sadly, mall businesses like us are overlooked because we don't have big jets, we fly under the radar, so to speak. That said, millions of local economic dollars change hands in my companies, and many like minded peers, consultants, customer, and investors also rely on various part 91 operations. We've parked, washed, landed, taken off, picked up passengers, et al, and generally this SW parking area enables efficient use of our time and limited resources. Access to this area , or one on the West side, is critical . The East side of the runway is too busy, jam packed, with no reasonable room to park cars, and go at our own safe pace away from the hustle. Our immediate impact to King county has merely been approximately ten million over a few years, however, we are just one business, collectively businesses like ours are easily a billion.	Comments noted. See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>This particular area on Boeing Field is unique, and it needs to be retained, eliminating it will pinch operations into potentially unsafe compromises. In comparison, there are no sufficient secure and dependable alternatives at Renton (no approaches and far too cramped) or Auburn (no approaches and completely insecure). Please consider carefully the impact your proposed actions will have to MANY small business, which I guarantee you, are currently being overlooked. I urge you to reconsider, or solve the problem with adequate development of similar areas/access/hangars elsewhere on the field.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted,</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p>		
#1 Clark Crawford		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Why waste aviation aspects of a historical nature that still provide a niche of usefulness to those that brought the existing field into the world of aviation. To discard all elements of that connection in favor of the almighty dollar is short sighted. Be sensitive to aviation heritage. Keep the General Aviation spaces available and functional in that useful corner of Boeing Field. I first used the facilities of Boeing field in the 1950's and on into the 70's both as private aviation and commercial endeavor. I am in favor of both, even today. Thank you for your consideration. May your heartstrings be plucked and nourished with Aviation tradition and history.</p> <p>Clark Crawford</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
#1 Eric Misbe		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage		<p>As an aircraft owner and user of the SE tie down area I urge you to reconsider the plan to turn the SW tie down area into a cargo ramp area without having a solution / new area for the GA aircraft that would be impacted. General Aviation</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
		facilities		seems to always be the easy answer to toss aside, yet GA account for a hefty use at KBFI and other area airports as well as generates large revenues for area airports and businesses. As airports get more busy space certainly does become a premium however consideration and accommodation for GA must always remain part of the plan. Thank you for your time.		
#1 Ben Buehler		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Hello To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I just got word that the new Master Plan has a proposal to eliminate the Southwest Hangar and tie down space and not relocate the hangars or tiedown space, This would be a devastating thing to happen for general aviation at KBFI and the surrounding airports, there simply is not enough hangar or tie down space available at KBFI or Surrounding airports they all have long waiting lists for tiedown and certainly hangars. Many of us have been Tenants for 30 plus years and have been contributing to the airport fund which over that period of time is a substantial amount, and I don't think it is reasonable to evict us we have been your customers. I like many others learned to fly out of KBFI and enjoy the airport and have always been grateful to have a hangar at KBFI.</p> <p>I believe a solution can be found by the management and the consulting firm, either having a different location for air cargo or the SW complex, possibly the Jorgenson complex (not sure what the plans for that property is). I believe since 1976 KBFI has lost over 80 General Aviation Hangar.</p> <p>Thank You for your consideration in this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1
Unknown		Displacement/ Loss of		To whom it may concern:	Comments noted.	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
		Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>Save the Hangars and Tiedowns!</p> <p>It is not enough that the MOF (Museum of Flight) could remain as the only vestige of GA (General Aviation) and its history at Boeing Field (KBFI)...IF the Master Plan were to eliminate 75 tiedowns and hangars on Apron 2.</p> <p>A number of military, commercial and GA historical records have been set with launches at KBFI.</p> <p>Over the past 40 plus years, I have assisted with emergency aircraft repairs and preparations for record attempts using borrowed hangar space at KBFI.</p> <p>I have commuted to my Boeing job(s) on occasion, tying down on Apron 2 spots coordinated with Operations.</p> <p>Nearby airports or airstrips have been closed since 1975, including: Bellevue Cedar Grove Evergreen (Federal Way) Issaquah Martha Lake Sky Harbor</p> <p>with no replacements in sight (Evergreen Sky Ranch, Black Diamond, was the LAST new airport allowed in King County, in 1964.)</p> <p>Displacing those GA aircraft on Boeing field to a "nearby" (e.g. Olympia, etc.) airport will greatly diminish their utility.</p> <p>(NOTES SUBMITTED INCOMPLETE TO MEET 12-15-20 OPEN COMMENT PERIOD.</p>	See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.	

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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 Ghyrn, Colin, and Elizabeth Loveness		Displacement/ Loss of Existing GA aircraft storage facilities		<p>To King County,</p> <p>My name is Ghyrn Loveness, I am a licensed private pilot that has been using BFI since 1987. My brother, Colin, mother, Elizabeth, and I have a shared ownership in a DeHavilland Beaver housed in hangar E1 in the SW hangars at BFI. These are the only hangars within the local area that can fit this size of aircraft in proximity to the central Puget Sound and greater Seattle area. I have enjoyed this airport for many years and It has been always a very handy airport for my family, friends and my business because of its proximity to Vashon Island and West Seattle where my family and myself have lived at since the early 1980s.</p> <p>The master plan is an ambitious plan that does not benefit GA but hinders their progress for present and future generations of aviators. GA is the blood that feeds aviation in America and hurting GA will hurt the progress of all aviation. Your Master Plan will not have value if this blood is cut. It will also leave a large number of current tenants homeless without option for nearby relocation. It will burden neighboring airports and drive away activity, including maintenance, flight training, and sight-seeing activities that support GA operations and inspire and train future generations for STEM careers.</p> <p>The Master Plan is one sided and at a great sacrifice to GA. It helps the few at the expensive of the many. GA is made of Americans that appreciate this country and also share the love of aviation and always willing to help the industry and community. King County should look for a wholistic approach to this Master Plan where King County can find a balance between all because it will benefit all not just a selected group of individuals or entities.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Robert Braunstein comments on pgs. 14-16 above.</p>	1

Comments and Responses: DRAFT REPORT Post Public Meeting Email Comment Log

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
				<p>The following are some points to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Aviation (GA) has a rich history at Boeing Field, providing jobs, flight training, aircraft charter, maintenance, repair, recreation and more • GA activity at Boeing Field generates significant economic impact to King County – both at the airport and in the surrounding community • The redevelopment of the Southwest area will eliminate an estimated 75+ general aviation hangar and tie-down spaces at the airport, with no plan for relocation on the field for these aircraft • Other airports in the area do not have the additional capacity to accommodate these aircraft, forcing many owners to base their aircraft several hours away, or sell • i strongly oppose the proposed redevelopment of the Southwest tie-down and hangar area unless a new hangar and tie down area, commensurate or larger in size, can be located on the field <p>GA deserves a continued presence on Boeing Field!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>		