

Notes from Point Hope Runway Realignment Scoping Meetings

(February 3-4, 2015; Point Hope Qalgi)

Public Questions/Comments and DOT&PF Responses

February 3rd Meeting, Point Hope Community Qalgi.

- 1) **What is the erosion rate for the northern runway safety area, and how was it calculated?** We are using a conservative average coastal erosion rate of 10 ft./year to develop the runway realignment design. The average rate was developed by DOT&PF Coastal Engineers who have taken a number of direct measurements over the last several years, and compared them to historic documents and current aerial photos we have of the airport and coastline. For example, a 1972 erosion report by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined there has been an approximate 8.8 feet-per-year rate of erosion longer term. It's important to remember this is an average erosion rate and changes in weather conditions could increase or reduce that average any given year. By rotating the runway to the northeast by 15 degrees, we can achieve a 500 ft. buffer between the current northern coastline and the northwest tip of the proposed new Runway Safety Area. We anticipate this will achieve a 50 year design life before erosion impacts the proposed future runway safety area. On the south shoreline, DOT&PF coastal engineers recommend a 300' buffer from the active beach. They believe erosion on the south side isn't a concern at this time based on historical photography comparisons.
- 2) **How far from the beach is the runway now, and how long would a project keep it safe?** Currently the active beach area has eroded to within about 30 feet from threshold lights at the end of Runway 19. We're designing a project to delay future loss of runway safety area for up to 30-50 years.
- 3) **How much is the project going to cost?** Total estimated cost including all phases ranges from \$20-\$30 million dollars.
- 4) **Are you going to repave the existing runway?** No, the existing runway will be demolished during the construction of the new runway. We need to construct a new paved realigned runway.
- 5) **Would the project also improve the road from the runway to town that has bad bumps?** Yes, improvements to the airport access road from the airport to the first intersection are eligible to receive Airport Improvement Programs (AIP) funds. The first intersection has been identified as at the road that leads to the Point Hope Landfill.
- 6) **But the landfill access isn't a real community road intersection, just a turnoff.** Unfortunately, any other non-airport use of the access road from the airport qualifies the first intersection as a location where AIP funding for road work ends.
- 7) **How will the runway be constructed and what types of materials and paving will be used?** We will need to reconstruct a new embankment for the realigned runway, and will try to reuse as much of the existing embankment material as we can, and will need additional fill from either a local source or have to get it barged in. In order to keep the runway open, construction will be phased to leave 2,500 ft. open for continued use during construction. The runway will have new asphalt surfacing.

- 8) **Who planned the project? Did you come here first and talk to the people?** We began initial planning at DOT&PF, and our staff has been to Point Hope 5 times for informal meetings with the community and to conduct field studies that refined the proposed design. We're here now to get input and comments about that design, and ask the community if we've missed anything or if changes are necessary before we finalize the project.
- 9) **Will someone come every year to measure erosion?** While there has been no ongoing, dedicated measurement of erosion at Point Hope by DOT&PF, we can encourage the regional airport manager to take periodic measurements during routine servicing of airport infrastructure, and monitor available satellite imagery to record any changes.
- 10) **You have to see [the erosion] with your own eyes, not just satellites and reports.** We have actual measurements we've taken over the last few years, and we understand it's a big concern to the community that its effects on the airport are monitored. We'll certainly make actual measurements in subsequent years as well as review the most current satellite imagery that becomes available.
- 11) **There were other DOT meetings where we said we wanted a runway farther inland as it would have a longer life. Why does this project propose to leave the runway where it is? The community of Point Hope desires comprehensive airport relocation as a long term goal. We don't foresee erosion stopping and want to prepare for the future. This project will just be a band-aid to get us through until a relocation project can be funded.**
The combination of cost and timeframe makes it impractical to move the entire airport to a completely new location. An airport move of that scope would probably take 5-7 years to plan, design, and permit; then it could take many more years to fund that much larger project. The project we're proposing now is for a shorter term fix to an immediate problem of coastal erosion. The project was initially just going to repave the existing runway, but when it was apparent there was an immediate threat to the runway over the next 5-10 years, we were able to revise the project scope to address erosion, which actually gave it a higher prioritization over other statewide airport projects. The community can still work to make a case and gain support for a full airport relocation farther inland over the long-term, but this proposed project will maintain the current level of service for the immediate future.
- 12) **An alternative that was considered in a 1984 study was a site between the airport and the town. There were considerations of a nearby reindeer corral and adjudication of a Native Allotment that caused that project to be discontinued. Another option considered was to build into the lagoon, but that was dismissed due to cost and geotechnical considerations.** DOT&PF appreciates the depth of community discussion on potential airport alternatives. A detailed discussion of all alternatives considered will be included in the environmental document for this project. We understand that it's been a long term goal of the community to relocate the airport for the long-term. This proposed project isn't designed to satisfy that goal, but is considered an "interim" solution to solve the current safety deficiencies and maintain the existing service level.
- 13) **We thought there were landfill concerns with its location close to the airport. How will this project address that?**
There are exemptions for those kinds of issues depending on the management of the landfill. Point Hope and many rural communities fall under that exemption. Also, the NSB representative at the meeting commented that the landfill still has a useful life and they are in the process of actively working to extend its functional life, and would cap it sometime in the future.
- 14) **Has the NSB put any money into this project at all? (NSB representative's response at scoping meeting):** The NSB wants to move the airport...but it would take a lot longer and more money, and if this runway goes away we'll have to go back to [service using Cessna] 207s and 185s because it won't be long enough. So doing this will keep the Safety Zone long enough so the runway won't be shut down for bigger planes. So that's why the state went ahead

to make it 4000' so we can keep the existing planes coming and fix things in a shorter time frame. If we go with another bigger airport it will take longer, more money and we may have to even shut down this runway. That's why DOT is here proposing this and why we're putting out input. If they don't do this, what timeframe are we looking at?

- 15) **Where are you going to get material for the project?** *When it comes to material, DOT&PF often specifies it as "contractor furnished". What that means is DOT&PF would locate a site, get permits for it and make sure it meets specifications, but wouldn't make it mandatory that a contractor use it. That way it's available, but they can use other sources if they have a more cost effective option. DOT cannot dictate means and methods to the contractor.*
- 16) **We're concerned that if material is mined on or near a beach, we may see additional, long term erosion. The community prefers winter hauls if materials will require hauling along the beach. Finding stockpile areas is relatively easy here. Beach material sites will be surveyed by DOT&PF coastal engineers to investigate concerns about additional erosion.**
- 17) **Can you use lagoon mud for fine material? ?** *There are clamshells in that mud...measured at up to 5% by content...and we heard that's a barrier to that material being useful. Our material geologists have picked out some sandbars in the river they'd like to sample as we'd potentially need a small portion of fine material for the project. Our geologists want to test some of those areas. We may be able to use that material to mix with other gravels that don't have enough of a fine-grained component in them naturally.*
- 18) **Those sandbar sources proposed in the river aren't DNR property. The Native Village of Point Hope did not agree with DNR navigability determinations proposed for those areas in the past. The sandbars should be considered Tikigaq Corporation lands. Have you also checked for Native Allotments around areas you want to get materials from? From what we've seen on the maps and have also been told by Alaska DNR, they consider the potential sources by the river as being on state lands. But we do understand there may be some question about conveyances and ownership in those areas, and will make sure we check all the records of parcels' land status with DNR, the NSB and the Corporation land office to be sure we have up-to-date information.**
- 19) **Are there other material sources you're considering?** *NSB has tested a few sites in the mountains south of town that might be available, and we've been told about a private parcel that might have material available. We'd also like to test the NSB stock pile near the airport. We also have to include "contractor furnished" as a source, as material could ultimately be barged in if a contractor decides that is the most cost effective method of supply.*
- 20) **The "Million Dollar Hill" of material came from a hole dug at the south end of the snow fence. That material has been tested, and is of low quality and doesn't bind well. We will take new samples from that source and determine if it can be of any use for the project.**
- 21) **Please consider the rock outcrop source identified in the HDR report. This is good material, and developing that source would benefit the community.** *While DOT&PF has reviewed past geotechnical information, we haven't yet selected a potential material source for further investigation. We're familiar with the HDR report, and will consider the outcrop site as well as check out sources provided during comments at the scoping meetings. So far we've identified three options for further consideration: 1) utilize a local source of "marble size" beach gravel to mix with fine material from another local source; 2) utilize the material sources identified in the HDR report; or 3) barge all necessary material from a commercially available source, such as Nome.*

- 22) **There might be local property owners there that may want to sell gravel.** We've heard about that recently and will follow up on it.
- 23) **What about the short term stability of the 400 foot Runway Safety Area? With the erosion going on, will that still be there in 2017 when you begin construction?** Right now, the north shore RSA is less than 400' long due to ongoing erosion. Our coastal engineers predict that at 10' per year loss, it'll be close to gone by 2018. That's why the project is important regardless of whether long-term the community gets a project to fully relocate the runway. Left unchecked, erosion will go past the north threshold lights soon. If that happens, FAA would likely require we move threshold markings by 300' which would shorten the declared runway length and further limit aircraft or freight loadings that could land here.
- 24) **What if your estimates are wrong and the runway erosion happens faster and damages the new runway sooner than the 30-50 years you predict?** If erosion damage to the new airport happens sooner than anticipated, there are emergency repair funds for temporary repairs if something unexpected happens. One reason we've been to Point Hope several times over the last few years was to get good estimates on erosion and develop a project addressing the problem long-term. Unless other environmental factors change dramatically, we're fairly confident of the conservative 10' per year rate of erosion that was determined by research on historical rates and new field measurements.
- 25) **The Borough attempted to drill a water source well several years ago. At 200' they hit salt water with flow that seemed to be heading inland towards the lagoon. What will happen if you dig down for the project and there's underground seepage of salt water?** We don't anticipate a need to excavate down to the water table. Most dirt work will involve placing fill on existing grade except for two small areas near an old channel where the runway has settled...where the big patch is evident on the pavement. Depending on what we find when we drill test holes during preliminary work, we may have to sub-excavate that area a bit to remove organic material that caused settlement at that spot. Even if we hit the water table there, we'll backfill with better material and it shouldn't be an issue. We don't think there will be any other problems due to subsurface water over the remainder of the project area.
- 26) **What will happen to the old channels on land? Waves overtop and they fill with water, so will you put pipes under the runway area to let the water travel out of them?** We don't use culverts under runways, but drainage will be provided where necessary.
- 27) **Are there material sources under airport land that could provide underlayment, or is it too wet?** Recent storms washed over borrow sites at the airport and they were compromised. We don't know, but don't want to excavate below grade on most of the airport property because of concerns with cultural resources. As for moisture level in materials we use, we don't want the resulting embankment to be saturated during or after construction, and need it dried out enough to compact and stay compacted. However we'll test to be sure some reasonable percentage of moisture is in the material for it to compact properly.
- 28) **Are there any 14C claims that were not processed that will be required?** There are a couple of areas we know of that may have some interest in the parcels proposed for the project. This has been brought up at several meetings. **Do you know their names?** That kind of information will take some detailed research to figure out. Prior to any acquisition of ROW we would be sure to get up-to-date ownership data which would include information on those types of issues.
- 29) **Would the new runway be longer than the old one?** Yes, it will be 8 feet longer.

- 30) What is the proposed new runway length? We're concerned about the number of passengers a Beechcraft 1900 can carry into Pt. Hope. We need a runway that lets them accommodate a full 19 passenger load. It's a really big concern. In the past, the 1900s would carry 19 passengers and we had reasonable air fares for our community and even direct service to Anchorage. Now they're limited to 10 passengers. Our children's sports teams are competitive and need to travel to events to be able to be recognized for college scholarships. We don't want runway limitations to increase traveling costs or cost our students those opportunities. *We are using a Beech1900D as the critical design aircraft, meaning the runway will be designed for the proper landing and takeoff of a Beech1900D. As a 4000' runway will accommodate full operation of a 1900, that's the proposed runway length. As for their passenger count, recent FAA regulation changes increased the airport rescue/firefighting equipment requirements for service by aircraft carrying over 9 passengers, so that also affects the passenger capacity that can be flown.*
- 31) When will the next meeting take place to go over all this information? If you're looking at construction in 2017, is there something that has to happen here by the City, Native Village or Corporation for DOT to go forward with the project? *First, when have a final design, it would be helpful to get resolutions that communicate community opinion on it, or otherwise resolutions in support of, or not supporting, the project or a new airport. It's up to the community...the Native Village, or Corporation, or City individually or together.*
- 32) Your estimate of how long the project will last is based on the erosion rate remaining constant. Over the last 10 years there's been a dramatic change in ice melt and disappearance of multi-year ice causing more erosion faster. We have concerns about still having the runway where it is after the project as it may disappear quickly. Based on your data, it will be difficult to come up with a resolution when the new runway might disappear quickly and we may be forced to move farther inland. *Based on information we have, the realignment project is the best alternative for now. If the community, through the legislature or other sources, is able to secure funding for a more comprehensive, long term plan to develop another airport, you could still get work going to evaluate that. But that's likely a 7+ year range project in itself just to get all the necessary information gathered. Evaluating various build alternatives for that scale project would take at least one additional year. But if the community says 'We don't want this realignment project, and prefer to build a new airport inland instead...', we must take that into account, and it could delay this project if that's the community desire. The work we've done now could be used for the larger project's environmental document, but we would have to restart the entire process we've followed up to this point for this project. In terms of the comments we've heard about relocation, we looked at the concept of moving the airport, but it came down to its price tag and extended timeframe. This project is designed to maintain the current status of air safety and transportation for the community in the face of impending erosion of the runway within a few years. Moving the airport inland would require a far more extensive analysis of runway location, access roads, utilities, airport engineering and environmental issues, funding and approvals.*
- 33) The Point Hope community has done lots of preliminary work on airport relocation already, and the cost to move it comes to about \$47 million according to a study by HDL. The NSB is looking for material sites, and there's data we've gathered on other issues. Also, there has already been a community discussion on relocation, so when you do consider cost and all those things, we can help by incorporating our information and by obtaining Federal Department of Commerce funding to help to put these pieces together. *Part of the design process for this project is comparing the cost and benefit of all design alternatives. These have included "No Action", "Laterally Shifting the Runway", "Runway Realignment", "Full Relocation", and "Installing Shore Protection". The runway realignment alternative provides the best cost to benefit ratio, maintains the current level of service, increases the size of RSAs, replaces airport navigation aids and, importantly, is affordable now while solving immediate erosion problems.*

34) You said you're going to move the pavement farther south, but also that there's more storm surge on the south?

Those sound like conflicting ideas. We've been working with our coastal engineers, and they've told us we need to stay about 300-ft. away from the south beach to prevent storm surge from affecting the new project. If we wanted to build closer than that, they recommended installing shoreline protection. As a result we've designed this project so the southern tip of the RSA is at least 300 feet from the southern shoreline.

35) What years were the pictures taken that you're using for comparison of the beach erosion? Are they current?

The most current satellite photo we're using is from 2013...just over a year old. We are comparing it to a few others taken in 2009. We're also comparing those to measurements we've taken on the ground very recently, so we do have more current erosion numbers, if not actual photos of the current conditions.

36) We're supposed to be gaining land on the south and losing land on the north side, and would be interested in verifying the loss over time. That's already evident on the series of older photos, and again we can request the regional airport manager to monitor changes to the shore adjacent to the runway more routinely after project completion.

37) Will the northern and southern beaches on airport property still be accessible around the ends of the runway for travelling to whaling and seal hunting areas? Please be sure these areas remain available for access. On actual airport property, only aviation and airport uses are allowed. But if you're asking about use of the shorelines as travel lanes to the rest of the Point Hope Spit, yes, there will still be 100-foot wide public access easements through airport property along both the north and south shorelines.

38) How will you remove the existing asphalt pavement? A big grinder will be used mill up the existing pavement in phases into recycled asphalt to be used in the new construction.

39) Are they going to allow planes to use the runway during the work or are we going to have to worry about getting traditional air freight shipments from outside? Will construction phasing impact our flight schedules or cause 2-3 day closures? Please ensure we will not have interrupted deliveries of groceries and passengers. DOT&PF will work to ensure construction phasing plans/schedules have minimal impact on scheduled flights. A 2,500 ft. runway will be maintained during the construction project. There may have to be a few complete closures on some days, but they're usually scheduled at night and only for short durations so we can get work done between normally scheduled flights...between the last of the each day and first of the next day.

40) How many days do you think the runway will be closed for passengers, supplies, medevacs, etc.? We need to be sure we can get in and out and don't want to reduce the 4-5 planes a day we get. We can phase construction so a contractor can build part of the project without affecting the main runway, and then for other parts get work done in one night so the runway is open the next morning. There is also commonly a contractual requirement for contractors to make the runway available on short notice...usually one hour...for emergency or medevac needs.

41) Please hire local people for construction projects. We have a need in the village for jobs. DOT&PF is required to award the construction contract to the lowest bidder, and cannot specify local hire as a contract requirement. However we will include a contract provision for a "Post Award Conference" that would be a meeting in Point Hope that the contractor will be required to attend. When that takes place, the community can take the opportunity to inform the contractor about local hire availability and other resources you may have to offer.

- 42) **What will the new easement be around the runway?** An easement connecting the realigned access road with the existing shoreline easement would be established around the realigned apron so the community will have an established way to get through airport property without driving vehicles over the apron or runway.
- 43) **When would the project start?** We'd like to work toward starting construction in 2017. There may also be preliminary fieldwork this coming summer and possibly next winter involving geotechnical material investigations and topographic surveys. We've already done enough of a cultural resource study that we can begin to develop concepts for mitigation and develop the required Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement between FAA and the Native Village of Point Hope, and other consulting parties.
- 44) **What did you find for cultural resources?** We actually started with a preliminary survey by the DNR Office of History and Archeology archeologist when our consultants were doing wetland survey work, and we also invited an individual from the community to oversee that work. Then we followed up with the more formal, detailed investigation for cultural resource impacts and again had a local advisor along. During both surveys, the archeologist found no cultural resource items or artifacts, which really only means he doesn't think there's a concentration of cultural material anywhere specific on the project area. There will always be a potential for individual artifacts or small sites on the project area that we missed, and since it's within an established archeological district, we'll need to initiate consultation with the Native Village and develop a mitigation plan. But overall, the project footprint should not adversely affect existing cultural resources based on what the archeologist found. During construction we will likely have the contractor employ a professionally credentialed archeologist to monitor any excavations or ground disturbing activities.
- 45) **Please consider prohibiting mining within airport property.** We understand the concerns about cultural resources and other traditionally important sites that are within the current airport property, and we don't anticipate doing any excavation for materials on any areas that have not been previously used for that purpose. While we will likely do some localized excavation in the old channel area to remove organic material where the runway currently has settled, that location is not likely to have a high probability for cultural resources. However, we would have an archeologist monitor that work to ensure nothing is missed.
- 46) **The community has interest in receiving cultural resource mitigation money to match other funding from the Department of Health that would help pay for work on our heritage documents. We also think that re-use of old material in the existing runway embankment should require archaeological monitoring during construction activities.** The project will require development of a Section 106-process mitigation plan for cultural resource impacts, and those kinds of details can be worked out in a Memorandum of Agreement. For instance, the MOA could dictate that funding be provided for that heritage document program, or that individual tasks for that program might be specifically paid for by a mitigation fund, or whatever we come to agree upon with FAA, SHPO, the National Park Service for the Ipiutak Site, and other consulted parties in community. We've already anticipated that part of the MOA would require that any earth-moving activities will require having both a qualified archeologist overseeing the work as well as some kind of local representation on-site as we did for the wetland and cultural resource field studies.
- 47) **The National Historic Landmark status will also require special considerations with land acquisitions as it's mostly Corporation land.** We will work with the Corporation to make sure there is accurate land status information for the project and that any coordination with the National Park Service on lands that belong to the Corporation land will include representation from the Corporation Land Office.

- 48) **Someone said you were interested in getting material from the south beach near the point of Point Hope Spit.**
That's where we hunt, watch for bowhead whales and launch whaleboats, so activity there might interrupt whale migration or our hunting. You should leave it alone as we use that area a lot during and after whaling. The material there is very small anyway – about the size of rock salt. Thank you for that information, and we'll be sure to factor all that into any material source investigations. If that area does turn out to contain material that's made available by the landowner, we would need to have detailed discussions with the community on things like specific locations, timing, and methods of material collection and haul before we considered using it.
- 49) **Please explain where the material came from for the existing runway. You may also want to consider where material came from to construct the Cape Thompson/Cape Lisburne runways. For the 1968 runway, gravel came from near Patrick's Camp – by Jabbertown near Lot 6 that you can find on U.S. Survey 92-18. The military used material from those allotments. Could you use that too?** From what we found, the existing runway appears to have been constructed mostly from local material. We recently learned that the Cape Lisburne Radar Site runway is constructed of good material available near that site, but in checking on its potential availability for this project found that because it's on U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge land, there's a restriction that only allows it to be used at that one location. One of our geologists will be making a trip to Point Hope to sample potential material sources sometime this summer, so we'll know more about specific locations you mention after we can test them.
- 50) **How much material will you need?** Our conservative estimate is 150,000 cubic yards.
- 51) **If material is 'contractor furnished', as you have described, would contractors need to get material themselves?**
Contractor furnished means that the contractor can select whatever material source they wish for the project (in accordance with Federal and State Law, as well as permitting and land ownership requirements). They can independently source materials locally, or barge them in...whatever they decide. However, to ensure a project can be constructed, DOT&PF may test and obtain some agency clearance or permitting for one or more sites near a project to ensure something is available, but that site is not mandatory for a contractor to use. After we do some testing of local material sources, we'll make a decision on whether to permit a local site or not.
- 52) **Could DOT sole-source materials from our Village Corporation?** No, we can't do that as federal purchasing rules attached to FAA project money won't allow it. Material cost has to be part of potential contractors' bid submittals, and the contract is awarded to the lowest bidder.
- 53) **You mentioned the Army Corps of Engineers. What will they do for the project?** The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has jurisdiction over waters of the United States, and has responded to our scoping letter with a comment asserting that jurisdiction over project area wetlands. As there aren't many wetland acres on the airport project, obtaining the required permit for wetland impacts may take less time than if there were many acres. However if we go on to include a permitted material site in the project that's in wetlands, it would probably increase the complexity, cost and time for obtaining a permit, so that remains a big consideration. Alternatively, if a new material site was primarily in uplands that would be a better option.
- 54) **If there's salt water beneath the ground, how can there be so few wetland acres on the airport?** "Wetlands" as regulated by the Army Corps of Engineers are defined very specifically based on vegetation, depth to water table and other factors. It's an odd fact that you can dig down only a few feet and actually reach a water table, but still not have a site classified as a "wetland" because it does not meet all the requirements as defined by the Corps of Engineers. A location must meet all the defining parameters to classify it as a wetland site.

- 55) **For years we've been asking for some kind of building at the runway to house a restroom, as there are many times Elders or others need one, and it's too far to travel to town. Please find a place for a permanent terminal building as we need that restroom and shelter from the cold and wind. For example, Elders from Point Lay and Kivalina often stop here to change planes on their way between Barrow to Kotzebue, and need a place for a break during those flights.** *DOT&PF has guidelines for providing terminal or shelter facilities upon completion of a construction project. We can include a shelter in the project plan with an agreement from the community to take ownership and responsibility for maintenance of the facility. That agreement could be with a City, Corporation or Native Village. Typically DOT&PF provides lease space for a shelter/terminal at no cost.*
- 56) **Aircraft head-bolt heater plugins would be a great addition to the apron, as many times folks would like to charter for meetings instead of taking scheduled flights, but can't leave planes unheated during standby time in the winter.** *That's certainly something we could incorporate into the project, but we'd have to have discussions with the community about who would take responsibility for purchasing the power and the cost of maintaining the system.*
- 57) **When will you be coming back with more information?** *We anticipate having our geologist visit Point Hope in the summer or fall of 2015 to conduct material source investigations. Once those investigations, as well as the draft cultural resource report and a preliminary final design are completed, we will likely come out to review those with the community to ensure they are accurate before we develop the draft Environmental Assessment.*

February 4rd Meeting, Point Hope Community Qalgi

- 1) **How did you measure erosion points on the shoreline, and what's the difference between now vs. 20 years ago that makes a project so important?** *Erosion has always gone on. The difference now is that this project went through a scoring process, and the imminent threat of erosion impacting the runway is more now than it was years ago. Initially, the project was just a repaving, and was score much lower. But because of how fast the erosion is going to threaten the runway, the project was revised to include dealing with the erosion, and that dramatically increased the project score and importance due to the safety considerations.*
- 2) **What kind of new lighting will you put in? Tritium? LED?** *We will still be installing new, standard lighting for this project. There are problems with the LED systems in cold weather climates, as the lights don't get warm enough to melt frost off of them.*
- 3) **How far toward the community will the airport access road be worked on? There may have been a dedication by the North Slope Borough of an easement in the past.** *At this point it's likely that the road could only be included up to its intersection with the landfill access road. FAA airport funding requirements mandate that access road improvement can only be paid for up to the first intersection that serves any other use. We may have some latitude if the road was initially dedicated specifically for the airport, and we'll look into that. DOT&PF recognizes the need for its rehabilitation, and will discuss the appropriate termini point for access road reconstruction that is eligible for funding with FAA. We will also research past road dedications.*
- 4) **What are your material needs and what part of them are taken care of so far?** *We are planning geotechnical investigations this coming summer to look for local gravel sources. We'll also do a topographic survey to give us better detail on what the airport surface looks like so we can create 3-D runway plans for project bid documents. We'll need over 100,000 cubic yards of material, but to be conservative we're looking for a source for 150,000 cubic*

yards. We do want to reuse the existing runway embankment material as much as possible too, but that will require us to carefully schedule construction to maintain portions of the existing runway for use during construction.

- 5) **What kind of liability issues are there with a runway owned by the state but no terminal? What if somebody gets hurt and there are no signs? Last week a polar bear surprised the electric meter reader out there. At rural airports there are standard signs that are placed, like those instructing the public to stay off the runway or out of restricted areas. Commonly there are just one or two signs. With an actual terminal building, there are terms in our lease agreements that discuss liability. We can provide a copy of a similar lease agreement to Point Hope organizations so you can see what's contained in those terms.**
- 6) **Doesn't NSB already have a lease lot there? There were a couple of leases in the past but leases come and go. Currently (June, 2015) there is no NSB lease lot at the airport. There was in the past for a terminal. That lease ended in 2004. Since then, there was only one short term lease in 2006 for fuel staging by the NSB Search and Rescue.**
- 7) **Comment: The old terminal was run by Northern Air Cargo in the 1980s and it was a good place.**
- 8) **Would developing material sites south of the community along the river or in the hills impact caribou migration or subsistence hunting? We would definitely check on that before anything was developed. Part of the environmental analyses would include taking a hard look at the impacts on fish and wildlife impacts, and any tie in with subsistence uses, for both the project area immediately around the airport as well as any DOT&PF-permitted material sources. If a contractor proposes to use their own or a commercial source, they would be responsible for insuring those sources have already received all the necessary permits for wetland and other impacts.**
- 9) **What is the current status of the townsite lots? We don't have that information compiled as of yet, but will be checking with our Right of Way staff to find that out before we begin Right-of-Way determinations and negotiations.**
- 10) **So from what you say we're losing land to erosion on the north beach, and gaining land by accretion on the south beach? Yes, our coastal engineers have said the Point Hope Spit is gaining beach from beach gravel deposition on the south beach, but losing beach to erosion on the north. This is a consequence of the sediment transport directions and sources. The cliffs to the south are feeding material into a northward flowing transport current that's dropping that sediment on the south beach through wave action. On the north beach, currents and wave action there are causing more loss of beach sediments than is being provided by upstream sources to balance that removal, resulting in a net loss over time.**
- 11) **We have to emphasize the importance to using the workforce in our community, and contractors should consider that. We have both the need and ability here, but contractors seem to come and go with their own people even though we can provide trained labor that's already here. We understand that, and we strive to have a pre-construction meeting in project communities with contractor that win bids prior to the project. That way a community and contractor can work together to exchange information on labor and equipment availability and, hopefully, get local labor involved.**
- 12) **There have been past feasibility studies for the airport to be (in various other places). What happened to those studies and have they been incorporated into planning this project? They took into account the dumpsite, bird hazards and other factors, and the outcome was we thought the best place for a new runway was up on the hill where the outcrops are, away from those problems. It's getting more inevitable when we look out 30-40 years. In regard to the alternatives for this project, these places should be looked at for relocation now as we'd like to**

not have to do this again. The community can certainly provide that statement of desire to this environmental documentation process, and it will be recorded in the record. For this project, we have looked at other alternative options that involve full relocation of the airport and, currently, both time and cost are limiting factors. As mentioned at yesterday's meeting, this project was scored on its need, and is being designed, to address the immediate threat of erosion at the airport and maintain the current level of service in the relatively short-term. However there is nothing that prevents the community from using this platform to express its desire to fund and implement a project that meets the long term needs of Point Hope, and the information from this project can help build both the case and sets of engineering and environmental databases for that effort.

- 13) **Is there any connection between your project and ANTHC funding?** No, this is a completely FAA funded project.
- 14) **Could the Tribe try to get funding from FEMA or another agency for airport fire equipment to increase the level of service and aircraft types that might come here?** It would certainly be a factor in the level of service possible for the proposed runway length, as that's one FAA requirement for allowing commercial air service with more than 19 seats per plane.
- 15) **You had another formal meeting yesterday and I heard attendance was pretty low. Are you comfortable with that, and with the level of input you have gotten from the community at these meetings?** Yes, we believe we've heard and incorporated what the community has to say based on yesterday's input, as well as from information provided and gained during all the previous informal meetings. In fact, we didn't hear much new input yesterday we hadn't heard before at other meetings, which we've found is a beneficial product of our general approach to these kinds of rural projects. Holding a number of preliminary, informal meetings that lets folks get concerns on the table long before 'formal' processes begin has proven to be a very productive way to help incorporate local knowledge into early project development. That way, we work things out with the public and community groups long in advance of any particular issue becoming a sticking point during the formal, federally required meetings, document development, and review.
- 16) **What about the whale bone and sod house areas near the airport? Will they be impacted?** Because of the configuration of the new proposed runway, ground disturbance won't reach out into the area of the mission or sod houses. While the community has told us they are comfortable with additional fill being placed over some areas of cultural concern, we'll still have to cooperate with the U.S. Park Service and Corporation over any acquisition of Corporation land within the National Historic Landmark in order to satisfy the National Historic Preservation Act. While we don't think it's going to be a major hurdle, there will still be a required negotiation on mitigation between FAA, NPS, and the Native Village on those issues. That could involve researching, documenting and interpreting what went on historically and prehistorically at those sites to provide a source of that information for future use by the community, archeologists and other researchers.
- 17) **It would be nice to know that information and have it to share with others. We really haven't played a strong enough role in that process yet, and having a funding source dedicated to that purpose would help us to compile and relate those stories. The community, and specifically the Native Village of Point Hope, would be a consulting party to any of those mitigation efforts, and would have full access to any information coming out of the process.**
- 18) **No other cultural resources of significance were found?** Not during the wetland or archeological surveys we've conducted. A significant part of the project area that will be impacted is located on previously disturbed ground, so cultural resources there were already impacted years ago when the original airport was constructed prior to current regulations. While that's unfortunate, there's still information to be gained, and we'll still be looking for any input we

can find from the NSB TLUI database, sources of Traditional Knowledge, and whatever be found during earthmoving on previously disturbed airport areas. All of these would be great additions to the knowledge base of local and regional history.

19) Could you explain the coastal zone part of the investigation? Is that the North Slope Borough Coastal program?

There's a formal Federal Coastal Zone Management Act that is part of the U.S. Energy Policy Act that describes designated areas such as beaches, barrier islands, specific areas on East Coast and Gulf of Mexico, and shorelines of coastal states as coastal zones. That Act requires federal agencies to coordinate their undertakings with State or Tribal coastal programs to ensure there is consistency with state and Tribal coastal management programs. At this point, while there used to be a State of Alaska Coastal Program, that's no longer in effect; but there is a North Slope Borough Division of Coastal Planning in their Planning Department that administers a program that's similar to what the other agency's (ADNR) review was. This project will have to go through that NSB Coastal Management Program review to insure there are no adverse impacts to NSB Coastal Zone resources.

20) Comment from NSB representative present at the meeting: The NSB Coastal Management Program lost its teeth when the State DNR program ceased to exist; it now defaults to the NSB Land Planning Process through Borough Code. Regardless of a formal coastal zone program, the project is still subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process that will require a detailed description of the potential impacts to what, for all intents, are your coastal zone resources. These include fish and wildlife and their habitats; physical and biological resources of the shoreline and lagoon; coastal wetlands; and beaches dunes or other physical resources that provide natural storm protection. Potential impacts of the project on this suite of resources will be considered in the project Environmental Assessment, regardless if there is any formal coastal management program in force or not.

21) The Tribe should be able to take that program over by default, as federal programs are supposed to be able to be contracted by Tribes. There are barrier islands and wildlife refuges here and also along Cape Thompson, and I want to bring that out as those are federal concerns that Tribes are interested in. We'd be glad to see that in the document. Are Cape Thompson or Cape Lisburne federally managed coastlines? We'd be glad to have any of that kind of information brought to the table. From what we've found so far, Capes Thompson and Lisburne aren't federally defined "coastal zones" as it would seem they are federal refuges or military land that independently qualify them as "federally managed". According to the language of the Act as amended, lands subject solely to the discretion of the Federal Government are exempt from the definition of "coastal zone", however the waters adjacent to the shoreline at those areas are considered federal "coastal waters" under the Act. Again, regardless of their inclusion under a coastal zone program, the potential impacts by the project will be considered, and if necessary avoided, minimized or mitigated.

22) How many weather stations are there at the airport? Over the past 5 years or so the weather station has either given erroneous information that causes planes to either refuse to fly or otherwise make them unable to fly to town. We're trying to figure out why that is? Is the weather station okay? This project won't affect the FAA weather station. We know that over the years there have been times when weather hasn't been reported or the equipment has gone down, and have heard before that people here report that conditions are not as the weather station is reporting.

23) The weather station going down has caused us to lose a significant grant for wind turbine development as we had to have weather data for every day all year, and because it was not operational for 2 days that year, consequently we were taken out of competition for that grant. Since you asked for comments, we'd like to put that out as something worth mentioning. Often we'll call here from Kotzebue and people say the weather here is fine, but in

Kotzebue they think the weather is no good because the weather station isn't working properly. We think it's because smoke from the weather station furnace chimney drifts right over the meter and it gives a wrong reading. DOT was never able to fix that so you should consider a backup weather station in case of malfunctioning equipment. *DOT&PF also noticed gaps in wind coverage dates while performing a wind study for the airport project. The AWOS/Weather station is owned and maintained by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). We will pass on your concerns along to the FAA.*

- 24) **Can you have the terminal building covered with sod? Also, could it use solar or wind power, as that would reduce the heating and power costs for that kind of thing. Those kinds of design details would be something we'd have to check on, plus it would require a bit of engineering research to determine if solar or wind sources could provide adequate power continuously if that's the desire of the community.**
- 25) **The NSB's position is that it supports the project, and we would like to request two considerations: one is to provide for electric head-bolt heater plug-ins aircraft, specifically for our Search and Rescue helicopter operations. A blank meter box with associated plug-ins would be sufficient. The second is that we request that portion of the road to the community used solely for access to the airport be repaved. A wired blank meter box and associated head-bolt heater plug-ins can be provided through this project, though an agreement will be required with a local entity that would agree to provide long term power and maintenance. And as we've mentioned previously, the access road resurfacing can be paid for with FAA funding up to the first intersection that leads to non-airport use.**