

Q1 What is your relationship with the airport?

See accompanying 04-14-22 Survey Analysis for quantitative results for Questions #1. Responses to "Other" option for Question #1 listed below by participant.

| OTHER Q #1 (PLEASE SPECIFY) - each row represents an individual survey participant's response | |
|---|--|
| hangar owner | |
| Have used Birchwood airport since 1966 | |
| Alaska trail user | |
| Cyclist | |

Birchwood Airport Master Plan Update

| | |
|---|--|
| Local resident | |
| Trail user | |
| recreational biker | |
| Community member (this should have been an option as to not exclude) | |
| Anchorage resident who uses public spaces in birchwood | |
| Alaskan | |
| Anchorage resident | |
| Recreational bike rider | |
| Anchorage resident | |
| Chugiak Community Council Parks and Rec Representative | |
| Airport Association BOD Member | |
| Hangar owner | |
| Retired Aircraft Dealer, Have 4 planes and 2 Hangars (Mid Field Hangars #4 and #9) | |
| Crucial Land Owner | |
| Hanger owner | |
| Do the planners have at least an estimate of the costs of Alternatives offered for consideration? | |
| Railroad | |
| Aviation consultant | |

Q2 Approximately how many times per year do you use the airport?

See accompanying 04-14-22 Survey Analysis for quantitative results for Questions #2. Responses to "Other" option for Question #2 listed below by participant.

| OTHER Q#2 (PLEASE SPECIFY - each row represents an individual survey participant's response) |
|---|
| When flying with friends. |
| Summertime only (daily) |
| worked on bush planes there |
| Having these 2 questions first comes of as exclusionary to input from general community members |
| Daily Summer, Winter wx dependent, very other day |
| Drive past it every day |
| Daily during summer. |

Q3, Q4, Q5, and Q6 Please indicate your level of support for each Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.

See accompanying 04-14-22 Survey Analysis with quantitative results for Question #3, #4, #5, and #6.

Q7 Please rank the four alternatives from highest to lowest in how they represent your vision and needs (what you want and would like to see) for the Birchwood Airport over the next 10 to 20 years.

**See accompanying 04-14-22 Survey Analysis
with quantitative results for Question #7.**

NOTE: Responses to Questions #8, #9, and #10 include color-coded "theme tags" used by the project team to understand emerging categories of comments, concerns, and questions related to the potential alternatives.

Q8 What do you like most about the alternatives and why?

| RESPONSES (each row represents an individual survey participant's response) | |
|---|--------------------|
| Nothing Nothing | |
| More amenities additional lots | |
| 2 & 3 are garbage. 4 is only decent cuz it allows simultaneous operations which means no more waiting for those gay super cubs to land on the gravel strip. | |
| More amenities Planning for some future expansion may be desirable for younger pilots or those wanting access to more space for hangar construction. Electrical outlets to pre-heat for ski operations on the southeast side tie-downs would be helpful. | |
| Only 1 keeps 4000 x 100 airstrip | |
| Nothing Nothing. | |
| More amenities 1 AND 2 preserve all winter use of ski strip/parking for straight ski aircraft. 2 Will also expand much needed hanger/tiedown space. | |
| Keep costs low Use of airport unrestricted with marginal increase of tenant costs for lease and maintenance. (Alternative one) | |
| Keep costs low 4. Need to develop pilots in lower cost off airport STOL airplanes, a primary reason to fly. Whether big tire beasts, all the way down to ultralights, we need good airport, not in Anchorage. | |
| Nothing Nothing | |
| More amenities More options for hangar space | |
| More amenities New hangars, ski apron/runways | |
| More amenities I'd like to see some development and more hangars. | |
| Safety Safety improvements for everyone both on and off airport property | |
| Growth opportunity Alt 4 solves a lot of issues and provides for the greatest expansion. | |
| More amenities more hangar space | |
| Growth opportunity 4 offers the best future growth. | |
| Growth opportunity Room to grow. | |
| Safety I like that they improve safety, provide growth for general aviation, and that they establish parallel taxiway on the east side. | |
| Growth opportunity I love the idea of expansion in option 4. There is such a great demand for hangar and tie down space. The expansion would be great and just what is needed | |
| Growth opportunity Alternative 4: more opportunity for growth and safety | |
| Safety I like moving the gravel strip for safety. I like the increased build opportunity. There is such a large demand for hangar and tie down space. We need to expand this airport for safety and economic reasons | |
| Need to minimize impact on residential area | |
| Want no changes I like the no build option most, we have enough air traffic lower than 500ft right over our house on the regular. | 1/24/2022 4:22 PM |
| Neutral on airport. Just looking for safety and access for the public to nearby trails and future trail planning. | 1/24/2022 12:34 PM |

Birchwood Airport Master Plan Update

| | |
|---|---|
| #4 has a separated gravel/ski airstrip | |
| Please identify and reserve a permanent multi-use trail corridor through the airport land. | |
| Please include a trail corridor to extend the coastal trail to Eklutna in the project | |
| Less impact on Fire Creek with 1-3. This is a conservation easement and Muni plans call for a recreational trail to follow Fire Creek and pass the airport to connect to Birchwood Spur and the Mouth of Peters Creek Park. | |
| Best fits the needs of the airport and the community | |
| Want no changes The first alternative with few changes to the existing airport. | |
| Growth opportunity The bigger the better. | |
| Growth opportunity I support more growth for tie down areas and new hangar construction. | |
| Want no changes Leave well enough alone. Alternative one has worked for many years, safely and successfully. Plans 2,3,4 are way too complicated, unnecessary, and costly. | |
| Gravel runway not adjacent | |
| More amenities Expansion of parking and land lease for hangar space | |
| Want no changes I like alt. 1. Massive development at PABV is unnecessary. If development is deemed necessary, a new East side taxiway is a must! | |
| seems to do the best the airport | |
| More amenities Expansion for additional hangar space. Hangar space is extremely limited forcing many of us owners to park outdoors all year. This is hard on airframes and engines both driving costs of ownership up! | |
| Nothing Nothing | |
| Growth opportunity Additional land added, safety issues resolved, ski strip moved. | |
| Want no changes Alternative ONE meets the needs of the majority of the populace with no expensive involved. It keeps the airport as a quiet, fun and safe user-friendly airport. | |
| More amenities More Hangar Building | |
| Eklutna, Inc was never consulted in any of these alternatives. As the CEO of Eklutna, Inc. I oppose the selling of Eklutna, Inc. land. We are willing to work with the managers of the airport to bring development to these areas. |  |
| Growth opportunity Shows somebody is addressing the issues. There are no more expansion opportunities for tie-down or leased lots. | |
| More amenities Hangar space electricity at tiedowns | |
| Growth opportunity Option 3: gravel strip has separate taxiway, no longer need to tie up the runway with back taxiing. More hangar opportunities and tie downs. | |
| More amenities More tie down spots. Possibility for hangars | |
| More amenities I like additional tie downs and hangar leases. | |
| Growth opportunity While I like the existing footprint of the airport, I am not opposed to adding more hanger lease sites to expand the opportunity for folks to purchase and build hangers. | |
| Want no changes NO BUILD represents current and future needs adequately | |
| Growth opportunity #4 Provides The Most Effective Long Term Plan - Work Could Be Done In Stages | |
| Growth opportunity Increased hanger leases | |
| Want no changes No change--It's perfect the way it is now. | |
| Removal of in-line taxiways | |

Summary of Comments on Spring 2022_BirchwoodAMPUpdate_RAW Survey Results.pdf

Page: 11



Number: 1 Author: SWade Subject: Sticky Note Date: 4/14/2022 1:34:44 PM

NOTE: After receiving this comment from Eklutna, Inc., the project team connected with Eklutna Inc.'s leadership and staff in January 2022 to clarify/confirm Eklutna Inc.'s participation in an in-person interview (Fall 2020) and membership on and participation on the Stakeholder Advisory Group (Fall 2020 - present). Eklutna, Inc. has participated in the two SAG and community meetings held to date, including the most recent meetings held in October 2021 to review and discuss the alternatives shared in this survey. Also in January 2022, the project team met with Eklutna, Inc. to learn more about the organization's goals related to their lands adjacent to the Birchwood Airport. All landowner plans, goals, and projects on their lands adjacent to the airport will be considered in the development of the full draft master plan, including potential layout alternatives.

Thank you, Eklutna, Inc. leadership and staff, for your continued engagement!

Birchwood Airport Master Plan Update

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| Growth opportunity | Increase in hangar availability, increase in safety of runway ops. Options 2 and 4 are the best for hangar availability while option 4 increases overall safety of the airport. | |
| Want no changes | I like the status quo for simplicity | |
| More amenities | Alt2 i like more tie-downs, like parking with restrooms | |
| Growth opportunity | I appreciate the thought which has gone into all of this. I welcome expansion of Tiedown's, hangar space and general areas. Lots of good ideas! | |
| More amenities | -Additional tie downs are beneficial. -Electrical outlets at tie downs are beneficial. -Potential for new lease lot/hangar construction could be beneficial if financially feasible. -General maintenance and upgrades to lighting systems, asphalt surfaces, facilities, and wind socks is good. | |
| Growth opportunity | New hangar lease area is definitely needed. | |
| Want no changes | That there is a "no build" alternative that does not increase public cost and does not alter (shorten) the existing runway. | |
| | They are relatively compact. | |
| | The flight path on the north side does not fly over shotgun fields | |
| | Modernization | |
| Growth opportunity | Of the four alternatives, Alternative 4 provides the most lease lots for hangars | |
| | Keep the ski strip essentially where it is. Understand the need to eliminate the in kine taxiway, but respect the overruns possibilities. Skiplanes don't have brakes. If possible acquiring the land to the south east of the Airport is a win Win for the airport and the Eklutna. That area is good for additional hangars and tie downs, but none of the layouts shown works for airplanes. Use of that area needs to be reconsidered. Inwould emphasize Tee hangars over individual box hangars because it provides more covered airplane storage per square foot. On the south west side in front of the row of hangars, need to pave the gravel strip so the asphalt goes from the lease lot to the taxiway. High power over gravel to climb the slope there results in expensive prop damage. Also gravel gets on taxiway causing prop damage to airplanes taxiing by for runway 02L. NEED TO FIX bathroom! | |
| Safety | #3 provides for the safest operating environment. The gravel strip located next to the paved runway makes simultaneous operations the least likely. #3 also provides for the most convenience with full length taxiways on both the east and west airport ramps. | |
| | Cleans up much of the cobbled together airport | |
| Nothing | None | |
| Want no changes | Plan 1, fix what needs fixing and stop. | |
| Want no changes | Maintains current runway operations | |
| More amenities | More hangars and tie downs. Need more of these. | |

Q9 What do you like least about the alternatives and why?

| RESPONSES (each row represents an individual survey participant's response) | DATE |
|--|------|
| Increased air traffic and decreased safety. Rumor has it that the runway will need to be shortened to 3500 for the city to get funding, further decreasing safety. | |
| Shortened runway the main runway should NOT be shortened. many light twins need 4000 feet in length for accelerate / stop safety concerns | |
| Shortened runway I hate that it makes 20R/02L shorter. Limits the aircraft that can use the runway. | |
| Shortened runway Shortens the main runway considerably, 3 & 4 leave no access for aircraft equipped with straight skis to taxi to the ski strip without crossing a paved taxiway. Many years ago we were promised ski access from the west ramp that was never honored. | |
| Shortened runway 2,3,4 all have very narrow 60' runway and 700' shorter at multiple millions of expenditure. 60' wide very narrow for winter operation, many airplanes and gliders | |
| Everything. | |
| Moved gravel runway 4 will cause traffic pattern issues and is unsafe. Also not conducive for mixing straight ski and wheel ski taxi!! | |
| Large increase in tenant costs and traffic density and safety concerns. | |
| Moved gravel runway 4, gravel runway, good separation. | |
| Moved gravel runway relocating the gravel strip or eliminating it would be folly. leave it as it is. | |
| Trail No corridor for bike/walking path | |
| Interruption in airport operations (i.e. Option 4) | |
| Trail No bike pathways to connect with other existing or planned pathways. | |
| Un-needed expenses | |
| I don't want parallel runway operation restrictions. | |
| Dislike 1 The option to remain in a dangerous configuration is still an optional | |
| Dislike 1 Birchwood needs to grow as anchorage fields are maxed out. | |
| not enough property lease options | |
| They are all the improvements. 4 is just the best one I think. | |
| Costing a lot more money to the people already there. | |
| I don't like that they don't require FAA approval for the gravel/ski strip. | |
| Dislike 1 I believe option 1 is a terrible idea! A build moratorium would drive costs up and make the airport stagnant and eventually close! If an airport is unused the local community will demand closure and repurpose. I have seen this many times before | |
| Dislike 1 The moratorium of option 1 is not in the best interest of the economy or safety of Birchwood airport and surrounding community. | |
| Dislike 1 The build moratorium is a bad idea given the interest. Need to expand this airport for economy and safety | |
| Dislike growth Need to minimize impact on residential area | |

Birchwood Airport Master Plan Update

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Dislike growth | We do not want to see larger aircraft than currently use this airport, we don't want to see & hear more planes flying over our house, and we don't want more traffic rolling through our neighborhood. | |
| Trail | I would like to request that a TRAIL CORRIDOR be included in the Airport plans. The northern extension of the Coastal Trail to connect Eklutna to Eagle River from Fire Creek past Birchwood Airport to the Mouth of Peters Creek is included in the Muni's 1997 Areawide Trails Plan, but no corridor has been identified in the airport plans. | |
| Trail | No public use trail system included in any of the plans | |
| Trail | No reserved permanent trail corridor. | |
| Trail | Please include a trail corridor to extend the coastal trail to Eklutna in the project | |
| Trail | None of the plans seem to follow the adopted Muni Recreational Trails Plan. Please add the trail corridor from Fire Creek to Birchwood Spur through the airport. | |
| | The alternatives do not fit the needs of the airport or the community. Neither is it accurate to the dynamics of the airport. | |
| Dislike growth | Too many changes that do not represent the future phases of General Aviation | |
| Dislike 1 | Smaller offers fewer options. | |
| Dislike growth | My concern is the amount of congestion could occur with these major overhauls at an untowered airport. | |
| Dislike growth | 2,3,and 4. Too complicated. Too expensive. Increased costs will undoubtedly be passed on to the tenants. If all tiedowns were occupied the congestion would compromise safety. Proposed changes are unnecessary. BCV has been operating successfully for many years. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. | |
| Moved gravel runway | The moving of 20L/02R in order to accommodate an east-side parallel taxiway. Seems useless and unneeded | |
| Conflicting traffic patte | Alt. 4 separates existing hangars from the ski strip and will undoubtedly result in confusing traffic patterns (unfortunately, many pilots don't follow established procedures). Shortening the N end of the runway will likely result in additional restricted area incursions. | |
| | nothing | |
| | The large distance required for FAA runway separation that require long taxis from apron to runway. | |
| Conflicting traffic patte | None of the new options address the unsafe parallel operations or security | |
| | Any improvements to maintain the integrity of BCV is welcomed as long as costs don't increase excessively. | |
| Dislike growth | All the alternatives (besides #1) require major construction, expand the airport considerably increasing air traffic, pedestrian through put and expense. Not to mention increased crime like at Merrill Field with no regard for the current users or money needed for renovations. It will pad the pockets of some and empty the pockets of others. The only way to pay for these renovations is to increase fees for users and lease holders with no benefit to current lease holders. According to the chart above none of the FAA elements and standards have been enforced by the FAA since the inception of the current airport. In fact, the FAA, just did an overall airport improvement after months of public comment and reviews. Everything can be waived by the FAA, for example, the AWOS does not meet sighting criteria and is fully operational and certified by the FAA. The increased revenue from Birchwood airport does not even go back into Birchwood but goes to public funds and is utilized by remote airports. | |
| Moved gravel runway | Do Not Like the movement of a New Ski Strip Location in Option #4 I feel it will be confusing to New or First Time User Flying into the traffic pattern and increase the chance of a Mid Air Collision | |
| | Eklutna, Inc was never consulted in any of these alternatives. As the CEO of Eklutna, Inc. I oppose the selling of Eklutna, Inc. land. We are willing to work with the managers of the airport |  |



Number: 1 Author: SWade Subject: Sticky Note Date: 4/14/2022 1:35:01 PM

NOTE: After receiving this comment from Eklutna, Inc., the project team connected with Eklutna Inc.'s leadership and staff in January 2022 to clarify/confirm Eklutna Inc.'s participation in an in-person interview (Fall 2020) and membership on and participation on the Stakeholder Advisory Group (Fall 2020 - present). Eklutna, Inc. has participated in the two SAG and community meetings held to date, including the most recent meetings held in October 2021 to review and discuss the alternatives shared in this survey. Also in January 2022, the project team met with Eklutna, Inc. to learn more about the organization's goals related to their lands adjacent to the Birchwood Airport. All landowner plans, goals, and projects on their lands adjacent to the airport will be considered in the development of the full draft master plan, including potential layout alternatives. Thank you, Eklutna, Inc. leadership and staff, for your continued engagement!

Birchwood Airport Master Plan Update

to bring development to these areas.

Unless you know the process of expansion it would infer that growth equates to higher user fees. This wouldn't be true. Getting the upper end of choice uses others people money.

Conflicting traffic patte Option 4: with the staggered runways, I believe there could be issues in the traffic patterns. Birchwood is the training ground for student pilots, and there is potential for pattern confusion and possibly cutting off traffic landing or taking off. Also have the gliders to deal with. I believe we should have 1 traffic pattern.

Conflicting traffic patte # 4 alternative has the runway moved south from existing one. I think that is a bad idea. I think that would lead to pattern conflicts and cause accidents.

Conflicting traffic patte Leave the runways as they are.

Dislike growth There is no need to rebuild the existing runway as it is in excellent condition. I feel there is little to no need to move the gravel runway as simultaneous ops adds little benefit for a huge cost

Dislike growth Massive build in Alternative 4 is wasted time and money to the State and its residents, for unneeded changes both now and in the future.

Airport Disruption - Need Provisions For Control Tower When The Time Comes

Land acquisition

Dislike growth Making it too large--perimeter road will cause too much traffic and reduce security around hangars.

All of the alternatives, besides leaving our airport the way it is, shorten RWY 20R. It's difficult to break out the why from just the material presented here but I presume that it then brings the airport into FAA compliance, thus allowing access to federal funds? If this is true, is the new land acquisition based on federal funds? Are the new hangars federally funded? What process is in place to take care of Birchwooders first when the Anchorage hoards move in to gobble up hangar space? What's the distribution plan and priorities for the new spaces?

Moved gravel runway Moving ski/gravel strip to new area

Dislike 1 Option 1 really makes no improvement at all.

Conflicting traffic patte Adding a runway is an air traffic hazard.

I don't like the wrap around access road

Moved gravel runway Alt4 gravel runway placement. Taxi to far from N.E. Ramp

Moved gravel runway I believe the offset of the gravel runway to the west to be dangerous, we would have staggered traffic flows in the same direction, leading to visibility problems and possible mid airs.

Shortened runway -Dislike Shortening and narrowing of runway in general. -Dislike Vehicle parking (18) or (19) on maps being inline with main runway for engine failure on takeoff event. -Dislike Alternative 3 gravel strip location is undesirable for winter ski operations. -Strongly dislike alternative 4's moving of the gravel runway way out of the way and need for two independent traffic patterns instead of one common pattern over the inlet. -Dislike the shape of the proposed lease lots for the expanded area. Too long and skinny. -Dislike high reliance of property expansion for functional layout of Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. (IE the north end of the runway being shortened instead of south end or combination of both, which is the one with the current fence obstacle and minimal RSA.

Massive construction will hamper summer ops. Option 4 gravel is a long taxi and a long way from current fuel.

none of the alternatives consider how little the actual ski strip is utilized for actual ski operations, determined the extent to which the impact of accommodating a small group of users (skis) that includes a very low percentage of airport "use" and how all that specifically affects the public cost of the alternatives (2.3&4) that have been proposed

The railroad will not allow a runway approach over our yard facility as shown on Alternative 4.

This is likely going to cost the existing occupants a lot of money in increased fees and taxes.

Birchwood Airport Master Plan Update

A lot of money going to something it doesn't need to.

None of the four alternatives provide for relocating the railroad, which is the only way to provide a compact and efficient layout of expanded tie-down space and lease lots.

Moved gravel runway Moving the gravel strip to the southeast corner causes a lot of problems and doesn't efficiently use available space. Need to consider that ski lanes can't taxi over plowed taxiway. Layout of southeast corner needs to be reconsidered, prioritize Tee hangars to a greater extent.

#3 The removal of Taxiway D is premature. I realize that in the future the runway may have to be shorted to comply with the FAA Standard for funding, but in the meantime Taxiway D is very useful and used regularly, especially for glider operations. #4 The location of the gravel runway will lead to simultaneous operations on the gravel and paved runways and create a serious mid-air collision hazard.

Cost, disruptions, time to complete

Conflicting traffic patte Alternatives from original layout are deadly to aviators. The original is already dangerous. Traffic patterns and parallel runways with no tower control is a recipe for disaster.

To much growth to the south apron, that area will cost more to develop ie. Railroad buyouts and swamp. Also environmental studies?? Are they available.

does not require FAA approval for development


Puts entrance and exit of north end of runway right at my hangar. People will be running up and blowing my planes and hangar with their prop wash.

Q10 What other comments or questions do you have about the four alternatives or the Airport Master Plan Update process?

| | RESPONSES (each row represents an individual survey participant's response) | DATE |
|--|---|------|
| | No new growth PABV is a small, rural airport with basic services. This is why we have made this our home base. We DONT want another Merrill and we DONT want increase costs. | |
| | Pro alternative four alternative 4 is good as long as the main runway remains at 4000 feet in length | |
| | No shortned runway Is there any way to do the improvements but not shorten the main runway? | |
| | I appreciate the improvements, upgrades and maintenance over the years. My first flight out of BCV was my senior year, aviation science class at Chugiak High School, 1972. | |
| | No shortned runway Moving a perfectly good runway and making a very narrow and shorter runway at massive costs reminds me of the bridge to no where fiasco a couple decades ago in SE Alaska | |
| | No new growth It is fine as it is. No need to waste money doing fixes that aren't needed. | |
| | No new growth If a mountain side taxiway is really needed we could just use the mountain side road like they do at Lake Hood. No tower is needed or wanted. | |
| | With alternatives 2-4, traffic density could require a control tower? | |
| | The Glen needs a bypass rd in case of shutdown. This rd ideally should go by the airport from South Birchwood. Possibly from Beach Lake Rd. or other ideally suitable that can smoothly cross the tracks, without the crazy 90 degree corners.. Help Business access, create park access etc. | |
| | Trail Please add a bike corridor for the residents and commuters of the bike/walking path!! | |
| | Trail Please make sure that the plans includes space for a trail corridor alongside the airport | |
| | Trail Way back when there was a plan to allow for a separated bike/multiuse path. That doesn't exist in any of these plans and would be a shame to omit. | |
| | what is the process for leasing land for development. | |
| | Trail I would like to see a multi use trail corridor as part of the plan | |
| | No new growth Too much congestion and expense. | |
| | None at this time. | |
| | Pro alternative four Number four gives most opportunity for growth and safety | |
| | Trail Please include a trail corridor for bikes. | |
| | No new growth With the new APD shooting range on top of the Birchwood shooting range, I think we have enough noise pollution in the area without expanding the airport that is practically in our backyard. | |
| | Trail Could we please get a bike/walking trail corridor as part of the plan?? Many people bike Birchwood loop and going down to the airport and along the water would be a beautiful extension of the coastal/ship Creek trail! | |
| | Trail Include the trail corridor to the master plan | |
| | Trail I would like to request that a TRAIL CORRIDOR be included in the Airport plans. The northern extension of the Coastal Trail to connect Eklutna to Eagle River from Fire Creek past | |

Birchwood Airport Master Plan Update

Birchwood Airport to the Mouth of Peters Creek is included in the Muni's 1997 Areawide Trails Plan, but no corridor has been identified in the airport plans.

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Trail | Please include a Trail Coordinator in the planning to advocate for Public use trails in the area | |
| Trail | Please identify and reserve a permanent multi-use trail corridor through the airport land. | |
| Trail | Please include a trail corridor to extend the coastal trail to Eklutna in the project | |
| Trail | Please include a connector to the coastal trail to link The trail all the way to Eklutna. | |
| Trail | I am in support of providing a land corridor through the airport to connect a future coastal trail (non motorized) from Eagle River to Eklutna. | |
| | Will this plan be presented before the Chugiak/Eagle River Parks and Rec Board of Supervisors for approval? | |
| | The current master plan recognizes the depth scope and extent of airplanes that exist. The proposed master plans do not recognize the depth and scope of airplanes that can land on the airstrip. | |
| | Many of these FAA requirements are meant for outside GA activities and changes that don't fit Alaska usage. | |
| | One thing that's challenging is the State's super long leaseholds for so little money, and offer goes back to leaseholder again. No one can 'break in' to a lease. It's definitely a challenge and unfair as this is public land. | |
| | All of the land use for tiedowns, etc. appear to be out of a dream world. Has a survey been done as to the demand for so many additional tiedowns and hangars? What is the projected return on investment. Basic economics! | |
| | Has there been any consideration to building a waterway? If alternative 4 is selected and the gravel strip is moved to the south, could the old gravel strip be constructed into a waterway? | |
| No new growth | I don't see the demand for expansion. Existing tie-downs aren't fully utilized. | |
| | none | |
| | Has funding been secured for any of the improvements? | |
| | Overlay or seal cracks of all existing asphalt and at some point pave lease lots. It should be maintained by the State. | |
| | What will be the cost to the current lease holders? Why do we need 2 bathrooms, the pilot planning facility was always sufficient and maintained for years by volunteers? Why do companies get a free pass? Businesses from Merrill Field and CAP constantly and continuously use the Birchwood airport to do their training yet provide no income to Birchwood with no revenue taken or expected. The reason is because air traffic at Merrill field is too busy and now you want to expand our Birchwood airport, taking away the user friendly, community centered small safe airport eventually forcing the requirement for a control tower | |
| | We need a "Public Wash Ramp " on the Airport. My Hangars and Most on the Airport Do not have water to wash our aircraft | |
| | Eklutna, Inc was never consulted in any of these alternatives. As the CEO of Eklutna, Inc. I oppose the selling of Eklutna, Inc. land. We are willing to work with the managers of the airport to bring development to these areas. |  |
| | Land acquisition is assumed and not certain. Currently the RPZ is not owned by the FAA/State. All plans make the assumption that these lands are available. | |
| | I would like to see a larger public bathroom solution. As a female pilot, options for myself and my passengers are limited. Even prior to the septic failure, there was only 1 toilet in the pilot's lounge and often a line. | |
| | Cultural Resources survey will be required in all alternatives. Identification efforts shall include determinations of eligibility for the National Register (through the Section 106 process) | |
| No new growth | Keep it simple and a fun airport, and we will monitor rule breakers and safety | |



Number: 1 Author: SWade Subject: Sticky Note Date: 4/14/2022 1:42:11 PM

NOTE: After receiving this comment from Eklutna, Inc., the project team connected with Eklutna Inc.'s leadership and staff in January 2022 to clarify/confirm Eklutna Inc.'s participation in an in-person interview (Fall 2020) and membership on and participation on the Stakeholder Advisory Group (Fall 2020 - present). Eklutna, Inc. has participated in the two SAG and community meetings held to date, including the most recent meetings held in October 2021 to review and discuss the alternatives shared in this survey. Also in January 2022, the project team met with Eklutna, Inc. to learn more about the organization's goals related to their lands adjacent to the Birchwood Airport. All landowner plans, goals, and projects on their lands adjacent to the airport will be considered in the development of the full draft master plan, including potential layout alternatives. Thank you, Eklutna, Inc. leadership and staff, for your continued engagement!

Birchwood Airport Master Plan Update

in operations. Complications will see people move out and desertion will be eminent.

Is there FAA pressure to change the airport, or is this an initiative requested OF the FAA by folks representing Birchwood? What motivates the need for change? Besides new hangar space, what does the board see as their vision that prompted these proposals?

No new growth Simultaneous parallel runway ops may sound good but I believe in reality it would just needlessly complicate operations

I suppose tie-downs rates will increase. Nobody likes higher rates

None, keep up the good work and keep us informed.

It does not appear as a legitimate process when planners do not consider and/or make public anticipated cost of any proposed alternative. In the current process it is obvious the ski strip is driving most planning decisions swirling around alternatives 2, 3 and 4. Why have planners not provide a considered alternative that would include closing ski strip?

No new growth This is a needless operation that in the end is going to make Eklutna Corp and others a lot of money and will drive the "little guys" out. The big question is whether this is a required dog and pony show that has to be done. I strongly suspect that this project is already decided and we are just going thru the motions.

What development recommendations in the 2005 Master Plan were implemented by the department? What assurance do the airport users have that the department will actually follow the Master Plan finally adopted as a result of the current project?

Get the southeastern corner land if possible because it will avoid long term land use conflicts, even if it takes a while to finalize plan for exact use. Thanks for listening.

Not enough information and stakeholders have been left out of the process... owner and leasing, but never contacted or called you should start with those that have a vested interest not a select few trying to make a land grab.

What is the time frame.