

# Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

## Birchwood Airport Master Plan (AMP) Update:

### Public Meeting #2 – NOTES



October 27, 2021; 6:00 – 8:00 pm

#### Project Team

- Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF): Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor (Birchwood AMP Project Manager), Shawn Gardner (Anchorage Area Planner)
- Federal Aviation Association: Jonathan Linquist
- Project Consultants:
  - HDL Engineering Consultants: Mark Swenson (Consultant Project Manager)
  - Agnew::Beck Consulting: Shelly Wade (Public Involvement, Land Use and 3PLoad), Aubrey Wieber

#### Participants – please see list at the end of this document

#### Meeting Overview

- This is our second of three public meetings.
- We have also held two Stakeholder Advisory Group meetings and will hold a third in 2022.
- This meeting is to update the public on progress made since our last meeting in March.

#### Project Overview – **Slides 5-13**

- We are updating the 2005 Birchwood Airport Master Plan.
- This plan will look at surveying users for existing issues and desired amenities, future land use in the area, fixing existing issues, exploring future partnerships.
- We are in the “Fall 2020-2021” phase. We expect to complete the project in Summer 2022.
- We recently uploaded an FAQ, a Financial Assessment and an Aviation Forecast to the “project documents” section of the [website](#). The Financial Assessment does not breakdown property taxes or other local taxes, and whether any of that money goes to the airport.

#### Financial Assessment – **Slides 14-23**

- This assessment includes operations expenses, revenue, profit, and comparisons with other airports. None of the comparisons are perfect, as the data available has gaps in it. This assessment is based off the most comprehensive data available.
- The revenue breakdown for 2015 and 2016 is not available, likely because it was not tracked by category at that time.
- **Representative Ken McCarty:** It’s my understanding that all funds that come into the state are not designated. They are all captured and go into the CVR, and then are designated at the will of the Legislature and cannot be used for future operations.
  - **Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor:** There is a caveat to that. All monies made on an airport must be used at an airport. Because this is a network of airports, it can be used within the system.
  - **Representative Ken McCarty:** But that violates the state constitution.
  - **Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor:** The congressional mandate supersedes state law.
- **Mark (participant):** Do "expenses" include capital improvements?
  - **Mark Swenson:** Expenses in the assessment do not include large, FAA-funded capital projects, but they do include smaller expenses. However, the columns “Capital Outlay” and “Facilities” are a bit of

a mystery. We don't believe capital projects are included in this, but maintenance of capital projects is.

### **Land Use Assessment – Slides 24-31**

- The land the airport resides on, as well as the adjacent land, is predominantly zoned for industrial and low-density residential. There are no planning documents that propose significant changes to zoning or use of any of this land.
- Eklutna, Inc., is the largest nearby landowner.
- Expansion opportunities are really limited to southern expansion as the rest of the boundaries are constrained by Cook Inlet and the railroad.

### **FAA Framework and Context – Slides 32-34**

- The FAA approves the forecast and critical aircraft determination, which largely dictates what improvements the FAA will pay for.
- Birchwood has received \$8.3 million in FAA Airport Improvement Program funds over the last 10 years.
  - That is an average of \$214 million each year.
- Projects at Birchwood must compete with all other airports for AIP funds.

### **Aviation Forecast & Alternatives – Slides 35-43**

- The Aviation Forecast was based on data recorded by a General Audio Recording Device.
- This data was recorded between July 21 and August 16, 2020, and September 2 and October 2, 2020.
  - In general, it is very difficult to get this data. While these two samples are small time periods, the data is relatively rich compared to what is normally available.
- **Representative Ken McCarty:** When you say the tie-downs are full, are you just looking at DOT-owned tie-downs, or all of them? How many are there in total?
  - **Mark Swenson:** I don't have that right off hand. It gets a little tricky when you consider tie-downs on private lease lots, but yes this is just DOT tie-downs.
- **Lars Gleitsmann:** How many tie-downs were removed during repaving?
  - **Mark Swenson:** There were tie-downs that were removed due to widening of taxiways. They also were spaced out a little wider. If you want to discuss this further, we can do it offline.
- **Dennis Serie:** When they did the repaving, the original tie-downs were too short, and you couldn't tie your tail down properly. So, they did widen it, but that was something we brought up several times.

### **Alternatives**

- We have four alternatives, the first being a “no-build” alternative where the layout remains the same.
- The biggest difference between the four alternatives is changes to the gravel ski strip. This is because a center portion of Taxiway A is where the gravel ski strip is located. This makes the full runway ineligible for FAA maintenance funds.
- We all agree that a longer and wider runway is better than a shorter or narrower runway, however, construction projects using AIP funds, the project must meet the needs of the designated critical aircraft, and not exceed the needs.
  - We as planners must consider that in updating the Master Plan.
- **Alternative One:** This is a “no build” alternative. This is an option. This maintains the existing runway in the existing configuration.
  - However, this could be an issue as parts of the configuration are not eligible for AIP-funded maintenance.

- **Alternative Two:** This is a “build” alternative but maintains the use of the current runways. It removes the in-line taxiway to improve safety. The gravel strip remains in the current location, and land is acquired in the east and south to allow for additional lease lots. This includes a reduction in length and width to meet FAA thresholds. This reconfigures taxiways to ensure there is always access to the main runway or gravel runway.
  - The land that would need to be acquired is Eklutna, Inc. land.
  - This includes a restroom at all of the parking areas.
  - This alternative is closest to the existing layout while addressing the inline taxiway.
- **Alternative Three:** This alternative moves several taxiways around.
- **Alternative Four:** This is the “Cadillac” alternative and has a lot of drawbacks. However, we felt it was worth considering how the airport would operate if the gravel ski strip was relocated to allow for 700 feet between two runways to allow for simultaneous operations.
  - We understand users might not like the idea of simultaneous operations, but it would increase the capacity of the airport.

### *Alternatives Discussion*

- **Representative Ken McCarty:** The airport is an alternative for many purposes. I am very concerned about food security in Alaska. If we reduce access for larger planes, that will cut Birchwood off as a location for food drops to come in during an emergency.
  - **Mark Swenson:** These are real life considerations. I agree, if the bridges go down, the airport will serve a critical need. The problem is the one funding avenue we have always relied upon is the FAA, and the FAA has funding requirements. One thing the FAA says is that military operations cannot be considered in the forecast for operations at an airport. The funding is where we get wrapped around the axel. Trying to reconcile funding requirements with issues like what you brought up is the challenge.
  - **Jonathan Linquist:** That is correct. You cannot use military use as part of critical aircraft designation. There are a lot of airports in the state that wish they had the potential to bring in larger aircraft in the event of an emergency. Unfortunately, the FAA has a pretty hard and fast threshold of 500 annual operations to be considered.
  - **Representative Ken McCarty:** With supply chain issues, we right now have planes coming into Ted Stevens to drop off goods. There are discussions about where other sites are that can handle larger planes.
    - **Mark Swenson:** That is all understood. In that case, is there other revenue from the state that can be used to maintain existing airport dimensions?
    - **Jonathan Linquist:** The fact that reconstruction would require a reduction of the runway, that is something that is likely not going to happen anytime soon. If there was an overlay, that is a different story.
    - **Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor:** DOT is willing to partner with an agency or entity that wants to pay the costs that FAA will not cover, but they need to agree in perpetuity to fund annual maintenance, which would be millions of dollars.
- **Mark:** What is the capacity of the runway? How far or close do the current forecast come to exceeding it?
  - **Mark Swenson:** The single runway configuration, considering the main runway and gravel ski strip effectively act as one runway, based on the data we have is not at capacity yet. The need for a parallel runway is not dictated by capacity, it’s dictated by use of the gravel runway. This is probably one of the only areas where state airport has gravel strips. Justifying the use is something the FAA is just starting to hear about. People love these ski strips, but they are not used in other parts of the country.

- **Abe Harman:** Could the whole length of Taxiway A be made gravel ski strip?
  - **Mark Swenson:** There would still be an AIP eligibility issue with the length of that runway, so it is likely not viable. It is more length than is needed, according to FAA.
- **Lars Gleitsmann:** You ought to talk about the RPZs more.
  - **Mark Swenson:** There are issues with the existing RPZs, which can be seen in the “no build” alternative.
- Are you considering costs versus income and expenses for the alternatives?
  - **Mark Swenson:** Once we identify a preferred alternative, we will do a deep dive on the cost of the alternative. Alternatives two and three also have increased revenue generating expenses. Alternative four would have the highest capital, maintenance, and operations expenses.
- **Val Jokela:** I would like to see a safety analysis for each of these alternatives as well.
  - **Mark Swenson:** We will run through some of that in a sec with the pros and cons analysis. As we move forward with a preferred alternative, we can look at that in greater detail.
- **Abe Harman:** I did not see the 300ft part listed in AC 150/5300-13A though. I only observed 700ft for simultaneous ops. Can I get a reference for where to research this 300ft portion?
  - **Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor:** The 300' separation is in the proposed 150/5300-13B.
- **Val Jokela:** I don't want us to get locked into just these four alternatives. There is a lot of knowledge and experience out there. It seems like these have all been decided by a small group.
  - **Shelly Wade:** There has been a robust outreach process to talk with users, tenants, etc., and that will continue, including with an alternatives survey.

### **Next Steps and Wrap Up – Slides 44-49**

- We will post the presentation and notes after this meeting.
- We will create a survey for users to weigh in on the alternatives.
- We have additional SAG and Public Meetings planned for 2022.

### **Meeting Chat**

18:12:15 From Thomas to Everyone:

- What is the initial problem statement?

18:12:55 From Aubrey Wieber to Everyone:

- Hi Thomas, the update of the plan is being driven largely by timing. The current plan is from 2005, so it is due for an update.

18:16:30 From mark to Everyone:

- Do "expenses" include capital improvements?

18:17:57 From Aubrey Wieber to Everyone:

- This Financial Assessment can be accessed here  
<https://dot.alaska.gov/creg/birchwoodamp/docs/Birchwood-AMP-Financial-Assessment-Final-May-2021.pdf>

18:24:50 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- Maybe answer in chat is fine with me not to disrupt conversation, but the Capital is only the State Capital, not including AIP funds correct?

18:31:47 From Lars to Everyone:

- You did go over that one slide too quickly.

18:33:20 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- Seems the current Birchwood financial model of low on-site staffing and not a lot of unnecessary expenditures is outstanding. Lower expenses and higher revenue than the comparable airports.

18:36:14 From Thomas to Everyone:

- Am I reading that right, Birchwood is  $8.3/(214 \times 10)$ ?

18:36:30 From Shelly Wade, Agnew::Beck to Everyone:

- Thanks, Lars - we can come back to those land use pieces when we dive into the alternatives (re: expansion opportunities).

18:37:16 From Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor, DOT&PF to Everyone:

- Thomas, Birchwood has received \$8.3M over the last 10 years.

18:38:07 From Thomas to Everyone:

- So, the math works out to .0038% of the 10 year funding, right?

18:38:44 From Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor, DOT&PF to Everyone:

- Correct.

18:40:32 From Lars to Everyone:

- Why was that device not used over a longer time period? Why was it used in That Rainy Season? The results would have been way, way different if it would have been used in May June and early July!!!

18:40:55 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- Technically .38% when you carry the decimal to convert to a percentage. But I get where you are coming from, Thomas.

18:43:30 From Lars to Everyone:

- How many Tie downs existed Before the re-paving affair with the way too wide spacing??

18:45:06 From Lars to Everyone:

- It's pretty easy to figure out with older photos of the airport! - I will count them in old pictures!

18:45:27 From Thomas to Everyone:

- Thanks (1/3 of 1%). What was the tie down count in 2000?

18:47:02 From Tom George (AOPA) to Everyone:

- Was the GARD system described also used to derive the traffic counts reported from Wasilla and Soldotna?

18:47:31 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- For John: One of the concerns that a LOT of us have that is present in all the options is the shortening of the main runway by about 1,000 feet. There are two primary objections to shortening/narrowing it.

- 1) We do get other larger and faster airports here, but there are not officially based here because they are training flights, or come and go for maintenance. In the event of problems, engine failures, students being slow powering up on a go around introduces extra risk in operations. Runway behind you does you no good...
- 2) Gliders are one of our user groups and their wing span is such that narrowing the runway will mean they will take out the runway edge lights frequently.  
For AIP funding, If the runway is narrowed, we disenfranchise one of our user group. Is leaving the asphalt like it is and having the AIP pay for any repaving of the first 3000 ft and the state pay for the other 1000 a viable option.

18:49:05 From Lars to Everyone:

- The Tiedowns were beyond the wingtips of the airplane types present!

18:49:13 From Rob to Everyone:

- The tiedowns in the 2015 Master plan 430.

18:49:15 From Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor, DOT&PF to Everyone:

- Tom George, no, it wasn't.

18:50:25 From mark to Everyone:

- What's the capacity of the runway system? How far/close do the forecast operations come to exceeding it?

18:51:00 From Rob to Everyone:

- 430 tiedowns in the 2005 Master Plan.

18:51:59 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- Could the whole length of taxiway alpha be made a gravel/ski strip? Would that remove the restriction?

18:52:21 From Lars to Everyone:

- Very Good Point Abel!

18:53:22 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- That does seem like a good option, but what length would the FAA support with AIP funds?

18:53:57 From Rob to Everyone:

- There have been no incidents or accidents with the Ultralight, gravel/ski strip so how is it a safety hazard?

18:54:02 From Lars to Everyone:

- They just need to stop plowing the snow there....

18:55:16 From mark to Everyone:

- Do forecasted ops reach 65% of the capacity of the runway system within the planning period?

18:56:43 From Thomas to Everyone:

- What size aircraft warrants FAA participation in a 4K x 100' runway?

18:58:19 From Lars to Everyone:

- This version as drafted here would further reduce the number of tiedowns!!!

18:59:51 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- I think it would be good to clarify that if option one was to eliminate taxiway A entirely and designate the full length as gravel/ski strip, that that would remove the funding restriction.

19:00:42 From Lars to Everyone:

- I think it would be proper if some more comments of actual airport users would be allowed in this "public Forum"

19:00:54 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- When not being used by landing or takeoff traffic it can still be taxied on. Functionally the same. But reconfigured to meet the rule.

19:01:15 From Lars to Everyone:

- Very Good point Abe!

19:02:35 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- If that works, even if the length exceeds the AIP funding limits for runway length, not much maintenance is necessary, an occasional drag or grader pass.....

19:03:04 From mark to Everyone:

- Have you considered an alternative access to the airport from the southeast?

19:05:57 From Lars to Everyone:

- So, the RPV Zones around each approach end of each runway ... You ought to talk about those a bit more.

19:06:42 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- We could also move the South Threshold of the runway North 100 feet instead of reducing all 700 feet from the North end. Then the RSA would be good even in the current airport boundary.

19:06:43 From Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor, DOT&PF to Everyone:

- The septic system replacement is tentatively scheduled for this coming summer.

19:07:21 From Lars to Everyone:

- The Septic of the ONLY public bathroom has now been out of action for how long?

19:07:58 From Rob to Everyone:

- The Airport Association is working to get that Septic System repaired as we speak. It has not been working most of this year.

19:08:15 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- The area in the southeast needs to be re-laid out with hangar shapes and airplane access in mind.

19:08:34 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- Lot shapes are not conducive to access to hangar doors.

19:08:56 From Lars to Everyone:

- Very good points Dave!

19:08:59 From Rob to Everyone:

- Good point Dave that looks like it's made for cars.

19:09:06 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- Connection is unstable, hard to hear.

19:10:08 From Lars to Everyone:

- If those of us that are not talking stop our videos the audio should get better!

19:10:39 From mark to Everyone:

- Will FAA participate in the costs of the improvements to the SE apron only if DOTPF pays for the access road which also provides access to the shooter park?

19:12:38 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- We currently have patterns on both sides, just only for ultralights on the east.

19:13:00 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- And helicopters. I guess that's normal though.

19:13:08 From Jeffrey Banks to Everyone:

- Alternative 4 Where is the segmented circle and windsock?

19:13:35 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- Not in favor of the new runway alignment, don't think the benefits of the parallel operations is outweighed by the down sides.

19:13:44 From Lars to Everyone:

- The Ultra Lights are almost completely gone for 10 years now, nobody uses any pattern to the East, that is why our residential areas are happy with us...

19:14:10 From 70 North to Everyone:

- Is there a cost vs income/revenue assessment been provided for alternatives 2/3/4

19:16:03 From Rob to Everyone:

- The east side pattern is also being used by helicopters now. Also, the winds are different many times at the southeast area from the north side of the airport. so where will the windsocks be for Alt 4. Also, Jeff makes a good point!

19:17:38 From mark to Everyone:

- Constructing the airport to meet the design standards of the critical aircraft does not preclude larger aircraft from operating there.

19:17:44 From Lars to Everyone:



- When Redoubt Volcano blew a decade ago, ash fell in ANC and Many commercial Twins and Turboprops landed in BCV that day, etc.

19:18:51 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- From a practical perspective, where may the funding come from to purchase the Eklutna land, does that need to be State Appropriated funds?

19:19:34 From Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor, DOT&PF to Everyone:

- Dave Swartz, property acquisition is considered AIP eligible as long as the development associated with the acquisition is AIP eligible.

19:19:46 From Lars to Everyone:

- The last big earthquake came really very close to doing much more damage, the emergency use issues here are very real, much more so than in the lower 48.

19:24:12 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- Is there any accommodation that can be made in light of how overwhelmingly profitable we are?

19:24:37 From Lars to Everyone:

- Those of you that are gainfully employed in this Master Plan process should really consider to come visit with us, the actual airport users at the airport and also go fly and see it from the air for yourselves... I think That would help.

19:26:03 From mark to Everyone:

- Good question for Northern Econ to look at but freight operators need to co-locate with other freight operators to facilitate freight transfers, like at ANC. Economic potential for a freight operator(s) at Bwood probably very small.

19:27:06 From Lars to Everyone:

- If a glider hits a light with the wing at speed it will total the glider...

19:28:07 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- Just a side note. We do have half a dozen Piper Navajo's based on the field for maintenance as well.

19:28:25 From Brian Walch to Everyone:

- Gliders support CAP training, which is an important program... does that get considered? Even though gliders don't qualify as critical aircraft?

19:28:34 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- I know they don't hit that 500 operations limits, but we do have class B aircraft based on field.

19:29:03 From Jeffrey Banks to Everyone:

- A nice green grass infield would be the best wingspan solution for the gliders.

19:29:37 From Lars to Everyone:

- A nice green grass infield - will be expensive.

19:33:19 From Lars to Everyone:

- So we clearly have needs here that exist: How can it be that every single issue at hand is just always wiped with "AIP funding" ???

19:33:25 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- I think the beauty is it wouldn't really cost much.

19:35:45 From Lars to Everyone:

- The Length of the Gravel Runway ski-strip is A SAFETY factor, not a detriment. Some in the lower 48 may see it as a detriment, but they have never done ski-flying instructions!

19:36:45 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- I think NO BUILD option should also include a 02L runway threshold displacement of 100ft as well to make sure it meets the requirements.

19:37:43 From Lars to Everyone:

- Are you aware that the issue is only created by moving the ski/gravel runway to the middle of the main runway?

19:38:14 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- For RSA anyway, understood RPZ will still go outside boundary.

19:41:10 From gabej to Everyone:

- 02R does extend to even with the threshold of 02L so that would not be in conflict but you would still have a conflict of the RPZ to the northeast apron.

19:42:04 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- As a comment, It would be good to have some gathering place to aid in community engagement. One idea is on the raised area on the east side not far from where the small wind sock is on the east side.

19:43:21 From 70 North to Everyone:

- How do you reach a preferred alternative without cost/revenue projections?

19:43:38 From Lars to Everyone:

- Dave Swartz; The raised area of the southwest corner of the North East Apron would be ideal for that. But what would the FAA say about something like that?

19:45:50 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- Into the chat because of bandwidth problem. On the west side, their access road extension past Nick Opegaurds Hangars will likely run into grade and fill issues.

19:46:00 From mark to Everyone:

- Thoughts toward developing a business plan for Bwood?

19:47:04 From Aubrey Wieber, Agnew::Beck to Everyone:

- Hi all, while this is a lot to digest, please remember that there is a project website with these assessments. Additionally, the meeting presentation and notes will get posted to the website.  
<https://dot.alaska.gov/creg/birchwoodamp/>

19:48:19 From Lars to Everyone:

- Birchwood is perfectly fine with No simultaneous operations!!! So that is not what should constantly be argued. Financially Viable and necessary should be what counts.

19:48:33 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- I think it's important to understand that the 700ft requirement is for SIMULTANEOUS operations, which has been identified as not needed at Birchwood due to volume of operations.

19:48:58 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- It's more an issue of offering a variety of surfaces for different aircraft types, not a need for simultaneous operations.

19:49:02 From Jeffrey Banks to Everyone:

- Please define simultaneous operations. The FAA supplement referees to parallel operations.

19:49:03 From Lars to Everyone:

- Exactly as Abe said.

19:49:15 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- Agree, as a design constraint, we should not include simultaneous operations

19:49:45 From Lars to Everyone:

- The 300 feet story is new!

19:49:45 From Rob to Everyone:

- No simultaneous ops are allowed at BCV.

19:49:50 From Dave Swartz to Everyone:

- As a comment, ski strip parking needs to have snow covered access to the ski strip.

19:50:51 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- FAA advisory circular AC 150/5300-13A defines the spacing requirement.

19:51:00 From Lars to Everyone:

- How about giving the actual users of this airport more of a voice?

19:53:01 From Lars to Everyone:

- The old Master plan called for more tiedowns and yet DOT keeps reducing the numbers of Tiedowns and there is no money to buy land to the south: etc.

19:53:08 From Robert Kelly to Everyone:

- When would construction begin on whichever of these alternatives are approved?

19:53:14 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- I did not see the 300ft part listed in AC 150/5300-13A though. I only observed 700ft for simultaneous ops. Can I get a reference for where to research this 300ft portion?

19:54:11 From 70 North to Everyone:

- Why is closing the gravel strip not an alternative? And if it was closed how does that change AIP funding matrix?

19:54:20 From Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor, DOT&PF to Everyone:

- Abe, the 300' separation is in the proposed 150/5300-13B.

19:54:36 From Lars to Everyone:

- Closing the gravel strip?

19:54:36 From Shelly Wade, Agnew::Beck to Everyone:

- Abe, the 300' separation is in the proposed 150/5300-13B.

19:55:06 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- So that means it's not in there currently?

19:55:09 From David Baldwin to Everyone:

- Would hope that the proposed Transit and car parking is not put in harm's way, in line with the runways. The recent MD-87 excursion into a pasture a good example, that would have been worse, if such items were in its way... we also had gliders forced to release and land beyond the runway, and an aircraft lose power and flip in the general area of the proposed transit parking recently....

19:55:16 From Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor, DOT&PF to Everyone:

- Abe, correct.

19:55:22 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- That would explain why I didn't see it.

19:55:23 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- Thanks.

19:56:07 From Lars to Everyone:

- As I said: That 300 feet deal I have never seen or heard of.

19:58:57 From Lars to Everyone:

- Well, Birchwood Airport Assn collected and documented more opinions from more airport users than DOT did.

19:59:09 From Abe Harman to Everyone:

- I think it would be cool if the users could propose their own alternative, and we could discuss feasibility of implementing that plan with regard to regulatory requirements, AIP fund restrictions, etc.

20:00:12 From Lars to Everyone:

- Shelly Wade, you really need to use better internet access for these Zoom meetings. It's a real issue.

20:00:32 From Gabe Niesen to Everyone:

- 100% agree Abe. May be like herding cats but knowing the constraints we're working within I think the users could come up with a compelling plan.

20:01:30 From Tom to Everyone:

- The gravel runway is critical for those of us with tundra tires and skis

20:02:20 From Lars to Everyone:

- Gravel Runway and Ski-strip is crucial also for flight Training in this area.

20:02:30 From Rob to Everyone:

- Yes I tried to login at 4 mins early and the meeting would not load either from my Zoom or the project page and kicked me off three times, thus I dialed in late.

20:02:41 From Brian Walch to Everyone:

- Is there an email list? I heard about this from a Facebook group, but I don't always check Facebook. Best way to stay informed?

20:03:11 From Lars to Everyone:

- Best way to stay informed? join Birchwood Airport Assn.

20:03:22 From Jessica Wuttke-Campoamor, DOT&PF to Everyone:

- Brian, please email Shelly or me and we'll get you added. [Jessica.wuttke-campoamor@alaska.gov](mailto:Jessica.wuttke-campoamor@alaska.gov).

20:03:33 From Brian Walch to Everyone:

- Great, thanks!

20:03:57 From Robert Kelly to Everyone:

- I am a member of Birchwood Airport Association but have not heard anything from them...

20:04:27 From Lars to Everyone:

- Robert Kelly update your info with us

20:04:33 From Rob to Everyone:

- [birchwoodairportassociation@gmail.com](mailto:birchwoodairportassociation@gmail.com) to join or use Facebook and go to our page.

20:04:42 From Robert Kelly to Everyone:

- I have several times...

20:05:03 From Robert Kelly to Everyone:

- Don't and won't use Facebook.

**\*Note: The chat has been preserved to reflect an accurate depiction of the meeting.**

**Participants – \*Note: The attendance list reflects how meeting participants identified themselves on Zoom during the meeting.**

Abe Harman	Lambert De Gavere	Rob
Ben Herning	Lars Gleitsmann	Robin D.
Brian Walch	Matt Freeman	Steve
Dave Swartz	Matthew Hansen	Thomas
David Baldwin	Paul Schneider	Tom
Della Swartz	Representative Ken McCarty	70 North
Dennis Serie	Robert Brennan	(303) 907-8541
Gabe Niesen	Robert Kelly	(907) 230-9425
Jason Wells	Tom George (AOPA)	(907) 301-9137
Jeffrey Banks	Val Jokela	(907) 644-0673
Jim Somerville	Debra	(907) 830-1996
Kimberly Collins	Mark	