

# DRAFT

## Pitkin County Website Public Comments Through End of Comment Period (10/4/2017) and Responses

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
Paul McDonough	August 27, 2017	Wonderful news! We are looking forward to finally getting a state of the art terminal and runway! Our family has enjoyed our 2nd home and the area for decades, however the getting to and fro has always been the worst part! We would love to the improved efficiencies and amenities of a new terminal! Also, a longer runway would allow more direct flights, leading to more skiers & customers to our businesses!	Thank you for your comment. Please note that the project does not include a longer runway, rather a relocated runway to account for FAA design standards which allow the new generation of regional jets. Your comments have been noted.
Howard Vagneur	August 28, 2017	Hi, I've reviewed all of your plans, drafts, etc. and it appears to me that you only address areas at the airport. An Extended current EA is needed for areas outside the airport envelope. I have been impacted by low flying, loud and off course aircraft over my property in Woody Creek for many years impacting my property and lowering the property value. Past advisement to airport authorities have fallen on deaf ears. HV	<p>Thank you for your comment. Your comments have been noted. The FAA has the authority and responsibility, consistent with NEPA and CEQ, to prepare and issue guidance for the preparation of environmental documents addressing FAA actions. The FAA has published such guidance and Airport Sponsors are required to follow that guidance when preparing EA's.</p> <p>Preparation of the Draft EA followed the required policies, procedures, and guidelines as outlined in FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures and Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions. These orders outline FAA accepted methodologies, methods, models, techniques, and thresholds of significance for the impact assessment and preparation of EA documents. The EA was prepared in compliance with NEPA, and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations. All environmental documents prepared under FAA oversight follow and adhere to these same Orders, setting national standards for the preparation of environmental documentation. Based on this evaluation, no significant noise impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project relative to federal thresholds. The Airport cannot restrict aircraft from flying in and out of ASE, as it is a public use airport.</p>
Ron Thompson	August 30, 2017	I fail to remember the voters approving an enlargement to the airport and you work for the voters. This voter is against your plan. Enlarging the airport will	Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been noted. The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) will be presented with the EA and all comments during fall 2017. At this point the BOCC will vote whether to



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>fundamentally change our city, we are popular because of our small town charming character.</p> <p>Our commissioners and the city council disrespect the federal government's immigration laws, therefore if you go ahead with this costly plan you should have a strategy for how to fund it without federal funds.</p>	<p>submit the document to the FAA. Should the BOCC submit the document to the FAA, the FAA will complete its federal finding. Once the FAA completes its federal finding, the County will be free to move forward with the projects. This action requires approval of the BOCC, but does not require a direct vote by the community.</p>
Peter Grenney	August 30, 2017	<p>Section - 2.2.2 Terminal Circulation Road Requirements and Parking Needs - seems outdated based on 2012 parking calculations. How is the parking management plan accounting for car-share, ride-share, autonomous vehicles, and e-bikes? Is there any opportunity to make the terminal a shared hub for other regional transportation services (i.e. Union Station) whether it's for buses, shuttles, shared rides, etc.?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been noted. The 2012 parking calculations were the most recent information on airport parking needs at the time of the Master Plan. It was not within the scope of this EA to update those numbers. Relative to your question on parking, the site plan covered in the EA plans for keeping the existing number of parking spaces due to lack of funding for a potential parking garage. The need for a general parking study for the entire valley has been identified due to broader parking needs, but it is assumed that due to limited parking, users will have to use other methods of transportation such as public transit, ride sharing, etc. The site plan includes a more intuitive link to the RFTA station to streamline ease of use of the public transportation system. Final details relative to these elements will be included in the final design.</p>
Name not shown	September 11, 2017	<p><b>MOST IMPORTANT:</b> When did citizens approve an enlargement to the airport? Can we bring torches to these meetings? This expansion is being crammed down the community's throat---just like all the new government buildings only the bureaucrats hungry for more power want in our little village. Geez. The Aspen Mayor and his Troika bypassed us citizens for the 47' foot City Hall with a 1500 sq. foot office with shower for the City Manager. When the newly hired airport director ---from .....get ready....LAX ----came into Rotary (typically a pro business group) to talk about the new plan in glowing (in his mind) and positive (in his mind) terms like "gargantuan" and "huge," I was told to shut up afterwards and not to mention it. HAHABA Remember, commissioners ---you work for us voters. A majority of voters are against your plan. This bears repeating: " Enlarging the airport will fundamentally change our city; we are popular because of our small town charming character."</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been noted. The Board of County Commissioners will be presented with the EA and all comments during fall 2017. At this point they will vote whether to submit the document to the FAA. Should the BOCC submit the document to the FAA, the FAA will complete its federal finding. Once the FAA completes its federal finding, the County will be free to move forward with the projects. This action requires approval of the BOCC, but does not require a direct vote by the community. None of the proposed projects would have any significant impacts relative to federal thresholds.</p>
Name not shown	September 23, 2017	<p>Some 50 years ago an article about the necessity of keeping our airport small appeared in the Aspen Times. Of course the financial interests ignored it as</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been noted. No significant impact has been identified from the projects relative to air quality</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>they will ignore it now. It is a shame that in a world gone bad with global warming and an ignorant upper class that we cannot find something better to do with this money. My absentee neighbors are all cutthroat CEOs with no morality. They want to come and go, if they do at all, in the largest possible contrivance. This would be a private jet with a wingspan that surpasses that of 15 tall men lying head to toe. Think of these men as dead and you will get a real picture of what global warming and unrestrained opulence brings.</p>	<p>or greenhouse gas emissions and therefore, no mitigation is required as part of the proposed projects. However, the Airport recognizes the importance of climate change and has been working with Pitkin County and the City of Aspen on the climate action planning to determine if there are ways to incorporate GHG minimization (such as preconditioned air, electric hook ups, sustainable terminal design) into the project or into other areas of the Airport.</p>
Peg O'Brien	September 25, 2017	<p>Please protect the air quality of the residential and recreational areas beneath the flight path.</p> <p>Data collection (on the mesa above the Woody Creek Post Office, on airport mesa above Jaffee Park, and others locales beneath the flight path - during on, off, and shoulder seasons), and analysis (perhaps involving a 3rd party environmental science group who would provide recommendations), followed by creation and strict enforcement of emissions regulations, may be appropriate. The Aspen-Valley-appropriate air quality regulations could then be used to guide decisions on types and numbers of planes allowed, which could inform the airport design.</p> <p>Thank you. Respectfully, Peg O'Brien WC Metro President</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been noted. No significant impact has been identified from the projects relative to air quality or greenhouse gas emissions relative to federal thresholds and therefore, no mitigation relative to this is required as part of the proposed projects. Because the Airport is a public use airport, it cannot restrict aircraft from flying into or out of the valley due to federal grant assurances (with the exception of a limited curfew in place that is grandfathered in). However, the Airport recognizes the importance of climate change and has been working with Pitkin County and the City of Aspen on the climate action planning to determine if there are ways to incorporate GHG minimization (such as preconditioned air, electric hook ups, sustainable terminal design) into the project or into other areas of the Airport.</p>
Bert Myrin	September 25, 2017	<p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I support the current flight curfew going forward. I am concerned about the potential for larger commercial and private jets. I support "The Ridge" terminal area improvement because the exterior appearance is smaller in scale, with a low profile roof that hugs the landscape.</p> <p>Additionally, the open interior makes wayfinding intuitive and the enormous windows provide a sense of place that is unique to Aspen. If it were up to me (which it's not), I'd support all improvements proposed except those necessary to accommodate larger jets. The projection of 74,190 additional annual visitors in 2033 with the runway project seems incompatible with maintaining the small-town character of Aspen. Thanks again for the opportunity to comment. - Bert Myrin</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Your comments have been noted. The existing curfew at ASE is grandfathered in place and will remain in place going forward. The addition of larger aircraft was modeled and found to have no significant impact on elements such as noise and air quality relative to federal thresholds. Because the Airport is a public use airport, it cannot restrict aircraft from flying into or out of the valley due to federal grant assurances.</p> <p>The concept for the terminal will be finalized during the design phase of the terminal, if the project moves forward, and will take additional public input during that process on items like "fitting into the landscape", wayfinding, etc.</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
<p>The North 40 HOA and Board - Michael Wessler (President) - Amy Barrow - Jeremy Barbin - Andrew Lodge - Jay Maytin - Jared Thompson - Pete Yang</p>	<p>September 25, 2017</p>	<p>The North 40 subdivision is hereby submitting their comments and requests for modification of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport (ASE) Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) and subsequent improvements to the airport. North 40 is a residential neighborhood comprised of approximately 70 deed restricted units in Pitkin County just outside the City of Aspen. Many of these units are occupied by families with children. All units are occupied year-round. Our community also maintains a field and children’s park which is shared with the community at large. Our neighborhood is adjacent to Colorado Mountain College’s (CMC) Aspen campus.</p> <p>The Aspen/Pitkin County Airport’s GA apron, runway, and taxiway are directly across Hwy 82 from North 40. This is where most private jets park and all airplanes must travel past when taxiing, arriving, or departing. The planes are visible from the North 40 field, park, and some of the houses. The airplanes’ noise and exhaust fumes affect the field, park, and all units to varying degrees – see Figure 4.11-3 and 4.11-4. Section 2.2.4 of the Draft EA acknowledges the impacts the airport has on the surrounding area including North 40 and Aspen Airport Business Center (ABC).</p> <p>“The need to reduce apron noise on surrounding communities. Coordination with the public during the Master Plan Update identified noise from the GA apron as a substantial concern for the businesses and residences near the Airport Business Center. The GA apron can be very busy during peak times in the summer and the winter, with numerous business jets parked. Jets are generally parked with Auxiliary Power Units (APUs) running, facing Highway 82 and the Airport Business Center (ABC). These units are run prior to taking off, during maintenance, and sometimes for hours while waiting for clients. This creates noise in the surrounding community. While this project is not directly related to the needed terminal improvements, its need could be addressed at about the same time as the terminal improvements.”</p> <p>Before proceeding, I want to note that we did move here knowing and accepting that our proximity to the airport would have implications on our daily life. I would also like to add that the airport does a good job of complying with the flight curfew at night between 10 pm – 7 am. During hours of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been noted. No significant impact has been identified from the projects relative to air quality or greenhouse gas emissions relative to federal thresholds. Because the Airport is a public use airport, it cannot restrict aircraft from flying into or out of the valley due to federal grant assurances (with the exception of the grandfathered curfew already in place). As part of the Airport Master Plan, the communities’ concern over APU use was documented, and as part of the process, the proposed noise wall between the Airport and Highway 82 was included in the EA to help address community concerns. Final material choice and height would be determined during the design phase. Changing the direction of the parked aircraft or run time of the APU is generally dependent on apron space and is managed by the Fixed Base Operator and the pilots, and is under their discretion and can’t be regulatorily limited. Any changes to those procedures would need to be coordinated with the FBO and the pilots and would be voluntary. It is not included in the scope of this EA. Additionally, the Airport recognizes the communities’ concerns about noise, air quality and climate change and has been working with Pitkin County and the City of Aspen on the climate action planning to determine if there are ways to incorporate GHG minimization (such as preconditioned air, electric hook ups, sustainable terminal design) into the project or into other areas of the Airport. These elements will be examined further during the terminal design phase and will include additional public involvement. The phasing out of Avgas is not included in the scope of this EA. However, the FAA is working nationally to move toward eliminating lead based fuels. Piston-engine aircraft operating in the United States rely on aviation gasoline (avgas) to power their aircraft, however, these aircraft are slowly working their way out of the fleet. To help "get the lead out," FAA is supporting the research of alternate fuels at the William J. Hughes Technical Center in Atlantic City. They are working with the aircraft and engine manufacturers, fuel producers, the EPA and industry associations to overcome technical and logistical challenges to developing and deploying a new, unleaded fuel. Your comments regarding the future intersections are noted. These were included because they are on the CDOT plan, however, the site plans for the redeveloped east side do not include the</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>operation, the airport generally emits constant background noise with noticeably louder noise levels during takeoff and landing. This is to be expected. What was a surprise to us is the additional noise and exhaust fumes emitted while planes sit on the apron waiting to park, taxi, and / or take off. They generally run their Auxiliary Power Units (APU) during this time. This is exacerbated by the winds which sometimes blow east across the runway towards North 40. This leads to noise and exhaust fumes that are so bad that we have had to leave the park and close the windows at our house. These symptoms happen with varying frequency throughout the year but worse case is multiple times a week during busy seasons.</p> <p>I understand that the Draft EA has deemed the additional noise and emissions of a redeveloped airport to be negligible and therefore are not requiring mitigating steps to address them as part of this environmental assessment. But it would be a missed opportunity to redevelop the airport and not address the issues of noise and air pollution, even at current levels. I request that you include the following additions to the Draft Environment Assessment to address these environmental effects at the North 40 and surrounding areas. Some of these suggestions would also reduce pollution in the greater Aspen/Pitkin County community.</p> <p>Noise/Visual Buffer</p> <p>a. Figure 1-1 (and other similar Figures) depicts a Noise/Visual Buffer along the east side of the GA apron. Section 4.11.2.2 describes construction options of a wall and / or berm: “For the Terminal Alternatives, the location of the terminal and apron would change and there would be an addition of a noise wall/berm on the ramp between the aircraft parking area and the North 40 community.” Different heights are discussed. The addition of a noise/visual buffer is not a requirement of this document but instead is a suggested additional project.</p> <p>b. Strongly support the development of a Noise/Visual Buffer between the airport and North 40.</p> <p>c. Recommend the 14’ high option along the east (North 40) side of the GA apron. Construction consisting of a sound wall on the airport side and an earthen half-mound on the Hwy 82 / North 40 side.</p>	<p>development of the additional intersection as it was determined to not be needed in the reasonably foreseeable future. There is however no plan to remove the southernmost intersection. Thank you for your additions relative to the parks and land use. Those will be added to the final EA.</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>d. Additionally, suggest adding a 10' high earthen berm north to the far end of the FBO and south to the far end of the parking lots.</p> <p>e. The materials used for the berm should come from the demolition of the old terminal and excavation for the new terminal and other improvements. This would greatly reduce the amount of fill being sent to the Pitkin County Landfill. This will also offset the cost of the berm.</p> <p>f. Building a 14' sound wall with earthen berm along the GA apron and 10' earthen berm in front of the FBO and parking / terminal will help contain noise and pollution within the airport.</p> <p>g. This will benefit North 40, CMC, Firehouse, and ABC. Will also benefit the Pitkin County Landfill.</p> <p>2) Change Direction of Parked Planes</p> <p>a. The Draft EA does not specify the direction planes should be parked on the apron. Currently airplanes are parked with their tails (and exhaust) facing North 40.</p> <p>b. Request that the orientation of parked airplanes on the apron be changed 180 degrees so that their noses are facing highway 82 / North 40.</p> <p>c. Changing the direction planes park on the apron will redirect the noise and exhaust of taxiing and APU's away from North 40.</p> <p>d. This will benefit North 40, CMC, Firehouse, and ABC.</p> <p>3) Limit APU Runtime</p> <p>a. The Draft EA does not include any reference to the benefit of limiting APU runtimes.</p> <p>b. Recommend implementing new policy that would limit APU runtime to 15 minutes and instigate penalties for overages.</p> <p>c. Extend an area to the far north (down valley) end of the airport where longer runtimes are allowed specifically for safety or maintenance.</p> <p>d. Rules will also need to be in place that would prevent pilots from running the airplane engines to provide the same services the APU normally does which would clearly circumvent any benefit of restricting APU runtime, possibly causing even more pollution.</p>	



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>e. Implementing a maximum time limit on how long an APU can be run will reduce the amount of noise and air pollution emitted by airplanes on the apron.</p> <p>f. This will benefit North 40 and the environment in general.</p> <p>4) APU Alternatives</p> <p>a. Section 4.1.4 of the Draft EA suggests exploring funding to provide alternatives to APU's: "Pitkin County will explore obtaining FAA Voluntary Airport Low Emission (VALE) funding for the installation of preconditioned air and ground power to enable airlines to reduce their use of APUs."</p> <p>b. Strongly support adding conditioned air and power infrastructure for both commercial and private aircraft as an alternative to using APU's – like electric car charging stations.</p> <p>c. Implementing electrical alternatives to APU's will reduce the amount of noise and air pollution emitted by airplanes while parked on the apron.</p> <p>d. This will benefit North 40 and the environment in general.</p> <p>5) Lead Emitting Fuels</p> <p>a. Section 4.1.1 states that 30,000 gallons of lead emitting fuel is used at ASE each year: Approximately 30,000 gallons of Avgas was consumed in 2015 in contrast to approximately 6 million gallons of JetA. Avgas emits lead, but was not evaluated because it is used in small quantities at ASE relative to JetA.</p> <p>b. Request the phasing out of Avgas which is described in the Draft EA as a lead emitting fuel.</p> <p>c. Eliminating lead emitting fuels will benefit North 40 and the environment in general.</p> <p>6) Hwy 82 Access</p> <p>a. Figure 1-1 (and other similar Figures) suggests an additional intersection between Hwy 82 and airport parking: "Future intersection per CDOT access control plan" .</p>	



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>b. Recommend limiting access between Hwy 82 and the airport to existing FBO and Baltic Ave intersections. Remove the existing third, southernmost intersection. And do not develop the “ Future intersection per CDOT access control plan”.</p> <p>c. Currently drivers attempt to circumvent morning traffic by exiting Hwy 82 at the FBO or Baltic Avenue and re-entering Hwy 82 at the southernmost entrance. This causes additional congestion and associated emissions on Hwy 82.</p> <p>d. Limiting intersections between Hwy 82 and the airport frontage road to the FBO and Baltic Avenue will benefit Hwy 82 commuters and the environment by reducing morning traffic congestion and emissions.</p> <p>The following comments are meant to clarify existing information contained in the Draft EA.</p> <p>1) Affected Environment</p> <p>a. Section 4.5.1 of the Draft EA states that the closest public park / playground to the airport is Harmony Park at Burlingame which is about ½ mile from the airport.</p> <p>b. North 40 owns and/ or operates three parks, the largest and most regularly used is a children’s park immediately adjacent to CMC. This park is about 650 feet from the airport. It is regularly used by children from both the North 40 subdivision and the community at large – CMC houses ballet, camps, etc. and participants and family members regularly use it.</p> <p>2) Land Use</p> <p>a. Section 4.9.1.1 of the Draft EA identifies existing land use in the vicinity of ASE. Reference is made to the North 40 subdivision but it is not described in detail in this section.</p> <p>b. Request adding language to this section that clarifies that North 40 is a residential neighborhood with approximately 72 deed restricted year-round residences.</p> <p>c. Additionally, add a reference to North 40 on Figure 4.9-1</p> <p>Approximately</p>	



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>30,000 gallons of Avgas was consumed in 2015 in contrast to approximately 6 million gallons of JetA. Avgas emits lead, but was not evaluated because it is used in small quantities at ASE relative to JetA.</p> <p>b. Request the phasing out of Avgas which is described in the Draft EA as a lead emitting fuel.</p> <p>c. Eliminating lead emitting fuels will benefit North 40 and the environment in general.</p> <p>6) Hwy 82 Access</p> <p>a. Figure 1-1 (and other similar Figures) suggests an additional intersection between Hwy 82 and airport parking: “Future intersection per CDOT access control plan” .</p> <p>b. Recommend limiting access between Hwy 82 and the airport to existing FBO and Baltic Ave intersections. Remove the existing third, southernmost intersection. And do not develop the “ Future intersection per CDOT access control plan”.</p> <p>c. Currently drivers attempt to circumvent morning traffic by exiting Hwy 82 at the FBO or Baltic Avenue and re-entering Hwy 82 at the southernmost entrance. This causes additional congestion and associated emissions on Hwy 82.</p> <p>d. Limiting intersections between Hwy 82 and the airport frontage road to the FBO and Baltic Avenue will benefit Hwy 82 commuters and the environment by reducing morning traffic congestion and emissions.</p> <p>The following comments are meant to clarify existing information contained in the Draft EA.</p> <p>1) Affected Environment</p> <p>a. Section 4.5.1 of the Draft EA states that the closest public park / playground to the airport is Harmony Park at Burlingame which is about ½ mile from the airport.</p> <p>b. North 40 owns and/ or operates three parks, the largest and most regularly used is a children’s park immediately adjacent to CMC. This park is about 650 feet from the airport. It is regularly used by children from both the North 40 subdivision and the community at large – CMC houses ballet, camps, etc. and participants and family members regularly use it.</p>	



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>2) Land Use</p> <p>a. Section 4.9.1.1 of the Draft EA identifies existing land use in the vicinity of ASE. Reference is made to the North 40 subdivision but it is not described in detail in this section.</p> <p>b. Request adding language to this section that clarifies that North 40 is a residential neighborhood with approximately 72 deed restricted year-round residences.</p> <p>c. Additionally, add a reference to North 40 on Figure 4.9-1</p>	
Lee Mulcahy	September 23, 2017	<p>Subject: New airport expansion</p> <p>Comment: Why are we not allowed to vote on the airport expansion? It's just like the new City Hall that is larger than the Art Museum----the voters get no input on whether we want it or not. This giant expansion is not in line with the community's desire to maintain our rural and small town character. Shame on you politicians!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been noted. The Board of County Commissioners will be presented with the EA and all comments during fall 2017. At this point they will vote whether or not to submit the document to the FAA. Should the BOCC submit the document to the FAA, the FAA will complete its federal finding. Once the FAA completes its federal finding, the County will be free to move forward with the projects. This action requires approval of the BOCC, but does not require a direct vote by the community.</p>
Nancy Tate Hall	August 25, 2017	<p>Subject: Airport Expansion Concerns</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>I realize that many people are all excited about recent projections of increased flights and larger aircraft in order to bring in all those tourist dollars. Does anyone ever bring up the fact that the airport happens to be surrounded by residential neighborhoods which are already negatively impacted by airport noise and pollution? Who wants to live near DIA? Do you hear from concerned homeowners? Aspen is considered to be a very environmentally conscious community which is "soooo" green and progressive--on top of the climate change issue, and recycling, composting, etc. What is this rumor about reversing the landing direction from up valley to down valley which requires flying over neighborhoods like Meadowood? I hear the 7 am flights every day since you moved the runway 1,000 feet closer to town and promised that "this was it". Plans for the new airport show the de-icing area moving closer up valley also which is extremely noisy. It is obvious that the airport needs to be spiffed up a bit, but it's still pretty cool in its present state,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been noted. No significant impact has been identified from the projects relative to noise, air quality or greenhouse gas emissions relative to federal thresholds. Because the Airport is a public use airport, it cannot restrict aircraft from flying into or out of the valley due to federal grant assurances. However, the Airport recognizes the importance of climate change and has been working with Pitkin County and the City of Aspen on the climate action planning to determine if there are ways to incorporate GHG minimization (such as preconditioned air, electric hook ups, sustainable terminal design) into the project or into other areas of the Airport. This EA does not include any changes to the flight procedures to approach over Aspen. Commercial service aircraft generally arrive from the north and depart to the north. The EA assumes no substantial changes to these approach and departures. The slight change in deicing area should not significantly change the noise.</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>and certainly convenient. I fear the "new and improved" airport has gotten out of hand and could be the nail in the coffin in terms of quality of life for people who actually live here. The airport issue has always been a hot one and will continue to be because it is basically in the wrong location! Therefore, whatever happens needs to be modest, efficient, and sensitive to its potentially disastrous environmental impact on nearby Roaring Fork Valley residents. I have attended several of the planning and feedback sessions. Seems only the positive remarks get posted and the others ignored.</p>	<p>The FAA and County believe that the EA provides an appropriate assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed actions both for existing conditions and under reasonably foreseeable conditions in accordance with all FAA Orders and guidance and the requirements of NEPA.</p>
Nancy MacKenzie	October 3, 2017	<p>"The Woody Creek Caucus contact the airport officials and the county commissioners informing them that the current environmental assessment does not take into account the specific conditions of a high altitude narrow mountain valley and that we request an independent and unbiased study that includes; air quality, emergency response, and noise issues in accordance with our Master Plan."</p> <p>We are contacting you now because at the May 27, 2017 monthly meeting of the Woody Creek Caucus the above motion concerning the current environmental assessment of the Pitkin County Airport was unanimously approved. As background information for you, Resolution No. PZ 2016-08 of the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission adopted the 2016 Woody Creek Caucus Master Plan. We request that you become familiar with Chapter 2* which is specifically addresses our concerns with the Pitkin County Airport. The Woody Creek Caucus supports the existing curfew, safety restrictions on GA aircraft, current operating hours, and noise abatement restrictions. We also support variable takeoff headings so that no one neighborhood receives all the noise impacts. We support future elimination of Stage 2 aircraft and do not support expansion of facilities that would allow louder, larger, and heavier aircraft, to use the airport. We strongly support a cap of 125,000 pounds gross weight for aircraft using Sardy Field. We continue to support safe operation of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport and all efforts to minimize impacts on residents of Woody Creek and the surrounding area. Our airport should be sized to our small mountain community, in keeping with the rural character of the resort. The Caucus is concerned that, while the future air service planning study supports airport expansion, it fails to study alternatives that relate to</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been noted. We appreciate your support of the existing curfew, safety restrictions, current operating hours and the existing noise abatement procedures, along with the elimination of Stage 2 aircraft. Please note, all Stage 2 aircraft are now banned from not only Aspen/Pitkin County Airport but all airports within the United States, with a few exceptions.</p> <p>The Airport has historically operated with a Modification of Standards (MOD), essentially a waiver, from the FAA due to the existing runway and taxiway separation distance being less than the national standard. In response to this MOD the County has implemented an aircraft restriction that restricts aircraft with a wing span of 95 feet or greater from operating at the Airport. After the completion of the 2012 Airport Master Plan and the accompanying Airport Layout Plan, the FAA changed their National Policy regarding MOD's nationwide and determined that they would not grant any additional MOD's and that all existing ones needed to be corrected if at all feasible, and the FAA would not approve the Airport Layout Plan for the airport until that analysis was completed.</p> <p>In response to that decision, the Airport undertook an Air Service Planning Study to evaluate feasible alternatives to meet the national design standards to eliminate the Modification of Standards. The Study evaluated over 30 separate alternatives to achieve compliance with the design standards, with the final approved recommendation being to shift the runway to west 80 feet</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>the health, welfare, safety and capacity of our valley. Therefore, we recommend that the Environmental Assessment and any ultimate decision regarding airport improvements consider alternatives. Develop an alternative that limits the airport to commercial regional jets and private aircraft with a gross landing weight of no more than a maximum 125,000 pounds. Because of our altitude and the nature of our topography, larger airplanes would create unacceptable burdens of noise and toxic pollutants for the many residents near the airport and for many miles down valley. In general, we believe that bringing more air traffic to Sardy Field is not in the best interest of the community.</p> <p>The valley is too confined. In addition, the airport is dangerously close to Aspen, the North Forty neighborhood, and large-scale events at Buttermilk. Emergency response in our narrow valley is a continued concern. Even now there is no way we could handle an emergency such as happened March 29, 2001 when a chartered business jet crashed near Shale Bluffs and all three crew members and fifteen passengers on board perished. It has become increasingly evident that the restricted air space in the Aspen area creates a conflict between ever-increasing numbers of private aircraft and commercial service. Large numbers of private aircraft should not be allowed to crowd out commercial flights. This is one more example that one size does not fit all situations. The FAA should modify its regulations in the case of an airport with a single runway located in a confined, high altitude, narrow valley.</p> <p>2*</p> <p>WOODY CREEK CAUCUS MASTER PLAN 2016 Pitkin County Airport Policy Statement: The Woody Creek Caucus supports the existing curfew, safety restrictions on GA aircraft, current operating hours, and noise abatement restrictions. We also support variable takeoff headings so that no one neighborhood receives all the noise impacts. We support future elimination of Stage 2 aircraft and do not support expansion of facilities that would allow louder, larger, and heavier aircraft, such as the 737, to use the</p>	<p>and to widen it to 100 feet. Again, this was done in response to the FAA requirements and was not initiated by the Airport or the County.</p> <p>The runway relocation will allow aircraft with wingspans up to but less than 118 feet, as opposed to the 95-foot limitation today. Many of the new generation aircraft of that size are quieter than the aircraft operating today. The new runway is planned to accommodate aircraft with a weight of approximately 150,000 pounds.</p> <p>The Airport Layout Plan was updated to reflect the Air Service Planning Study recommendation and approved by the FAA. This included an approval of the future forecasts of aviation activity. The FAA then awarded a grant to the County to prepare an FAA required Environmental Assessment pursuant to appropriate FAA Orders and guidance. The FAA requires a comprehensive evaluation of project impacts, including but not limited to: biological; historical and archeological; noise; air quality; wetlands; traffic and socio-economic impacts. To accomplish this analysis the County hired independent experts, procured through a process overseen by the FAA. These experts have conducted an independent analysis as required by the FAA Orders and the National Environmental Policy Act, based on an approved, reasonably foreseeable aviation activity and fleet mix based on the proposed project. The proposed reasonably foreseeable number of operations and fleet mix analyzed in the EA includes the addition of larger aircraft including the CS100 and the 737. Based on these factors, the proposed actions are not anticipated to have any significant impacts relative to noise or air quality.</p> <p>Based on existing statutes, grant assurances (contract requirements) and Federal preemption requirements, the Airport must remain open to all users at all times and cannot discriminate between users; i.e., commercial service and general aviation aircraft. The existing curfew and wingspan restriction would not be possible to implement today. The curfew is “grandfathered” since it has been in place prior to the statute addressing airport use restrictions was passed and cannot be amended or the existing curfew would</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>airport. We strongly support a cap of 125,000 pounds gross weight for aircraft using Sardy Field. We continue to support safe operation of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport and all efforts to minimize impacts on residents of Woody Creek and the surrounding area. Our airport should be sized to our small mountain community, in keeping with the rural character of the resort.</p> <p>The Caucus is concerned that, while the future air service planning study supports airport expansion, it fails to study alternatives that relate to the health, welfare, safety and capacity of our valley. Therefore, we recommend that the Environmental Assessment and any ultimate decision regarding airport improvements consider alternatives. Develop an alternative that limits the airport to commercial regional jets and private aircraft with a gross landing weight of no more than a maximum 125,000 pounds. Because of our altitude and the nature of our topography, larger airplanes would create unacceptable burdens of noise and toxic pollutants for the many residents near the airport and for many miles down valley.</p> <p>In general, we believe that bringing more air traffic to Sardy Field is not in the best interest of the community. The valley is too confined. In addition, the airport is dangerously close to Aspen, the North Forty neighborhood, and large-scale events at Buttermilk. Emergency response in our narrow valley is a continued concern. Even now there is no way we could handle an emergency such as happened March 29, 2001 when a chartered business jet crashed near Shale Bluffs and all three crew members and fifteen passengers on board perished. It has become increasingly evident that the restricted air space in the Aspen area creates a conflict between ever-increasing numbers of private aircraft and commercial service. Large numbers of private aircraft should not be allowed to crowd out commercial flights. This is one more example that one size does not fit all situations. The FAA should modify its regulations in the case of an airport with a single runway located in a confined, high altitude, narrow valley.</p> <p>2*</p> <p>WOODY CREEK CAUCUS MASTER PLAN 2016 Pitkin County Airport</p>	<p>be invalidated entirely. The Airport cannot dictate the type of aircraft an operator uses, the origin or destination of those aircraft and the times the aircraft fly, within our curfew limits, the weight of aircraft, nor the number of aircraft that operate at the Airport.</p> <p>Following FAA Order 1050.1F guidance, impacts to local communities are generally analyzed based on the significance of noise impacts or required relocations that could fracture a community or otherwise disrupt the community physically or economically. Aircraft noise already exists from current operations, although no noise sensitive uses are located in significant aircraft noise exposed areas. The proposed actions are not expected to generate significant aircraft noise exposure. No homes, businesses or other community resources would need to be relocated. Additionally, no historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological sites are located within the project's area of potential effect (APE). No significant health effects are anticipated. No significant impacts on children's health of safety or schools are anticipated. Therefore, no significant impact on the local community or cultural values is expected as a result of the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>In terms of emergency preparedness and response, the Airport fully meets all Federal mandated staffing equipment and training requirements for any aircraft incidents. For an event occurring in the community, response would be led by the Aspen Fire District and their emergency aid partners in Snowmass, Basalt, Carbondale and Glenwood Springs.</p> <p>In response to your concern regarding light pollution, FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, states that there is no official significance threshold when analyzing impacts from light emissions. The metric for measuring impacts is generally a comparison between existing background lighting/visual impacts compared with the change proposed from the project. The Preferred Alternative includes only minor lighting improvements associated with the terminal improvements. Light emissions associated with the proposed terminal area improvements would be similar</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p><b>Policy Statement:</b>            The Woody Creek Caucus supports the existing curfew, safety restrictions on GA aircraft, current operating hours, and noise abatement restrictions. We also support variable takeoff headings so that no one neighborhood receives all the noise impacts. We support future elimination of Stage 2 aircraft and do not support expansion of facilities that would allow louder, larger, and heavier aircraft, such as the 737, to use the airport. We strongly support a cap of 125,000 pounds gross weight for aircraft using Sardy Field. We continue to support safe operation of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport and all efforts to minimize impacts on residents of Woody Creek and the surrounding area. Our airport should be sized to our small mountain community, in keeping with the rural character of the resort.</p> <p><b>Current status:</b>            Sardy Field is a valuable asset of the people of Pitkin County. The airport is a vitally important facility for the economy of the area, for the way we function as a whole community, and as a major link in the transportation chain of the Roaring Fork Valley. Even so, in its growth and development over the past decades, the airport has become a source of controversy. In view of the fact that Woody Creek is one of the affected communities directly under the flight path, we have in the past been a voice in this controversy and are concerned with noise impacts, air pollution impacts, and safety considerations.</p> <p><b>Current airport planning:</b>            Due to constant pressure from the business community and other special interest groups, there has been a prolonged effort to expand Sardy Field into a state-of-the-art, urban-style airport. The Caucus views the justification and predictions of future needs for this massive expansion with skepticism. Ultimately, it may not be in the best interests of the community at large, including Woody Creek.</p> <p>Beginning in 2010, a study was commissioned by the Pitkin County Commissioners and airport personnel on the adequacy of the airport terminal facilities for the future. Past studies have consistently overestimated the projected number of passengers using the airport. Although airport use</p>	<p>to those of the existing terminal. Additional lights from the terminal facility or parking areas would be shielded per the Design Guidelines to minimize impacts. Similarly, the relocation of runway and taxiway lighting for the airfield would not result in a drastic change from existing conditions. No additional runway lighting would be required but the runway lighting would be relocated 80 feet to the west. Therefore, lighting improvements associated with the terminal and runway projects are not expected to result in a significant impact.</p> <p>The FAA will review the Final EA, expected impacts, and proposed mitigation. If the impacts exceed the significance thresholds for any affected resource, the FAA may then recommend the preparation of an EIS. Should the impacts not exceed the significance thresholds for any affected resources; the FAA will likely prepare a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Record of Decision (ROD).</p> <p>We appreciate your concerns about the quality of life in the Valley. The Environmental Assessment being prepared for the proposed improvements is consistent with all FAA regulations and Orders, and other applicable regulations. We also appreciate your comments about the FAA modifying its regulations for a single runway airport located in a confined, high altitude, narrow mountain valley, but it is not within the purview of the County to challenge the existing regulations.</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>remained relatively flat over the past fifteen years, according to airport records, the study predicted significant passenger increases in the next 20 years, and therefore a need for a new \$80 to \$100-million-dollar terminal. The Pitkin County commissioners have approved this new terminal with the adoption of the 2012 Airport Master Plan. The County intends to conduct a multi-phased design process for this facility, which is to include comprehensive public input prior to construction.</p> <p>Predictably, there is now a follow-up study, “The ASE Future Air Service Planning Study,” that recommends expanding and strengthening the airport runways and allows for a second FBO operation, so as to increase air service to the airport, especially GA. The technical phases 1 and 2 of the study to expand the airport to the west were made with no public input, and specifically, no contact with the Woody Creek Caucus. Phase 3 is now in progress, calling for an Environmental Analysis as well as public input. However, the choices for the expansion and operation of the airport, which will be presented to the public, are limited to the results of Technical Phases 1 and 2. The claim of the “ASE Future Air Service Planning Study” is that, without a \$120 million to \$130 million expansion of the runway to accept a new generation of airplanes, Aspen will not have a viable service after 2021.</p> <p>Concerns of the Community:</p> <p>The Woody Creek Caucus is skeptical of the claim that there will not be a viable commercial service after 2021 without a huge expansion. Just in 2012, The Airport Master Plan stated that “no change will be made in the existing prohibitions on (1) aircraft with wingspans greater than 95 feet, and (2) aircraft weighing more than 100,000 pounds maximum gross landing weight.” However, it has recently been revealed that the FAA did not accept this portion of the Master Plan.</p> <p>We are opposed to a larger, urban-style airport close to the center of Aspen, with all of the negative impacts this could bring to Woody Creek and the community at large. The increased traffic of larger, heavier, more intrusive airplanes will dramatically increase the discomfort of the many residents around the airport and in the flight path. It would be yet another step in Aspen’s path toward commercialization and the loss of Aspen’s unique</p>	



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>character. The airspace and mountainous surrounds of the narrow valley at the entrance to Aspen is a constant.</p> <p>A larger airport will certainly increase the pressure on this environment and on the people who live in the valley. There will be more noise, more air pollution, more safety concerns, and more competition in our limited airspace between commercial and GA aircraft.</p> <p>In an issue of Snow Magazine some years ago, an article by Andrew Nemethy describes a theory about the rise and decline of tourist towns, which even 25 years ago was being seen in resorts east and west. The resort starts as an attractive small town with amenities and natural environments that attract many to settle there. These places are often small, with low traffic, low taxes, and a strong sense of community, set in a lovely rural landscape. Growth moratoriums are gradually put in place, with the result of raising the cost of real estate. The cost and the cost of living also rise and become too high for many residents. They must now travel to shop for basic needs. Traffic jams and higher rents – residential and commercial -- drive out the locals. As improved infrastructure is deemed necessary for all the traffic, taxes rise. New schools, hotels, and hospitals are required to serve the upscale population. This is a common pattern of development in desirable resort areas, including the Roaring Fork Valley. We in Woody Creek would like to put on the brakes and preserve some of the character of old Aspen and the appeal of the ski resort lifestyle. The local economy has become less driven by tourism and local residents than by construction and development or redevelopment and luxury maintenance. Suddenly the community needs an excessive amount of architects, planners, lawyers, designers, contractors, and trades people.</p> <p>Our government continues to grow, and it demands more taxes and more bureaucracy to keep pace with the growth. None of the decisions that create growth are based on the character of the town we want. Rather, they are based on the need to keep people who have moved here for economic reasons employed. Government and the commercial infrastructure have to keep growing. The perceived need to keep the tourist base ever growing creates an onerous spiral in which quantity overwhelms quality. Prices on businesses and real estate keep rising. Homes just built are remodeled every</p>	



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>several years. Chain stores replace small, locally owned shops. Prices go so high that locals don't even bother to shop locally. Our town begins to look like a small version of Los Angeles, New York, or Dallas. Folks don't mingle, and the sense of neighborliness has disappeared. The appeal and character are destroyed. People leave. Corporations arrive.</p> <p>Summary of the Airport Chapter:            The Caucus is concerned that, while the future air service planning study supports airport expansion, it fails to study alternatives that relate to the health, welfare, safety and capacity of our valley. Therefore, we recommend that the EA and any ultimate decision regarding airport improvements include consideration of the following alternatives:</p> <p>A. Develop an alternative which assumes airplanes currently serving the Aspen market or their equivalent will continue to be available beyond 2021; And/or            B. Develop an alternative that limits the airport to commercial regional jets and private aircraft with a gross landing weight of no more than a maximum 125,000 pounds. Because of our altitude and the nature of our topography, larger airplanes would create unacceptable burdens of noise and toxic pollutants for the many residents near the airport and for many miles down valley. Large airplanes such as 737s would severely impact the livability of the upper Roaring Fork Valley forever. Furthermore, our Alternative B is critical because the Aspen community does not have a large enough emergency capability or the infrastructure to manage a mishap involving larger airplanes.</p> <p>1. We are also concerned that runway expansion and strengthening to allow for larger regional commercial airplanes will open the airport to larger, heavier and louder aircraft, both commercial and private. The community has been promised for many years by various government boards that no 737-type aircraft would be allowed to use the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport. If this promise is not kept, the impacts of noise and air pollution, as well as growth generation, will be greatly increased. Larger aircraft such as the 737 require much larger and noisier engines. The Roaring Fork Valley would be changed forever if these heavy aircraft were allowed to operate here. If the airport must ultimately accept new regional jets, these should be limited to</p>	



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>commercial regional jets and private aircraft with a gross landing weight of no more than 125,000 pounds. The FAA should recognize that one size does not fit all. An airport at 8,000 feet in a narrow valley is in a very different environment than one on the plains at a lower altitude. Our valley has confined airspace, numerous homes around the airport and in the flight path, and decreased air circulation, resulting in more air pollution. The Aspen community should require flexibility in how the airport is operated, and not be forced to accept a standard that will damage the community and cause severe discomfort to its citizens.</p> <p>2. Our list of concerns includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise abatement.</li> </ul> <p>"As with most rural resort environments with low ambient noise levels, any noise emissions, especially during the evening hours, are a serious local environmental concern. Woody Creek is no exception. In addition, Aspen may be unique as a result of the increased sound transmissions in a low-humidity, high-altitude, valley constricted environment." -Brad Christopher, former airport manager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Light pollution</li> <li>• Air pollution. Jet fuel, the most toxic of pollutants, is often strongly present in our valley.</li> <li>• Larger, heavier, louder aircraft</li> <li>• Flight hazards. This valley is a problematic location for increased air traffic</li> <li>• Encouragement of growth from overbuilding the airport Increases in airport traffic will require commensurate growth in accommodations and accompanying development.</li> <li>• Degradation of our community's character</li> </ul> <p>3. In general, we believe that bringing more air traffic to Sandy Field is not in the best interest of the community. The valley is too confined. In addition, the airport is dangerously close to Aspen, the North Forty neighborhood, and large-scale events at Buttermilk.</p> <p>4. The new terminal is out of balance with the projected long-term population growth. A larger airport with more capacity will drive development.</p>	



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>5. Since the rationale for enlarging the airport is to enable it to accommodate the new generation of commercial regional jets, it should be possible for the commercial airlines to maintain their schedules. It has become increasingly evident that the restricted air space in the Aspen area creates a conflict between ever increasing numbers of private aircraft and commercial service. Large numbers of private aircraft should not be allowed to crowd out commercial flights. This is one more example that one size does not fit all situations. The FAA should modify its regulations in the case of an airport with a single runway located in a confined, high altitude, narrow valley. Thank you for your consideration of the concerns of Woody Creek.</p> <p>Woody Creek Caucus Nancy MacKenzie, Moderator</p>	
John Edwards	October 3, 2017	<p>I am opposed to the airport improvements for the following environmental reason: The expansion will impact the sensitive area including but not limited to wildlife, sensitive zones: wetlands, water flow, noise, and pollution. In addition, there is missing information due to assumptions that have not been articulate. For example, there are no noise measurements taken in flight pattern 7 to 14 miles away. The residue or unburned jet fuel has not been measured in this zone, as the high elevation of the runway created engine inefficiency. I am opposed to the terminal expansion: The expansion will impact the sensitive area including but not limited to Wildlife, sensitive zones: wetlands, water flow, noise and pollution.</p> <p>The economic projections regarding this project in my opinion use old data from the 2013 economic impact study for Colorado airports (new data will be surveyed in 2018). And is not a representative sample due to the seasonal nature of the airport. Skier visits are also flat or only slightly increasing. Traffic may be impacted. In addition, weather (wind, temperature and visibility) and altitude and weight of aircraft will reduce safety concerns. In an event of a large/ full bigger plane crash, medical facilities would be strained and perhaps insufficient to handle an event that I pray will never happen, (see 2002 private jet crash that killed 18 people). Please refer to the 2012 Airport Master plan for addition concerns of those who live in this valley or visit Aspen (there was an environment assessment in that report).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The analysis of aircraft noise exposure in this EA was prepared in compliance with FAA Order 1051.1F, Policies and Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts, and FAA Order 5050.4B, Airport Environmental Handbook. The Order that was in effect when the project was scoped was 1050.1F, which requires the use of noise exposure contours using the FAA’s Integrated Noise Model (INM) showing the area affected by 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) and greater noise levels. The INM is a state-of-the-art, FAA approved software program used to model the noise exposure levels from aircraft operations and engine testing and produce contours of equal noise energy. These contours are presented using the 65 Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) noise contour metric where 65 DNL represents significant aircraft noise levels.</p> <p>DNL metric measures the overall noise experienced during an entire (24-hour) day. DNL calculations account for the sound exposure level of aircraft, the number of aircraft operations and a penalty for nighttime operations. In the DNL scale, each aircraft operation occurring between the hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. includes a sound level penalty to account for the higher sensitivity to noise in the nighttime and the expected further decrease in background noise levels that typically occur at night. DNL provides a numerical description of the weighted 24-hour cumulative noise energy level using the A-weighted decibel scale, typically over a period of a year.</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>Finally, the public needs more time to comment on this E I hearing. The notification was fair at best. FYI October 3, 2017 is Tuesday not Monday as stated in the documentation. Please allow more time for others to comment or reconsider this project for all of the stated reasons.</p> <p>Sincerely John Edwards</p>	<p>Because DNL is a cumulative metric, while areas can receive single event noise levels above 65 dB, it is the average of these noise levels over the course of a year that provides for the 65 DNL contour. Although the FAA recognizes that noise occurs outside of these contours, the 65 DNL contour has been federally accepted at the level at which residential and other noise sensitive land uses are non-compatible with aircraft noise. Because the existing 65 DNL noise contour shown on Figure C6, page C.18 of the EA, does not encompass any noise sensitive land uses (homes, schools, churches, etc.), the existing land use in the vicinity of the Airport is considered compatible with aircraft operations and aircraft generated noise under the federal guidelines.</p> <p>In response to your comment about impacts to water resources, wildlife, wetlands, traffic and other pollution, the EA analysis indicates that the primary impacts will be to Owl Creek, as a result of the piping. The piping of Owl Creek within the fence line is needed for safety reasons, as it is a wildlife hazard. This impact to Owl Creek will be mitigated as part of the project. The EA analysis indicated that there are no significant impacts to wildlife, and this was concurred by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Additionally, no significant impacts were found relative to air quality, other water resources, traffic or noise.</p> <p>Data provided in the 2013 economic impact study for Colorado airports was used in this EA because at this time, it is the most recent data available.</p> <p>In terms of emergency preparedness and response, the Airport fully meets all Federal mandated staffing equipment and training requirements for any aircraft incidents. For an event occurring in the community, response would be led by the Aspen Fire District and their emergency aid partners in Snowmass, Basalt, Carbondale and Glenwood Springs.</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
			<p>In response to your comment that the public needs more time to comment. The EA team has worked throughout the process to be inclusive of public comments. For this comment period, notice was given 30 days prior to the public hearings through newspaper advertisements, emails to stakeholder groups, and social media. Additional outreach occurred prior to the meetings including radio ads and additional newspapers ads, press releases and social media outreach. The full comment period was 45 days, longer than the normal 30-day comment period.</p>
Name Not Shown	October 3, 2017	<p>Aspen has said again and again in its community plans that it wants to be a tourism-driven and resort-based economy. Maintaining air service is critical to that. Anyone who advocates preventing the improvements to our runway and airport that will allow the next generation of aircraft does not have our community's true interests at heart. Yes, the next generation of aircraft will have wider wingspans. They will also be quieter and more fuel efficient. Aspen's original airport was a central piece to bringing Aspen out of the Quiet Years and establishing our resort economy. Truly, it helped make Aspen, Aspen. Please allow the airport to take the next necessary step in its evolution. This would mean a runway expansion that accommodates the next generation of the same types of aircraft we have now (which, again, will be slightly bigger and may carry nominally more passengers) and a design that presents a terminal to our guests that is safe and scaled appropriately to handle a busy winter day that may include a backlog of passengers due to cancelled flights. The current plan accomplishes both of these goals reasonably.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.</p>
Bill Tomcich	October 3, 2017	<p>As an individual who has closely monitored and has been involved with commercial air service into this valley since 1995, I have learned how important it is to plan for the future. While visitors and locals are currently enjoying the greatest variety of flight options, connections and competition this airport has ever seen, there is currently just one operator flying one aircraft type into the Aspen Airport for all three commercial airlines, and no new CRJ700's have been manufactured or delivered since 2011. By the year</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>2031, those newest CRJ700's will be twenty years old and nearing the end of their practical life span while the vast majority of CRJ700's will already have been retired from commercial service.</p> <p>As identified in the EA, there are a variety of new generation regional and small narrow-body aircraft that will be able to operate at ASE, and some of them will be in service by next year. Some of these aircraft are larger than the current 70 passenger regional jets currently serving the market, while all of these aircraft will be quieter and more efficient than any commercial aircraft that have served ASE in the past or present. However, because of the new efficiencies in modern wing design, none of these new aircraft that are expected to enter service over the next five years will have wingspans that are within ASE's current 95' wingspan restriction.</p> <p>Airport staff and the consultant team have put an extraordinary amount of work into planning for the future, and the plans for both runway improvements and a new terminal building will allow for the continuation of commercial air service as we now know it. The Aspen Airport is an economic lifeline for the business community of this resort based economy and is unquestionably one of the key competitive advantages of this resort destination, and there are many businesses who share my strong support of these essential proposed airport improvements.</p>	
Steve Skadron	October 3, 2017	<p>Dear Mr. Kinney,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Airport's (ASE) September 2017 Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). Currently there is a 95-foot wingspan restriction at ASE. Regional aircraft with this wingspan are phasing out by 2025. If this restriction continues, airlines presently serving ASE would be unable to provide future air service at the same level. Since nearly 50% of the winter tourism relies on air service, this restriction would potential damage the economies of both Aspen and the Roaring Fork Valley.</p> <p>The EA analyzed an expanded runway that would meet FAA regulations and a new, larger terminal. While there are assumptions that smaller regional aircraft will continue to serve ASE, the larger runway configuration could allow larger aircraft, such as 737s to serve ASE. The City has concerns about the potential impact of these larger planes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Your comments have been noted.</p> <p>In response to your concern regarding larger aircraft, such as 737s, to operate at ASE, this EA analyzed the potential introduction of the 737 and modeled a number of these operations based on a reasonably foreseeable forecast. No federal thresholds for noise or air quality were triggered under the proposed project.</p> <p>With regard to your comments on the terminal area improvements, the final design will be coordinated with public input with regard to elements such as the distance between check in and pick up. During the entire EA process, we continued to get public comments that no jet bridges was an important</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>Overall, the City recognizes that an expanded and improved runway adds continued economic stability for the community, continues the commercial operations to better serve visitors and the community alike, and provide increased safety for passengers. The City supports the following improvements and other considerations in the EA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The City supports the runway improvements as outlined in the EA</li> <li>-The City supports the terminal area improvements. The new terminal should remain humble, with minimal distance between the drop-off and check-in locations. The City supports that jet bridges were removed from the alternatives to preserve the passenger experience of deplaning to mountain views.</li> <li>-The EA states that the piping of Owl Creek is unavoidable to its proximity to the Runway Safety Area and the Object Free Area. The City encourages continued collaboration with Pitkin County Open Space and Trails to find a suitable mitigation site for these impacts.</li> <li>-The City supports current operating hours implemented by the curfew at ASE.</li> <li>-The City has concerns regarding later arrivals and flexibility to accommodate late arrivals, specifically with regards to passenger and personal safety, rather than diverting these planes to other airports in the region. The City encourages revisiting this curfew to see if exceptions can be made in certain instances.</li> </ul> <p>We value Pitkin County's significant investment in the airport and appreciate the public outreach effort made by the project team to ensure community involvement throughout the EA process. A successful project will allow for continued commercial airline service to the region while maintaining Aspen's small mountain town character.</p> <p>Please contact Hillary Seminick, City Planner, at 970.429.2741 with questions. We look forward to continuing the productive partnership with the Airport, the FAA the surrounding communities, and stakeholders as this project proceeds.</p> <p>Respectfully, Steve Skadron</p>	<p>element to the terminal design and the character of the Airport. Thank you for your comment on that.</p> <p>In response to your comment about Owl Creek. The piping of Owl Creek is needed to improve safety by removing a potential wildlife hazard. However, this project will require mitigation and if the project moves forward, a mitigation project (preferably local) will be identified. Coordination with Pitkin County Open Space will be part of helping identify potential local mitigation projects.</p> <p>Regarding your comment about the curfew. The existing curfew will stay in place, with no changes from this project. However, as it exists now, there is some flexibility with respect to late landings relative to safety/weather. That will continue even if the projects are constructed.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and notes about being a partner with the Airport.</p>



DRAFT

**Snowmass Public Hearing (9/26/2017) - Comments and Responses**

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
Tom Cuccio (Snowmass Village)	September 26, 2017	For the future of Aspen Snowmass, I am in favor of the runway reconfiguration	Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
Steve Parmalee (Snowmass Village)	September 26, 2017	Do parking now - cheaper than later. Approve of runway adjustments. Need more hangars, airplane storage. Approve of terminal proposal.	Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. The same number of parking spaces as exist now were included in the future site plan, with no potential expansion for parking as part of this project. However, it is recognized that parking is a valley wide concern and additional studies separate from this EA will be needed to address parking issues in the future.
Jim Ward Aspen CO	September 26, 2017	I moved there 1973, so I've experienced probably 40 years plus of dealing with the airport. I know that, you know, and I'm not really against the airport or all the development, but I have concerns. And one of the, you know one of the maybe to start with, and that is that putting this airport in this almost residential area where, you know, there's a lot of people living very close to this airport and getting a lot of air from airplanes coming and going. Particularly, on the...end of the runway on the south end of the runway where they sit in idle, uh, until they can leave and when they do leave then they send a big blast and there's...housing that's just basically just across the road a few hundred feet, you know? And I think that's, you know, one of the big concerns.	Thank you for your comment. According to federal thresholds, this project would result in no significant impact relative to noise. No residences or other noise sensitive uses are located within the 65 DNL (which is considered by the FAA to be non-compatible with that level of aircraft noise). Additionally, because the airport is a public use airport, it cannot restrict aircraft operating at the airport. In terms of your comment about idling noise. This project examines a potential addition of a noise wall to reduce engine noise from aircraft on the general aviation ramp.
Jim Ward (Continued)		I also think that, um, I also think that one of the things is that its...getting this airport bigger and bigger...is kind of "when do you stop?" It's kind of like getting-trying to get 50 pounds of something inside of a 30-pound bag. You know? I mean it's really, it's getting kind of a maxed-out situation.	Thank you for your comment. Following FAA Order 1050.1F guidance, impacts to local communities are generally analyzed based on the significance of noise impacts or required relocations that could fracture a community or otherwise disrupt the community physically or economically. Aircraft noise already exists from current operations, although no noise sensitive uses are located in significant aircraft noise exposed areas. The proposed actions are not expected to generate significant aircraft noise exposure. No homes, businesses or other community resources would need to be relocated.



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
			<p>Additionally, no historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological sites are located within the project's area of potential effect (APE). No significant health effects are anticipated. No significant impacts on children's health of safety or schools are anticipated. Therefore, no significant impact on the local community or cultural values is expected as a result of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
<p>Jim Ward (Continued)</p>		<p>I don't know the Snowmass and the Woody Creek communities, but they're the ones that are most, would be most, you know, concerned about what my main object is. And that is the lead-in lights. As they days get shorter and the nights get longer, and the lead-in lights when you come through the area - the lead-in lights are a huge hazard. Its...similar to...you are driving down a two-lane highway and some big pickup with four headlights has got 'em all on high. It's a hazard. You know? You can't - you can almost not see what, you know, if there was an animal or something on the road. It's just a huge problem. And um I know that...I know that there's not going to be any planes if they're reacting to the PAPI lights and they're all red the plane is going to have to be high enough so that he could still see the lights, the lead-in lights, without it blinding the people on the highway. Um, so if he's coming in and he's got two red lights and two white lights then he's going to be way high enough, so that the lights don't have to be shining on the highway. And I think that that would help people agree to the expansion of the run...of the runway and the airport if they would solve, what I think, is a problem</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. According to the FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, there is no official significance threshold when analyzing impacts from light emissions. The metric for measuring impacts is generally a comparison between existing background lighting/visual impacts compared with the change proposed from the project. The Preferred Alternative includes only minor lighting improvements associated with the terminal improvements. Light emissions associated with the proposed terminal area improvements would be similar to those of the existing terminal. Additional lights from the terminal facility or parking areas would be shielded per the Design Guidelines to minimize impacts. Similarly, the relocation of runway and taxiway lighting for the airfield would not result in a drastic change from existing conditions. No additional runway lighting would be required. Therefore, lighting improvements associated with the terminal and runway projects are not expected to result in a significant impact. However, the relocation of the runway lights 80 feet to the west could help the potential issue you note of lights blinding drivers on Highway 82.</p>
<p>Jim Ward (Continued)</p>		<p>Just the fact that, you know, I'm sure glad that they have you can't fly in after 11 o'clock, I believe it is, and you can't fly before 7 because of its closeness to residential people. You know who are trying to sleep. You know?</p>	<p>The County has a voluntary noise abatement program that discourages aircraft operators from extending landing gear more than four miles from the runway threshold and encourages minimum reverse thrust consistent with runway conditions and available length. The voluntary noise abatement</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
			program does not prevent aircraft from operating at the Airport and is not a mandatory noise curfew, but does encourage aircraft to not depart or arrive between 2300 and 0700 MST (please see <a href="http://aspensairport.com/operating-procedures/noise-abatement">http://aspensairport.com/operating-procedures/noise-abatement</a> ). This curfew will not be changed as part of this project.
Jim Ward (Continued)		So anyway, thank you very much for having this opportunity to hear what I have to say. Um, I think that living three miles off the end of the runway I've been uh able to have an opinion. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment. Your comments have been noted.

DRAFT



DRAFT

**Aspen Public Hearing (9/25/2017) - Comments and Responses**

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
<p>Cheryl DuBrule Aspen CO</p>	<p>September 25, 2017</p>	<p>Do not allow planes to take off and land over Meadowood subdivision. Mitigate noise that travels from airport toward Meadowood subdivision. Mitigate toxic fuel smell that comes to Meadowood. Do not allow planes to fly toward Aspen to take off - this is not safe and the planes go over my house. I live hear year round for 33 years-this is my house where my family lives 24/7 365.</p> <p>20,000 extra pounds for aircraft is not safe. This airport is for billionaires, not the community. I have to shut my windows from stink of fuel in Meadowood.</p> <p>Email: Airport Expansion Sept. 23, 2017 Sunday Sept. 18 low flying large jet took off easterly over Meadowood and Aspen. Thursday Sept. 22 11:30am jet took off easterly over Meadowood Aspen. Noise and safety concern. Called and reported and emailed at 11:46 spoke to Alan Mantle, Airport Operations. Was confirmed tower granted takeoff east. Over Aspen. I expressed concern of safety and nose. Mr. Mangle said the pilot has to request and tower grants but pilot has to sign a waiver to release the airport of any financial responsibility.</p> <p>So even if it is not safe, sign this, so airport is not financially responsible if you don't make the takeoff and kill people in the houses on the takeoff path? This is not safe and concerns me. That the airport abrogates responsibility for financial reasons to the pilot!!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This EA does not include any changes to the flight procedures to approach to and depart from ASE. Also, because the Airport is a public use airport, it cannot restrict aircraft from flying into or out of the valley due to federal grant assurances (with the exception of the grandfathered curfew already in place). In accepting federal funding, the County has agreed to comply with 39 specific grant assurances. These assurances require that the County, among other things, must “make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the Airport.” (Grant Assurance 22(a)).</p> <p>According to Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 91.119, Minimum safe altitudes; in general, there are minimum standards for operations of fixed wing aircraft (excluding when necessary for takeoff/landing). Over congested areas, an altitude of 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within a horizontal radius of 2,000 feet is required, except for under take-off and landing procedures. Complaints on low-flying aircraft may be filed with the FAA, Office of Flight Standards, which monitors aircraft operations. Once the facts have been recorded, an FAA aviation safety inspector attempts to identify the offending aircraft operator. For more information on low flying aircraft complaints, please visit the following website: <a href="http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/field_offices/fsdo/">http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/field_offices/fsdo/</a></p> <p>In general, Aspen operates under what is called contra flow operations, where aircraft generally arrive and depart in the same direction (departing to the north and arriving from the north). This proposed project does not look at changing those patterns. Air traffic control’s primary directive is safety.</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
Anonymous	September 25, 2017	<p>My only concern is that the terminal becomes more workable than it is now. My preference in design is "Pavilion", "Ridge" concept looks too fancy, too expensive, a waste of money, etc.</p> <p>Keep terminal as simple as possible with working toilets, enough carousels to handle 4-6 planes on ground at once; enough food and beverage outlets to keep passengers and employees happy, unlike now where only food available is inside TSA.</p> <p>Also, magazines and gift items need to be readily available, both for arriving and departing guests. You know what's wrong with the current terminal is that a harassed, hassled, frightened and tired incoming passenger has no access to a cocktail.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This EA covers approximately 25% design for the terminal and the site plan; final design will be included subsequent to the EA. All projects will be designed in accordance with Aspen/Pitkin County Design Guidelines which are intended to provide a mechanism to ensure that future development and redevelopment at the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport is implemented in a manner consistent with community values which reflect high standards for architectural quality, environmental sensitivity, neighborhood compatibility, and sustainability.</p>
Richard Heede Snowmass, CO	September 25, 2017	<p>10 years ago, when ASE lengthened the runway, we were told that improvements were required to meet FAA specifications - that that larger aircraft would not be used. Here we are and FAA requirements pushing us into capacity for 118' wingspan and 150,000 lb. landing weights! Capacities and FAA requirements are one thing. The community's right to object to the use of larger aircraft is another. Thanks, Rick.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This project is related to bringing the airfield up to FAA required safety standards to allow for future commercial service aircraft to continue to operate at ASE. Based on the Master Plan Update of 2013, the D-III standard was identified as the correct design group for ASE and therefore, ASE must meet those D-III standards. The demand for flying into ASE exists without the project and should not change with the addition of larger aircraft.</p> <p>Relative to your comments about the community's right to object to the use of larger aircraft. It is not within the purview of the County to challenge the existing regulations. Also, because the Airport is a public use airport, it cannot restrict aircraft from flying into or out of the valley due to federal grant assurances (with the exception of the grandfathered curfew already in place). In accepting federal funding, the County has agreed to comply with 39 specific grant assurances. These assurances require that the County, among other things, must "make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the Airport." (Grant Assurance 22(a)).</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
Valerie Braun	September 25, 2017	<p>Where are the current noise monitoring stations that produced the "non noise sensitive" areas? Where are the current particulate and fuel "dump area" monitoring stations? There is incredible jet fuel odor at the airport business cluster and along the trail system during busy airport use times. I would LOVE to have both kinds of monitoring done on my property in Woody Creek. It is hard to believe you are getting 65 dec. readings and not higher with a number of aircraft in/out of this airport. Low flying helicopters have become another addition to the noise problems. I think the terminal designs are interesting but they look incredibly expensive - estimates? This project may drive me out of the valley.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The analysis of aircraft noise exposure in this EA was prepared in compliance with FAA Order 1051.1F, Policies and Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts, and FAA Order 5050.4B, Airport Environmental Handbook. The Order that was in effect when the project was scoped was 1050.1F, which requires the use of noise exposure contours using the FAA's Integrated Noise Model (INM) showing the area affected by 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) and greater noise levels. The INM is a state-of-the-art, FAA approved software program used to model the noise exposure levels from aircraft operations and engine testing and produce contours of equal noise energy. These contours are presented using the 65 Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) noise contour metric where 65 DNL represents significant aircraft noise levels.</p> <p>DNL metric measures the overall noise experienced during an entire (24-hour) day. DNL calculations account for the sound exposure level of aircraft, the number of aircraft operations and a penalty for nighttime operations. In the DNL scale, each aircraft operation occurring between the hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. includes a sound level penalty to account for the higher sensitivity to noise in the nighttime and the expected further decrease in background noise levels that typically occur at night. DNL provides a numerical description of the weighted 24-hour cumulative noise energy level using the A-weighted decibel scale, typically over a period of a year.</p> <p>Because DNL is a cumulative metric, while areas can receive single event noise levels above 65 dB, it is the average of these noise levels over the course of a year that provides for the 65 DNL contour. Although the FAA recognizes that noise occurs outside of these contours, the 65 DNL contour has been federally accepted at the level at which residential and other noise sensitive land uses are non-compatible with aircraft noise. Because the existing 65</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
			<p>DNL noise contour shown on Figure C6, page C.18 of the EA, does not encompass any noise sensitive land uses (homes, schools, churches, etc.), the existing land use in the vicinity of the Airport is considered compatible with aircraft operations and aircraft generated noise under the federal guidelines.</p> <p>In response to your comment about jet fuel, odors from aircraft typically have more of an oily smell versus an odor like one would experience when fueling an auto. The pollutants that comprise this type of smell are accounted for in the air pollutant assessment presented in the Environmental Assessment (EA) for precursor pollutants -- pollutant levels where the standards exist to protect human health and welfare. The air quality modeling within the EA covers many of the pollutants that relate either directly or indirectly to fuel "smells," and covers all the pollutants regulated federally that relate to human health. Since the project does not trigger any federal thresholds of significance for air quality for these pollutants, there are no significant impacts relating to the air quality.</p> <p>High level estimates of the terminal designs were included in the EA, but are highly dependent on final designs and total size of the terminal as decided during the terminal programming phase, if the project moves forward.</p>
Gretchen Geary	September 25, 2017	Hoping to bid fiber technology for the airport. Locally owned company.	Thank you for your comment. This EA covers approximately 25% design for the terminal and the site plan; final design, including communications at the Airport, will be completed subsequent to the EA.
Lucas France	September 25, 2017	Bigger better more more more. I don't see any carbon offset. Aspen should take the lead and implement a "carbon sink to offset this development." To do anything less is short sighted. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment. Preparation of the Draft EA followed the policies, procedures, and guidelines as outlined in FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures and



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
			<p>Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions. These orders outline FAA accepted methodologies, methods, models, techniques, and thresholds of significance for the impact assessment and preparation of EA documents. The EA was prepared in compliance with NEPA, and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations. All environmental documents prepared under FAA oversight follow and adhere to these same Orders, setting national standards for the preparation of environmental documentation. Based on this evaluation, no significant impact has been identified from the project relative to air quality or greenhouse gas emissions that exceeds federal thresholds.</p> <p>The Airport recognizes the communities' concerns about noise, air quality and climate change and has been working with Pitkin County and the City of Aspen on the climate action planning to determine if there are ways to incorporate GHG minimization (such as preconditioned air, electric hook ups, sustainable terminal design) into the project or into other areas of the Airport. These elements will be examined further during the terminal design phase and will include additional public involvement. The question of carbon offsets is also being examined during the Climate Action Plan process.</p>
Andrew Doremus	September 25, 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Runway improvements first</li> <li>2. Terminal - "Pavilion" style is great. Possible have the green roof sloped to give more open space inside like the "Ridge"</li> <li>3. Have a restaurant ramp side - the middle of the terminal with a rooftop bar.</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This EA covers approximately 25% design for the terminal and the site plan; final design will be included subsequent to the EA. All projects will be designed in accordance with Aspen/Pitkin County Design Guidelines which are intended to provide a mechanism to ensure that future development and redevelopment at the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport is implemented in a manner consistent with community values which reflect high standards for architectural quality, environmental sensitivity, neighborhood compatibility, and sustainability.</p>



## DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
Liz Chapman Aspen, CO	September 25, 2017	I prefer the Pavilion scenario. I would ask for a 14' sound wall.	Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. Final height and materials of the noise wall would be determined during the design phase.
Jackie Francis	September 25, 2017	Love the noise wall. Thanks!	Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
Cheryl DuBrule	September 25, 2017	Cheryl DuBrule. And my concern, number one, is the jets, and especially if you allow larger jets, taking off toward the Meadowood subdivision where my house is. I've lived there for 35 years – 365 – 7 days a week. I mean and that's my home with my family. Sunday September 18th, there was a low flying large jet. Took off, which I thought was easterly but I guess it's not, but it was directly over my house and over Meadowood headed towards Aspen. Thursday September 22nd at 11:30 a.m. another jet took off in that same direction over Meadowood that– I have severe noise and safety concerns. I called and reported and email at 11:46. I spoke to Allen Mantle at airport operations. I asked what was the procedure. He said that that they -the tower granted and confirmed takeoff east-whatever direction is over Aspen. I expressed my concern of safety, noise, the smell of jet fuel and Mr. Mantle said the pilot has to request and the tower grants. All but all the pilot has to do is sign a waiver to release the airport of any financial responsibility well what about the safety of the residents that live there all the time? So, if it is not safe and you just aggregate your responsibility by having them sign of financially to the pilot I don't know why ah ah where the responsibility lies. Um just with the pilot? And we don't know if these pilots are experienced with taking off in this area. Um and also what would happen if someone hap- I mean a school is in the path, so I'm very concerned about this. And also, I have a question about all the extra pounds – 20,000 pounds with the terrain and the wind and altitude concerns me about these larger jets and it just seems to me not for our community but for larger private jets to be able to come in and out of here.	<p>Thank you for your comment. This EA does not include any changes to the flight procedures at ASE. Also, because the Airport is a public use airport, it cannot restrict aircraft from flying into or out of the valley due to federal grant assurances (with the exception of the grandfathered curfew already in place). In accepting federal funding, the County has agreed to comply with 39 specific grant assurances. These assurances require that the County, among other things, must “make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the Airport.” (Grant Assurance 22(a)).</p> <p>With regard to low flying planes, Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 91.119, Minimum safe altitudes; in general, there are minimum standards for operations of fixed wing aircraft (excluding when necessary for takeoff/landing). Over congested areas, an altitude of 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within a horizontal radius of 2,000 feet is required, except for under take-off and landing procedures. Complaints on low-flying aircraft may be filed with the FAA, Office of Flight Standards, which monitors aircraft operations. Once the facts have been recorded, an FAA aviation safety inspector attempts to identify the offending aircraft operator. For more information on low flying aircraft complaints, please visit the following website:  <a href="http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/field_offices/fsdo/">http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/field_offices/fsdo/</a></p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>I also am going to complain about all the planes that have been allowed to land in that opposite direction. Um flying over Meadowood over our homes. The noise, the low flying airplanes, the jet noise, the smell of the fuel, and um safety concerns, but especially the peace of our neighborhood. They need to find somewhere else to fly over other than this neighborhood. I've been there for a long time this neighborhood has been here for a long time. I've noticed an increase in this landing and now this week after we went to a meeting, John Kinney came to the meeting, he promised us no one would be taking off in the direction of Meadowood. Twice this week this has happened with a very large jet. I'm very concerned about this, so I want to mitigate the smell of the jet fuel which, for what reason I don't know why whether its landing takeoff or whatever, comes over into our property can be mitigated with something. I'm sure you can come up with something like they do in Santa Barbra with trees or walls or something and the noise and the safety we don't want them flying over our community over...our house. We're very upset about this (inaudible). The citizens of Meadowood are very upset about this. And it would be near where the church is and these little towards Aspen and I think it affects the entire community. Thank you</p> <p>(Later comments added) Cheryl DuBrule: I also have another comment that um: John Kinney came to the Meadowood homeowners meeting and the new larger jets are going to be over 20,000 pounds more than the jets that currently land. This is very concerning to me due to terrain and wind - altitude. If anyone has lived here for any amount of time, I have sat on that runway in Denver and Aspen where they've asked people to get voluntarily get off the plane because the plan is too heavy. They would as 2-300 hundred-pound women with their luggage to get off the plane. How are you going to add 10 tons more of weight and safely land takeoff in this community? The airport is so close to Aspen. I'm very concerned that the FAA has the same regulations that go for LAX as go for Aspen. That airport is so close to us that we-we'll always</p>	<p>In response to your comment about jet fuel, odors from aircraft typically have more of an oily smell versus an odor like one would experience when fueling an auto. The pollutants that comprise this type of smell are accounted for in the air pollutant assessment presented in the Environmental Assessment (EA) for precursor pollutants -- pollutant levels where the standards exist to protect human health and welfare. The air quality modeling within the EA covers many of the pollutants that relate either directly or indirectly to fuel "smells," and covers all the pollutants regulated federally that relate to human health. Since the project does not trigger any federal thresholds of significance for air quality for these pollutants, there are no significant impacts relating to the air quality.</p> <p>With regard to your comment about impacts to schools, the noise and land use impact analysis presented in the Draft EA were prepared in accordance with Federal guidelines and showed that while aircraft noise would change slightly with the proposed project (increasing the 65 DNL contour by approximately 7.6 acres in 2028 compared to existing 2015), there would continue to be no noise sensitive uses exposed to 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) or greater noise levels. No schools would be exposed to 65 DNL or greater noise levels with or without the proposed actions. Part 150 Land Use Compatibility Guidelines indicate that schools are compatible with aircraft noise levels less than 65 DNL.</p> <p>In response to your comment about community impacts, following FAA Order 1050.1F guidance, impacts to local communities are generally analyzed based on the significance of noise impacts or required relocations that could fracture a community or otherwise disrupt the community physically or economically. Aircraft noise already exists from current operations, although no noise sensitive uses are located in significant aircraft noise exposed areas. The</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>meet the FAA criteria and that would be the argument to push this project through, which I don't think is good for our community. I think it's good for the billionaires who want to fly their jets in so they don't have to go to Eagle -Vail, but this is really not supporting the community and I think there's safety with the school nearby safety there-safety with the with buttermilk and *stutters* I just don't understand how they can say well 20,000 extra pounds fits the FAA when anyone knows I've seen 300 pounds taken off of these small planes because we weren't going to make it in and land because of all the terrain and altitude and wind and and um the temperature here. It's – none of this seems to make any sense to me. We have a whole crew here (inaudible) all these people here I don't even know how many are here...20 ...25 are here for this project. None of these people live here. They're not part of our community. They've all been brought in to push this project. I think the community needs to ask why and what's best for Aspen. These planes are flying over our teeny little town. This is upsetting to me. And it just isn't going to benefit anyone that lives here. It's going to destroy our beautiful quiet town and it's going to be too late once this all gets pushed through and I think the community can stop this and there's good reason to. The idea that in 2021 or later in another 10 years that these half of this fleet is going to be phased out that doesn't mean they're not going to make something new that can that that wingspan can fit here that can take the same number of commercial passengers. It just seems...unfair to do to our little community. That airport is close to Aspen. Nothing is going to fly in and out of here that the town will not hear and the residents. Thank you.</p>	<p>proposed actions are not expected to generate significant aircraft noise exposure. Further, no homes, businesses or other community resources would need to be relocated. Additionally, no historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological sites are located within the project's area of potential effect (APE). No significant health effects are anticipated. No significant impacts on children's health of safety or schools are anticipated. Therefore, no significant impact on the local community or cultural values is expected as a result of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
Hawk Greenway	September 25, 2017	<p>Hawk Greenway: So. Uh, I'm Hawk Greenway. I'm the owner and operator of an airplane that is a, um, general aviation airplane small Cessna out at the...tied down of the north ramp. So, I'm a general aviation user and operator on the Aspen airport and I have been for 25 years. Um, so I've watched it grow and change and well – one of the things that concerns me is the, um, maximum capacity of both the aspen airspace and the...runway. Um this plan, while spending all of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This EA does not include an extension of the existing taxiway to serve as a runway for general aviation aircraft. At this time, the redevelopment of the existing taxiway or development of a secondary runway that could serve general aviation aircraft is not reasonably foreseeable due to the existing land envelope and FAA design standards, as well as funding</p>



# DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>this, um, engineering and all of this time and all of this, um, attention, doesn't address, um, the runway, um, crowding issue whatsoever. And the um, what strikes me as an operator of a small Cessna tail dragger is um how little of the runway that I actually need. And I'm um routinely off in 6-700 feet. Um so, when I'm cleared for takeoff I'll use the um extended threshold um end of the runway and I kind of get a kick out of like getting off the ground before I actually reach the actual runway itself. Um, so when I when I look at trying to um mix the different um speeds and types of aircraft um to use the single runway here um it strikes me that its...sort of ridiculous and um that it's possible to have different types of aircraft using similar airspace.</p> <p>Um just come back from Alaska and Fairbanks International um Airport was a real eye opener to me where they have float plane lake, a um ski strip, they call it ski strip but it's like a gravel runway, and then um the 2 main runways. One of which is used for the air traffic - um air carrier traffic. And you know and Alaska is a different case where they've got a hugely um uh vibrant aircraft community and you know they have a lot of elbow room and land there. But one of the things Aspen has is a group um of small aircraft owners and operators that are operating these incredibly short takeoffs or landing bush aircraft and um they've become - uh they kind of remind me of the um Harley Davidsons that um of the local Rolex rider group - you know they're like collectors' items. And um you know aircraft are 50 years old, but their performance is...its almost helicopter-like in comparison to the runway needs. So um, I'm putting in a request for a grass um dirt runway um that could help relieve some of that um activity, and I think um, or some of that pressure on the number of um operations allowed um on the runway. So, like an extension of the um alpha taxiway...to the north during all of this studies and ah works that could uh give you know 1000, 1500, 1200 feet you know there are um you know probably a dozen aircraft on ah based on the field that wouldn't need the main runway and would use that. So um, otherwise ... I like the plan and I</p>	<p>constraints. Air traffic control deals with the issues relative to different size aircraft using the same facility/airspace.</p>



DRAFT

Submitted by	Date Received	Comment Summary	Response
		really like the um uh lightness and airiness of the depicted um terminals. I think those are quite nice artistic renditions.	

DRAFT

