

# **MEETING SUMMARY**

| The wave heights cited<br>PROJECT: | Sitka Seaplane Base | DATE:         | June 24, 2020             |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| PROJECT NUMBER:                    | 1124.63021.01       | TIME:         | 2-3:30 p.m.               |
| MODE:                              | Online Meeting      | SUBJECT:      | Pilot Stakeholder Meeting |
| ATTENDEES: SEE ATTACHED            |                     | ORGANIZATION: |                           |

The Meeting Purpose was to provide information on the status of the projects and the proposed upland and marine concepts, to verify the sizing and orientation of the floats, and to discuss the priority of various amenities. Concepts discussed and Range of Magnitude Project Costs were preliminary planning efforts based on the amenities identified during earlier studies and public scoping and based on field analysis of site conditions. (Note the siting study cost estimates were not based on site-specific information on topography and bathymetry.) These preliminary planning concepts are being refined based on input from the stakeholder meeting regarding the priority of various amenities. A refined concept will be developed to present to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to discuss the scope of federal funding authority and potential phasing of desired amenities. The Environmental Assessment and Tideland Conveyance Request will address the potential for full buildout of the site with all proposed amenities to allow for future expansion, even if a smaller facility is constructed initially.

After the presentation, meeting attendees asked questions and provided input.

Q: What is the cost difference between the two float types A & B?

A: For planning purposes, cost was estimated by surface square foot. The smaller surface floats (Type B) are probably 70% of the cost of the larger ones (Type A). All project range-of-magnitude costs discussed assumed the larger floats (Type A).

Q: Will floats only accommodate the aircraft shown? Or a variety of aircraft up to these?

A: The small positions would fit up to a Cessna 206 but you could put smaller aircraft on the ramp. The larger positions would accommodate up to a Beaver.

Q: Is it possible to put a roof over the based-aircraft floats?

A: This is not typically done on seaplane floats because the aircraft tails stick out from the float and so any roof would have to extend a long distance out from the center so that snow wouldn't shed off the roof onto the airplane. This would require the float structure to be built to a higher standard to accommodate the large roof and to accommodate the large wind loads on such a roof. It would be very expensive to do.

Q: Would it be possible for seaplane to be hauled out on ramp and trailered over to main airport?

A: The team has not analyzed the ability to identify a route where aircraft could be trailered from the Seaplane Base to the airport. Planes would need to have their wings taken off at the Seaplane Base before transport.

Q: Are the wave heights cited for a 100-year storm? Would you get actual wave measurements in design wave study using a buoy in the study area?

A: Yes, the wave heights cited were for a 100-year storm, however 2, 10, 25- and 50-year events were also analyzed and are included in the wind /wave report. The wave study was a planning level analysis using a spectral numerical model. During design a more sophisticated modeling effort would look at the waves in more detail and how the attenuators might deflect and reduce them. There is good wind data already available from the airport. Actual wave measurements might not be needed but would certainly help to verify the wind/wave correlation specifically for this site.

Q: Would there be fuel lines down the ramps to parking positions?

A: The utilities cost shown did not include fuel lines down the ramp. The current assumption is that the fuel facility would likely be a third-party service. They might have a storage tank on-site and a small truck to drive down onto the landing float and long fuel hoses.

Q: What was Kodiak's experience with Trident Basin? Did use continue to grow?

A: Kodiak did see use growth after the project and may need additional expansion in the future.

Q: Would the haul out ramp pilings need to be far enough out to allow aircraft wings to be clear?

A: The team confirmed that the pilings were set out far enough to allow aircraft wings to clear.

Q: Are wave attenuators more to protect the float system, or seaplane base operations.

A: The wave attenuators are primarily to protect the float system from damage however pilots should also consider any operational concerns especially with seaplanes tied up alongside the transient floats during stormy weather due to potential mechanical damage to pontoons.

Q: Could team look at not constructing haul out ramp but instead filling that area as well to create a larger upland area and allow for a shorter access trestle?

A: This alternative has not been evaluated. Extending the upland fill area further offshore would shorten the length of the pile supported trestle. It could result in the floats being closer to the SW exposure waves. It could reduce costs and is worth looking at if pull-out ramp is not a priority.

## Discussion of appropriate size of facility:

Most participants agree that the size of the facility (10 C206, 4 Beaver, 5 Transient) seemed about right.

## Discussion of various components/priorities:

There was discussion that without room to park planes on uplands and without being able to trailer planes to airport, the haulout ramp may not be a priority. If a haul-out ramp is included, it does not need the adjacent access dock.

There was a strong desire for fuel lines on the docks. Some operations occur outside business hours and would be good to have a self-fueling option.

The size of the terminal building could be reduced to just a very small bathroom and covered waiting area.

The facility does not need to be paved with curb and gutter. Gravel would be sufficient.

Since most operations are during summer, waves may not be as bad. Desire for more analysis on waves to see if wave attenuators could be eliminated, especially the one blocking SE exposure.

## Discussion of project ROM costs:

This was the biggest concern raised. The costs with all potential amenities included are more than twice what was anticipated. Participants recommended looking at ways to get the cost down by eliminating some amenities and constructing the minimum requirements to get the facility going. The cost of the wave attenuators was recognized as being extremely high and reducing or deleting them would help to reduce overall project costs.

### Other comments:

- Although there is a haulout ramp at Whiting, would be nice to have one on channel.
- Most operations are seasonal, during the summer (May September).
- There are increasing flights to support SEARH facilities.

Team Attendees:

Kelli Cropper, City & Borough of Sitka (CBS) Stan Eliason, CBS Ken Nichols, DOWL Tom Middendorf, DOWL Maryellen Tuttell, DOWL Katie Conway, DOWL Dick Somerville, PND

Participants

Mike Steadman Dave Gordon Kevin Mulligan Kevin Knox Francois Bakkes Sean Kveum Gary Smith Jared Green