



In reply, please refer to: 20829663

July 13, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Files

FROM: Jennifer Lutz

REFERENCE: Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes (FINAL)
Airport Master Plan Update
Carroll County Regional Airport
Westminster, Maryland

The fourth Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting for the referenced project was held on Wednesday, June 15, 2005 at 6:30 p.m. at the Carroll County government office building (see attendance list below). Gary Horst called the meeting to order and introduced URS Corporation (URS) and Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) personnel in attendance. In addition, G. Horst provided a brief background of the project including that the preferred alternative mainly consists of extending and relocating the runway, which will avoid the economic development efforts of the County within the vicinity of Meadow Branch. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has concurred with the recommendations made thus far. M. Waibel described the next steps in the Master Plan, which includes finalizing the Inventory section of the report (currently in draft format), continue reviewing previous forecasting efforts and finalizing the forecasts, and preparing an Aviation Demand Forecast section and Environmental Overview.

Mike Waibel -	URS Corporation
Chuck Trice -	URS Corporation
Jennifer Lutz -	URS Corporation
Ashish Solanki -	Maryland Aviation Administration
Gary Horst -	TAC
Marty Pittenger -	TAC
Steve Horn -	TAC
Paige Sunderland -	TAC
Kevin Utz -	TAC
Jeff Smith -	TAC
Bonnie Jones -	TAC
David Taylor -	TAC
Brian Stites -	TAC
Pete Welles-	TAC
Ralph Green-	TAC

The following are highlights from the meeting:

PROJECT STATUS/REPORTS

URS has recently completed a draft version of the Inventory Section of the Master Plan Update and provided copies to the TAC on June 10, 2005 for review and comment. The following comments were received from the TAC:

- G. Horst indicated that the amount of property on Page 1-1 should be 475 acres in fee-simple acquisition.

MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2005

Page 2

In addition, the weight for single wheeled aircraft on Page 1-4 should be 30,000 pounds, not 22,000 pounds. C. Trice indicated that the weight is listed as 22,000 pounds in the Airport/Facility Directory (AFD). A. Solanki mentioned that URS should review the previous Airport plans to determine if the weight was documented differently. The runway capacity as listed in the AFD cannot be changed unless there are known engineering references. These could be used for justification. M. Waibel requested available engineering reports and other applicable documentation from G. Horst.

- M. Pittenger suggested that the “Under Construction” placeholders on the web page be removed and a brief synopsis of what is to be placed on that particular web page to be included. In addition, he recommended a timelier uploading of meeting minutes.

- D. Taylor questioned the additional parts of the Master Plan. M. Waibel indicated that the Master Plan will have the following sections: Inventory, Aviation Forecasts, Demand/Capacity Analysis and Facility Requirements, Identification and Evaluation of Alternatives, Environmental Overview, Airport Business Plan, and Airport Layout Plan Development. M. Waibel indicated that a brief synopsis of these sections would be provided in the meeting minutes. These sections are included as tasks in URS’ Scope of Services for the Master Plan update, and are described as follows:

Inventory: This section will provide the information necessary to document existing conditions at DMW and will consist of detailing all landside and airside facilities, financial, and community information in order to establish baseline conditions for the study. Baseline year will be the County’s fiscal year (FY) 2004. This baseline year of FY 2004 will remain constant throughout the study.

Aviation Forecasts: This section will involve reviewing and refining the aviation forecasts approved by the FAA in 2003 as part of the Comprehensive Environmental Assessment (EA). Any refinement and revisions to the previously approved forecasts will be presented to the County and TAC, and will be submitted to the FAA for approval. Specific elements of this effort will include a review and potential revisions to aviation forecasts with regard to annual operations, number of based aircraft, fleet mix, peak hour, peak day, annual operations per based aircraft, and Instrument Landing Procedures (IFR) for the 20-year planning period.

Demand/Capacity Analysis And Facility Requirements: This section will focus not only on the major airfield components associated with upgrading the Airport Reference Code (ARC), but also consider some of the landside facility requirements that may be independent of the ARC decision. Based on the ARC decisions and the approved aviation forecasts, URS will proceed with the Demand/Capacity Analysis, which would determine the ability of the existing airside and landside facilities to adequately accommodate the planning activity levels. URS would also complete the Facility Requirements, which would compare existing aviation related facilities and operations with demand projections.

Identification And Evaluation Of Alternatives: This section is perhaps the focal point of the project, as it provides the framework for making decisions regarding future aviation growth. Work completed in previous tasks noted above prepared for the analysis of alternatives, and all subsequent tasks will define how the selected alternative is to be implemented. It should be noted that a substantial portion of this task is already complete, as several alternatives were previously identified, considered, and presented by URS to the TAC earlier in the project.

Environmental Overview: An analysis of potential environmental impacts caused by the proposed development projects will be undertaken to assist in the development of alternatives. The purpose of the Environmental Overview is to identify potentially “significant” impacts in general conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). This inventory may be used as a preliminary review of

MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2005

Page 3

environmental considerations that would need to be analyzed in more detail within the NEPA process. It is assumed that an Environmental Assessment (EA) would be required prior to implementation of the preferred actions associated with the update to the Airport Layout Plan. Also, the identification of potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures would assist in more accurately anticipating costs for the proposed development.

The objectives of the Environmental Overview section will be to evaluate potential environmental impacts of the selected plan to allow refinement of the preferred airfield, landside, and land use strategies, as needed; to assess the potential magnitude and significance of the impacts; and to identify and briefly discuss, as necessary, possible abatement and mitigation measures which may reduce or eliminate any potentially significant adverse impacts.

Airport Business Plan: The Airport Business Plan is intended to analyze DMW in respect to working capital and assess economic development opportunities. This section will collect and analyze available and appropriate data and determine recommendations. These recommendations, like the CIP, will be broken into short- (5 years), intermediate- (10 years), and long-term (20 years) action plans. Included in this study will be a Financial Capacity Analysis and an Airport Business Plan.

Airport Layout Plan Development: This effort takes the final selected alternatives identified in sections noted above and uses them to fully develop the Airport plans for DMW. The plans will provide for graphic depiction of the recommended development for DMW including the staged improvement of airfield and landside facilities.

- K. Utz questioned the draft response plan that is mentioned on Page 1-12. He asked who had adopted this plan and if it was instated. C. Trice indicated that in preparation of a Master Plan, it is a requirement to inquire about an airport's emergency response plan. The Airport Manager indicated that it was in draft format. K. Utz indicated that he had not seen this plan and would like to be able to review it. G. Horst mentioned that the police aspect of the plan has been implemented thus far.

- A public participant questioned the timing of the Environmental Overview in the Master Plan. M. Waibel indicated that the planning needs to be done before an environmental review could occur.

M. Waibel indicated that these comments would be incorporated into the Draft Inventory section of the Master Plan.

M. Waibel stated that the forecasts prepared for the Airport as part of an Environmental Assessment completed in 2002 do not provide enough detail. More information is required in order to perform the noise analysis for the Master Plan. A brief table outlining the forecasts recently developed was distributed. The forecasts were prepared assuming unconstrained conditions at the Airport. It was assumed that the projected increase in single-engine aircraft would slow with multi-engine and jet aircraft increasing at a higher rate. The forecasts will be refined and provided in more detail in Section 2 of the Master Plan. The following comments were made regarding the forecasts:

- J. Smith asked if the jet category of aircraft included turbine and propeller. M. Waibel indicated that those are included in the multi-engine category.

- P. Welles stated that adding only one based airplane a year is quite conservative and not practical considering the planned runway extension. M. Waibel indicated that the forecasts developed for the Airport would represent a steady trend.

MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2005

Page 4

- D. Taylor questioned how the operations prepared in the Maryland Public Use Airports Survey in January 2002 compare to what is forecasted now. A. Solanki indicated that traffic counts are obtained by the MAA-Office of Regional Aviation Assistance on an annual basis. Additionally, a significant amount of the operations information at a particular airport is obtained from the Airport Manager. However, if the manager is not able to consistently record the number of operations at his/her airport, then the information generally may not be accurate.
- M. Pittenger asked if a survey had been completed at DMW. A. Solanki indicated that a survey was completed in 1999. M. Pittenger indicated that many changes have occurred at the Airport since that time. M. Waibel indicated that the forecasts that were completed and approved in 2002 took into consideration the peaks and valleys that the Airport experienced since the last survey. A. Solanki indicated that in developing forecasts, an educated guess is applied and the task is approached using logical steps, including a review of the airspace and fuel sales.
- A public participant asked why there was not a breakdown of operations. M. Waibel indicated more information is still needed from the Airport, including the touch and go operations and nighttime operations. J. Smith and P. Welles indicated that the percentage of nighttime operations is less than two percent and the staff at the Airport, specifically the FBO, may have information regarding touch and go operations.
- J. Smith indicated that the IFR operations would increase with the ILS.
- P. Welles indicated that the fastest growing category will be single-engine turbo prop and this should be taken into consideration during the Master Plan process.
- J. Smith questioned whether a “decibel” analysis would be conducted. M. Waibel indicated that a noise analysis of existing and future conditions would be done as part of the Environmental Overview.
- A public participant questioned if accurate wind direction data was available since the direction of the prevailing wind will determine where the aircraft will be. It was mentioned that significant traffic in bad weather flies over Westminster and McDaniel College. M. Waibel stated that accurate wind direction data is available and is included in the Inventory section of the Master Plan. J. Smith indicated that the prevailing winds are from the northwest. P. Welles indicated that jets would most likely be the only aircraft operating in bad weather and their frequency is minimal. M. Waibel indicated that the runway would be pushed 600 feet away from Westminster and McDaniel College under the preferred alternative.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

M. Waibel introduced J. Lutz who will be preparing the Environmental Overview of the Master Plan.

M. Waibel then mentioned that the TAC needed to discuss what facilities should be included in the Master Plan. Types of facilities included a Maintenance Building, Terminal/Operations Building, a joint use emergency response facility, an ATCT, and an emergency generator.

P. Welles indicated that an emergency generator is not that expensive when compared to the total cost of the proposed airport development, and should be a necessity from an operational and safety standpoint. M.

MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2005

Page 5

Waibel indicated that the generator itself is not costly but getting it dedicated to one circuit is costly. G. Horst indicated that the CIP has allocated money for the acquisition of a generator.

M. Pittenger stated that the operations and forecasts would not allow for 24-hour operations.

P. Welles suggested that adjacent parcels would provide a good location for a terminal facility. Time should be spent in determining what services a terminal should provide. G. Horst indicated that this would occur.

M. Pittenger questioned if consideration has been given to networks, including wireless. G. Horst indicated that the Airport has a DSL line. P. Sunderland indicated that alternatives are being considered now with Verizon.

J. Smith questioned the need for a deicing facility. P. Welles indicated that the FBO has a few hangars available for aircraft storage and therefore does not need deicing capabilities.

OPEN DISCUSSION

The web page needs to have a "Last Updated" date.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

URS will be finalizing the Inventory section and by September will have a draft version of the Facility Requirements, Aviation Forecasts, and Environmental Overview completed.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Next meeting is tentatively scheduled for September.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

This represents URS' understanding of the main topics discussed during the referenced meeting concerning DMW.

cc: TAC members
T. Priscilla, Federal Aviation Administration
A. Solanki, MAA