



In reply, please refer to: 20829663

February 28, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Files

FROM: Mike Waibel

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

The third Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting for the referenced project was held on Wednesday, February 9, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. at the Carroll County government office building.

Highlights of the meeting follow:

The meeting began with introduction of Mr. Tom Priscilla of the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) Washington Airports District Office. Mr. Priscilla, the Baltimore Metro Engineer for the FAA will be involved throughout the life of the project and will review and comment on the various anticipated submittals of the Master Plan. In addition, Lawrence Twele, the new Director of the County Office of Economic Development was introduced. Mr. Twele mentioned the importance of Carroll County Regional Airport in terms of economic development.

Gary Horst reported that the TAC had met earlier in the evening and had adopted guidelines for administrative manners for the Master Plan project.

URS Corporation (URS) presented (PowerPoint Presentation available on project website: www.ccrmasterplan.com) on two separate issues: the development of corporate and T-hangars on the newly acquired parcel northwest of the Fixed Base Operator (FBO) facility; and the results of the further evaluation of various airfield development alternatives. URS presented a layout and construction costs estimate for the development of 72 new, nested T-hangars and five, 100' x 120' corporate hangars. There are currently 50 potential T-hangar tenants on a waiting list kept by Airport staff. The County has also received several inquiries as to the availability of corporate hangar space. Currently all corporate and T-hangar space is occupied at DMW. The proposed hangar development plan would involve the demolition of 3 existing T-hangar buildings that accommodate 41 aircraft. Therefore, although 72 new units would be constructed, a net increase of 31 T-hangar units would be realized.

URS estimates the cost to develop both the T-hangars to be approximately \$4.4 million. Only a portion of the site preparation for the T-hangar complex is eligible for funding by the FAA and the Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA). It is estimated that FAA and MAA would fund a combined total of approximately \$680,000 for the project. The corporate hangars construction is estimated to be approximately \$8.6 million. None of these costs would be eligible for FAA or MAA funding.

Mr. Horst asked the TAC to consider voting to approve the proposed development as depicted in the URS presentation. He mentioned that the implementation of the hangar development would begin in Fiscal Year 2006. The TAC members requested a delay in voting on the hangar project until URS had completed the presentation of the airfield alternatives.

MEMORANDUM

February 23, 2005

Page 2

Mike Waibel of URS presented the airfield alternatives as well as the issue of upgrading the Airport Reference Code (ARC) at DMW from its current designation as a C-II facility to one designed to accommodate aircraft in the C-III wingspan category. Since the last TAC meeting, URS was tasked with completing a series of action items:

- Evaluate a No-Build Airfield Alternative;
- Initiate the economic analysis/identify potential revenue;
- Determine the extent and cost for land acquisition;
- Identify level of current demand by C-III aircraft; and,
- Provide TAC with appropriate level of information to make a decision.

URS presented a list of assumptions that were considered for the comparative evaluation of the airfield/ARC alternatives and discussed two previously unknown issues at DMW that were not part of previous alternative evaluations:

- There are at least two aircraft owners/operators (one of which is a current tenant at DMW) who plan to purchase and base aircraft with Group III wingspans (79 feet up to 121 feet) within the next two years. Given the current FAA design criteria, when those aircraft are based at DMW plans must be in place to increase the runway/taxiway separation to at least 400 feet as well as meet the other requirements for accommodation of C-III aircraft. Mr. Waibel mentioned that if the TAC and County do not adopt an airfield alternative that meets the FAA's C-III criteria, that those aircraft could not be based at DMW. He added that the tenants that purchase these aircraft would most likely relocate all of their aircraft and businesses that are currently based at DMW.
- It is assumed under all of the build and no-build scenarios that DMW would install a Category I Instrument Landing System (ILS) for the Runway 16 approach. Upon the commissioning of that system, the existing row of seven corporate hangars would become severe penetrations to the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 surfaces. When this occurs, the FAA may require DMW to remove and/or alter the structures. A significant amount of revenue generated at DMW directly originates from those hangars and the businesses based therein.
- A closer analysis of the existing airfield configuration, property limits, and topography indicates that there is little or no feasible option to build more aircraft storage and/or parking facilities (beyond the above-described development of the new t-hangars and corporate hangars on the recently acquired parcel) unless the runway and taxiway system is shifted to the west.

URS continued the presentation by describing the new No-Build alternative. This alternative would not result in any runway extension or any increased separation between the runway and parallel taxiway. However, because of the existing strength issues on the current runway and parallel taxiway, it is assumed that the airfield pavement would have to be rehabilitated and strengthened to accommodate the existing aircraft that operate at DMW. This rehabilitation would require a closure of Runway 16-34 for approximately 6 months. The No-Build alternative would not meet the demand by the Group III aircraft and the seven corporate hangars would become significant obstructions once the ILS is commissioned.

URS continued by briefly describing the three (3) build alternatives that were previously presented in the December TAC meeting. Alternative 1 would also result in a significant runway closure and would not accommodate Group III aircraft. Alternatives 2 and 3 both could be implemented without any significant closures. Alternatives 2 and 3 would move the runway centerline in a manner where the existing corporate hangars would not penetrate the FAR Part 77 surface that would expand as a result of the ILS installation.

MEMORANDUM

February 23, 2005

Page 3

Alternative 2 would require the purchase and relocation of the Association for Retarded Citizens (Arc) facility that exists south of the current runway end. Alternative 3 would have no impact on the Arc facility. Both Alternatives 2 and 3 would impact the existing asphalt plant; however, Alternative 3 would not have as a severe impact on the facility. It may be possible to purchase the eastern most portion of the asphalt plant property.

URS then presented the revised construction costs estimates for each of the Build and the No-Build alternatives which are shown in the table below:

	Construction Costs	Land Acquisition	TOTAL COST	Local Share (2.5 Percent)	Runway Closure
No Build Alternative	\$8,329,000	\$160,000	\$8,489,000	\$212,225	185 Days
Alternative 1	\$40,690,000	\$512,000	\$41,202,000	\$1,030,050	200 Days
Alternative 2	\$55,335,000	\$4,143,000	\$59,478,000	\$1,486,950	*20 Days
Alternative 3	\$57,768,000	\$1,100,000	\$58,868,000	\$1,471,700	*20 Days

* Note: Runway Closures Could Occur at Night.

Jason Weiss of URS then presented the result of the revenue generation analysis conducted for each alternative. The numbers he presented were based on the following assumptions: the County would receive an average of \$0.20 per gallon of fuel sold; hangar leases would be \$350/month for small, \$450/month for large, and \$5,250 for corporate; and that revenue for fuel sales would be calculated as net revenue while the hangar revenue is expressed as gross revenue. Mr. Weiss's projected revenue results are shown in the table below:

NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

	2006	2010	2015	2020	2031
Hangar Rental	\$592,200	\$267,700	\$894,600	\$957,600	\$957,600
Fuel Sales	\$66,863	\$38,000	\$156,616	\$156,616	\$156,616
TOTAL	\$659,063	\$305,700	\$1,051,216	\$1,114,216	\$1,114,216

ALTERNATIVE 1

	2006	2010	2015	2020	2031
Hangar Rental	\$592,200	\$267,700	\$894,600	\$957,600	\$957,600
Fuel Sales	\$66,863	\$38,000	\$191,334	\$191,334	\$191,334
TOTAL	\$659,063	\$305,700	\$1,085,934	\$1,148,934	\$1,148,934

ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 3

	2006	2010	2015	2020	2031
Hangar Rental	\$592,200	\$592,200	\$1,134,000	\$1,302,000	\$1,617,000
Fuel Sales	\$66,863	\$203,268	\$323,755	\$419,156	\$419,663
TOTAL	\$659,063	\$795,468	\$1,457,755	\$1,721,156	\$2,036,663

MEMORANDUM

February 23, 2005

Page 4

Mr. Waibel then summarized the advantages and disadvantages of each of the alternatives presented. He concluded that Alternative 3 is the URS recommended alternative because: it allows for the accommodation of the Group III aircraft; can be implemented with minimal impacts to the operation of the airport during construction; would have no impact on the Arc facility; and would allow for a significant amount of expansion of aircraft storage and parking space. URS ended their presentation and the floor was open for questions.

Question and Answer Session

1. Will consideration be given to constructing an air traffic control (ATCT) as part of this process?

Yes. Although the FAA has no requirement to fund the construction of an ATCT at an airport such as DMW where no scheduled service exists, the varying type of aircraft that currently and are planned to operate at DMW in the future certainly warrant consideration of an ATCT. The Scope of Work for this project includes development of a viable site for an ATCT that is compatible with the implementation of proffered alternative. Even if the FAA may participate partially in the funding of the ATCT construction, it would most likely not participate in the costs to staff the facility.

2. As a resident of the Sullivan Heights neighborhood, I am concerned about the safety and the corporate jets that fly very low over my house.

The implementation of Alternative 3 would move the landing threshold for the Runway 34 approach 600 feet to the north which in a sense would help alleviate this issue.

3. The land acquisition costs for Alternative 3 seem low considering that the asphalt plant would require acquisition.

URS will look into this issue. As a follow up, because the runway shift under the Alternative 3 scenario would only place the asphalt plant partially within the runway safety area (RSA), it is possible that the plant could remain and only the eastern portion would require acquisition. This was taken into consideration in preparing the cost estimates.

4. Mr. Horst then requested that the TAC consider taking a vote as to the preferred airfield alternative as well as to proceed with the development of the T-hangar and corporate hangar facilities as presented earlier in the meeting. All nine of the TAC members who were present at the time the vote was taken, voted to adopt Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative. In addition, two TAC members who were absent at the time the vote was taken, had made previous arrangements to vote by proxy for the adoption of Alternative 3. All nine present TAC members voted to continue with the plans to develop the T-, and corporate hangar facility.

5. Mr. Horst adjourned the meeting and mentioned that the next step would be to present the alternatives to the Carroll County Commissioners in the coming weeks.

This represents URS' understanding of the meeting to discuss the Master Plan.