



In reply, please refer to: 20829663

January 5, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Files

FROM: Jennifer Lutz

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

The sixth Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting for the referenced project was held on Monday, December 12, 2005 at 6:30 PM at the Carroll County Government Building (see attendance list below). Gary Horst called the meeting to order and introduced Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) personnel in attendance.

Mike Waibel	- URS Corporation
Jennifer Lutz	- URS Corporation
Chuck Trice	- URS Corporation
Ashish Solanki	- Maryland Aviation Administration
Tom Priscilla	- Federal Aviation Administration
Gary Horst	- Carroll County Government
Joe Varrone	- Carroll County Government
Ted Zaleski	- Carroll County Government
Steve Horn	- Carroll County Government
Paige Sunderland	- Carroll County Government
Deb Effingham	- Carroll County Government
Don Vetter	- TAC
David Taylor	- TAC
Wray Mowbray	- TAC
Randy Cox	- TAC
Brian Stites	- TAC
Jeff Smith	- TAC
Sal Maranto	- Public Participant
Linda Simms	- Public Participant
Clarence Simms	- Public Participant

The following are highlights from the meeting:

REPORTS AND STATUS UPDATE

G. Horst provided a brief summary of the draft sections that have been completed to date: Section 1 (Inventory), Section 2 (Aviation Demand Forecasts), Section 3 (Facility Requirements), and Section 5 (Environmental Overview). Section 4 (Alternatives) was recently completed and distributed to the TAC for review.

MEMORANDUM

January 5, 2006

Page 2

Draft Section 4 (Alternatives) – Pinch Valley Road

M. Waibel, through the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, described the Alternatives developed for mitigation of impacts to Pinch Valley Road caused by the pending extension of Runway 16-34 and the landside development at DMW. Three alternatives were discussed for Pinch Valley Road. Alternative 1 proposes two cul-de-sacs constructed on either side of the extended runway with through traffic routed along Indian Valley Trail. With Alternative 1, an additional 1.2 miles and 5 minutes would be added to the travel time. Alternative 2 would involve one cul-de-sac constructed east of the extended runway. A new 4,500 foot realignment of Pinch Valley Road would be constructed. With Alternative 2, an additional 0.4 mile in distance and 1.5 minutes would be added to the travel time. M. Waibel stated that FAA will only fund “in kind” improvements; therefore any road improvements above the replacement of a gravel road would not be eligible for federal funding. Alternative 3 would involve cul-de-sacs constructed on Pinch Valley Road on either side of the extended runway. An additional 3,300 feet of new roadway would be built which would add 0.85 miles and 3.5 minutes to the travel time. Regarding costs, Alternative 1 would be the least expensive since the only construction would involve cul-de-sacs. The majority of the cost involved with Alternatives 2 and 3 are related to the grading and paving associated with the new roadway.

W. Mowbray questioned if property acquisition was included in “in kind” costs. M. Waibel indicated that property acquisition would be included.

M. Waibel indicated that URS will be sending letters to all impacted residents along Pinch Valley Road, Indian Valley Trail, and Pleasant Valley Road. This letter will provide a summary of the project and include a comment card with a self addressed stamped envelope. The letter will also invite the citizens to the next TAC meeting, which was scheduled for February 13, 2006.

W. Mowbray and D. Taylor questioned whether a traffic count or a traffic “stop” could be conducted to determine who uses the road, why they use the road, and when it is being used. D. Taylor suggested that a handout could be provided to the residents to determine this information. S. Horn indicated that the County performs traffic counts every three years. This data can be reviewed to determine if it is pertinent. M. Waibel stated that for the preparation of the Environmental Assessment, a more detailed traffic analysis would be conducted. This Environmental Assessment would be started after the completion of the Master Plan.

M. Waibel stated that no residents along Pinch Valley Road would be directly impacted since none live on the portion that would need to be closed to accommodate the extended runway. S. Horn commented that the fire department and post office should also be made aware of this proposed project. D. Taylor expressed concern that the portions of Indian Valley Trail that would be receiving the detoured traffic are gravel and would need to be improved in order to handle the increased traffic load.

Draft Section 4 (Alternatives) – Landside

C. Trice continued with a presentation of the landside alternatives developed for the Airport. He began with a brief summary of the facility requirements.

Alternative 1 would provide the following:

- 16 corporate hangars
- 84 T-hangar units (7 12-unit buildings)
- Ample parking (4 separate lots)
- 20 based tie-down positions
- 60,000 sy of transient apron
- 6,500 sf terminal building
- 4,000 sf maintenance facility

MEMORANDUM

January 5, 2006

Page 3

Alternative 2 would provide the following:

- 14 corporate hangars
- 96 T-hangar units (8 12-unit buildings)
- Ample parking (4 separate lots)
- 26 based tie-down positions
- 54,000 sy of transient apron
- 6,500 sf terminal buildings
- 4,000 sf maintenance facility

Alternative 3 would provide the following:

- 15 corporate hangars
- 80 T-hangar units (4 each 8-unit and 12-unit buildings)
- Ample parking (4 separate lots)
- 20 based tie-down positions
- 67,000 sy of transient apron
- 6,500 sf terminal building
- 4,000 sf maintenance facility

J. Smith questioned what type of equipment would be included in the maintenance facility. C. Trice indicated that snow removal and grass mowing equipment would be stored.

B. Stites questioned the location of the maintenance facility. He indicated that as currently proposed, it is located within the center of activity. C. Trice indicated that the Airport Manager had expressed interest in having the location of the building within close proximity to the Airport offices since the Airport staff would be the personnel utilizing the equipment. R. Cox indicated that this area of the Airport should be a representation of the Airport and should not necessarily include the maintenance facility. J. Varrone indicated that he spoke with D. Leister, Airport Manager, and he indicated that the location of this facility could be moved.

M. Waibel stated that these alternatives represent a placeholder on the Airport layout. A more detailed analysis would be conducted and the development would be conducted in phases and would reflect the needs at the time of design.

L. Simms questioned the size of the hangars since her plane currently just fits into the hangar that she uses. C. Trice stated that each T-hangar building is composed of "nested" T-hangar units, and the overall width of each building is 51 feet. M. Waibel indicated that if the County decides to fund the construction of these hangars themselves, the project would be procured under a competitive bid process, which means the County does not necessarily have control over the manufacturer chosen.

J. Smith questioned whether any thought had been given to revenue generation. M. Waibel indicated that the last task of the Master Plan is to complete a business plan which is broken into phases and discusses development on a year to year basis. In this analysis, how much money is expected to be generated will be discussed. This will be discussed further at the next TAC meeting. A. Solanki stated that an economic impact study of airports within Maryland was recently conducted. The final document is not available for public review; however, Carroll County does have the data specifically for their airport. Statewide data should be available to the public in February.

W. Mowbray stated that T-hangars should be built prior to the demolition of the existing T-hangars. M. Waibel explained that the County had tasked URS with analyzing the development potential on the 16-acre lot north of the existing facilities. The TAC recommended last March that new T-hangars and

MEMORANDUM

January 5, 2006

Page 4

corporate hangars should be built to meet the outstanding demand. It was decided that this 16-acre parcel could house T-hangars and the pavement where the existing 3 T-hangars are located could be used for corporate hangars. G. Horst indicated that this plan has been submitted to the Planning Commission and will ultimately go in front of the County Commissioners in possibly early June. M. Waibel stated that 42 T-hangars would be demolished and 72 to 80 would be constructed.

A. Solanki questioned whether the inner parallel taxiway would remain. M. Waibel stated that this parallel taxiway would not be necessary and could be removed. Its removal would help by decreasing the net impervious surface of the Airport and would allow for future development.

G. Horst requested the TAC to comment on the overall flow of the alternatives. R. Cox stated that he felt that Alternative 2 was the best scenario; however, the openings of the doors should be 120 feet and not 100 feet. In addition, the ramp in front of the terminal should be larger and the terminal should be moved to the center and flanked by hangars. B. Stites agreed with this recommendation with the addition to move the maintenance facility.

R. Cox also stated that by connecting the terminal to the hangars would provide better security for the community hangars. A. Solanki agreed that the terminal should be the focal point of the Airport; however, more restricted security measures could be instituted which would restrict movement on the airside (i.e., restrict driving on airside). M. Waibel stated that having the T-hangars on the north side would keep traffic away from the ramp movement areas. A. Solanki indicated that currently Alternative 2 would require the crossing of two active taxiways. M. Waibel stated that the access road to fuel farm could have a parking lot.

M. Waibel asked the TAC to recommend an alternative and the modifications that would be proposed. The TAC recommended Alternative 2 with the following modifications:

- Move the Terminal Building to the center within proximity to the FBO
- Flank the Terminal Building with hangars
- Create access to the T-hangars from the fuel farm access road.
- Make access to the T-hangars from Business Park Drive North
- Eliminate the parallel taxiway (existing)
- Move the maintenance building to the fuel farm area
- Pave more of the apron in front of the Terminal Building.

G. Horst pointed out that Old Meadow Branch Road has been modified under Alternative 2. S. Horn indicated that this would not be a problem.

A. Solanki indicated that more access to the T-hangars is better from an emergency response perspective. D. Taylor questioned if the increase in capacity of the hangars would require an increase in emergency response measures. M. Waibel indicated that you can avoid having a fire suppression system in place by limiting the amount of units and having a concrete masonry wall between them. G. Horst indicated that fire suppression units are located within two of the units currently.

J. Smith questioned if the Business Plan would incorporate private funding sources. M. Waibel indicated that URS would be meeting with the County next week to discuss the Business Plan and assumptions would be included in the Business Plan.

B. Stites stated that the decision on Pinch Valley Road should be made by the County and not the TAC.

MEMORANDUM

January 5, 2006

Page 5

G. Horst requested that the TAC adopt an alternative for further analysis. The TAC recommended Alternative 2 with the modifications stated above.

Next Steps

M. Waibel indicated that the Business Plan would be discussed at the next TAC meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

OPEN DISCUSSION

None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting will be held Monday, February 13, 2006 at 6:30 PM at the Carroll County Government Office Building.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.

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

cc: TAC Members
T. Priscilla, FAA
A. Solanki, MAA