



*In reply, please refer to: 20829663*

March 16, 2006

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Files

FROM: Jennifer Lutz

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

The seventh Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting for the referenced project was held on Monday, February 13, 2006 at 6:30 PM at the Carroll County Government Building (see attendance list below). Note: A mailer was sent to 122 residents in January 2006 informing them of the Master Plan Update and the potential impacts to Pinch Valley Road; the letter included in the mailer also informed the residents of this TAC meeting. A copy of the sign-in sheet is attached and reflects the names of the participants who chose to sign in.

Mike Waibel	- URS Corporation
Jennifer Lutz	- URS Corporation
Jason Weiss	- URS Corporation
Gary Horst	- Carroll County Government
Joe Varrone	- Carroll County Government
Ted Zaleski	- Carroll County Government
Deb Effingham	- Carroll County Government
Paige Sunderland	- Carroll County Government
Don Vetter	- TAC
David Taylor	- TAC
Wray Mowbray	- TAC
Randy Cox	- TAC
Brian Stites	- TAC
Jeff Smith	- TAC

Gary Horst called the meeting to order and introduced URS Corporation (URS) personnel and TAC members in attendance. G. Horst provided a background of the project including the formation of the TAC in September 2004. At the onset of the meeting, as well as throughout the meeting, several residents voiced concerns, comments, and questions. Given the magnitude and delivery of these concerns, comments, and questions, not all were documented. However, a sufficient representation of the citizen's comments were documented and included herein.

G. Horst informed the meeting attendees that a Master Plan is a long range planning document for a 20-year period. G. Horst informed the attendees that the last Master Plan for the Airport was completed in 1986 and all improvements included in that Master Plan were accomplished by 2004. These improvements included a runway extension to its current length of 5,100 feet, the addition of T-hangars, corporate hangars, an Automated Weather Observation System, and land acquisition. Since all development included in the Master Plan has been realized and the 20 year planning mark had been

MEMORANDUM

March 16, 2006

Page 2

reached, Carroll County selected URS in a competitive bid process in 2004 to complete a Master Plan for the Airport. A TAC was assembled in 2004 to provide technical guidance to URS during the Master Plan process. This TAC consists of members of the community and users of the Airport. G. Horst also stated that the Airport has operated since 1999 as an enterprise fund, which means that the Airport runs on its own revenue generated.

G. Horst stated that the County Commissioners will make the ultimate decision on the overall development plan at the Airport, including the closure/relocation of Pinch Valley Road. The County Commissioners could also vote to not continue with any development at the Airport. The No Build Alternative is always an option. The County Commissioners will be presented with all the information necessary to make a final decision, including the feedback received from the community.

M. Waibel provided a brief background on URS and its aviation expertise in Maryland. M. Waibel then stated that a website has been set up for this project (<http://www.ccrmasterplan.com>) and provides all the data compiled to date for this Master Plan Update, including all meeting agendas, presentations, and minutes. M. Waibel further explained that the current length of 5,100 feet is not long enough to accommodate the existing aircraft that operate at the Airport. Several alternatives were created to achieve a 6,400-foot runway. The last Master Plan recommended that an Instrument Landing System (ILS) be installed at the Airport. With the installation of this, the associated Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) would encompass the ARC Facility as well as portions of Route 97. Therefore, in an effort to minimize this impact, the runway was shifted to the north.

Many comments and questions were then raised by the public in attendance. Included below are the comments documented, and answers given, if applicable.

*What is this going to do to our property value? Does URS investigate property values?*

During the Environmental Assessment, potential socioeconomic impacts including property values will be assessed.

*What feedback can we give to make sure that the Commissioners know how we feel?*

One of the purposes of tonight's meeting is to again listen to public comments about this plan. We will compile the comments received to date, and those that may be given this evening and package them up for the County elected officials to consider.

*What have you done since 9/11 in deterring against terrorism?*

Question was not answered directly due to its ambiguity as well as the frequency and number of questions that were asked. However, Carroll County Regional Airport does have a perimeter fence and entrances are locked and controlled via a card-reader system.

*Has the extension been approved?*

G. Horst indicated that the County Commissioners simply approved the continuation of the remainder of the Master Plan Study using runway extension Alternative 3 as a basis. No part of the Plan or any expansion plans have been approved to date.

*Has a date been set for the Commissioners to vote on this Study?*

G. Horst indicated that no date has been set. This was the last TAC meeting scheduled and the information from this meeting would be incorporated into a presentation for the Commissioners. M. Waibel indicated that the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) will be presented to the County, Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA), and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). All three of these entities will have

MEMORANDUM

March 16, 2006

Page 3

to approve this ALP and then it becomes public record. The FAA will then perform an Airspace Analysis.

*When was the last environmental documentation performed at the Airport?*

G. Horst indicated that an Environmental Assessment was completed three years ago (Spring 2002). Should the Commissioners approve the development at the Airport as outlined in the Master Plan, an Environmental Assessment for the proposed improvements is the next step to occur.

*Will the Commissioners see that the public is opposed to this expansion?*

M. Waibel indicated that URS will tabulate all the comments received and present this to the Commissioners. In addition, the Master Plan will document these comments. Also, there will be time during the preparation of the Environmental Assessment for the public to voice their opinion.

*Has the safety of the residents been taken into consideration?*

M. Waibel indicated that the congregation of people cannot occur within the RPZ. If any property is within the RPZ, fee-simple acquisition typically results.

*We just purchased a house within what is currently shown as the RPZ. Why was this permit issued to allow us to build our house? Will I receive pain and suffering compensation?*

M. Waibel explained that it is unfortunate that the new home was constructed in what may become the RPZ, but there were no plans in place at the time of that decision that showed the extension of the runway at the proposed length. He added that the acquisition and relocation would be in accordance with the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.

*Why doesn't the alternative extend to the south?*

M. Waibel explained that when it was determined that the ILS was to be implemented at the Airport, the RPZ became larger and thus encompasses parts of Littlestown Pike and the Association of Retarded Citizens (ARC) Facility. The extension was then extended to the north to minimize the impacts to Route 97 and the Town of Westminster. In addition, with the alternative as currently designed, the runway can remain open during construction.

*When would they buy property?*

After the Environmental Assessment is completed, the property acquisition phase would begin. Construction would likely start in 2010; however, the runway would not be operational until 2013. At that time, the property must be purchased. The FAA does enter into Life Estates where people can remain within the RPZ; however, this is not widely practiced and is determined on a case-by-case basis.

*How do they determine the amount of my property? I own a custom log home. How many appraisals can I get?*

An appraisal would be conducted by certified individuals. Unique circumstances are taken into consideration.

*Does this Master Plan take into account the other capabilities of the surrounding airports? Hagerstown, Frederick (FDK), Winchester, and Martinsburg Airports all have the facilities that DMW is proposing?*

M. Waibel indicated that this Master Plan Study takes into account what facilities DMW needs to continue to serve its existing and projected demand. If DMW did not receive the facilities that have been identified as being required at the Airport, businesses would relocate.

*Why can't you relocate Route 97?*

M. Waibel indicated that the construction impacts such as severe traffic congestion and costs would make that option not feasible.

MEMORANDUM

March 16, 2006

Page 4

*Do planes take off towards Route 97?*

M. Waibel indicated that the direction of the prevailing winds dictate the direction of take off and landing and most of the takeoffs occur toward the north.

*The alternative shows a hold pad. Engines would be warming up on this area and the noise would be great and windows would rattle.*

M. Waibel indicated that this hold pad would most likely be removed and a bypass taxiway would be created instead.

*Where is the FAA money coming from to fund this project?*

M. Waibel stated that as a public use airport, DMW is eligible to receive FAA funding through grants provided as part of the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). Funds for the AIP are drawn from the Federal Airport and Airway Trust Fund which is supported by user fees, fuel taxes, and other similar revenue sources. Certain airport projects are eligible for reimbursement under the AIP up to a maximum FAA share of 95% of the total eligible cost. The Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) assists public use airports in the State through its Office of Regional Aviation Assistance by providing matching funds for AIP projects at 2.5% of the total eligible cost. The remaining 2.5% plus all non-FAA eligible costs are funded by the airport sponsor.

*Steve Osborn, a resident who lives at 1841 Pinch Valley Road, had several comments and concerns. He indicated that after 9/11, a temporary flight restriction (TFR) was invoked. At this time, pilots within this TFR went to airports outside of this area (FDK, DMW, etc). The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) is opposed to this restriction. If this TFR is lifted, then pilots will go back to their original locations. S. Osborn then compared FDK to DMW in terms of based aircraft, number of based jets, and length of runways. He questioned what corporations are going to come to DMW when FDK has all of the facilities and infrastructure that they require. He stated that this Study should not be based on a 'build it and they will come' scenario. He also mentioned that traffic will become an issue.*

M. Waibel stated that FDK is under going a Master Plan Study currently. He stated that many corporations have been frustrated in Frederick and that progress at the airport is slow. The Environmental Assessment will also analyze traffic.

*What size planes would land?*

M. Waibel stated that the Airport would accommodate an aircraft with a 97-foot wingspan, such as a Gulfstream V. M. Waibel indicated that these planes operate at the Airport now; therefore it is not a 'build it and they will come' scenario.

*FDK only has a 100 foot longer runway and these aircraft operate with that length now.*

M. Waibel stated that a longer runway has been approved at FDK. The runway will be extended to 6,000 feet, which is the longest that it can ever be extended given the physical constraints of the Monocacy River and Interstate 70.

*The larger aircraft that operate at the Airport do not carry as much people as they should. They should come in smaller aircraft. We do not have a population to support corporate aircraft.*

M. Waibel stated that a demand capacity analysis was conducted for this Master Plan and it determined that there is a demand for corporate aircraft at DMW.

*We know that the County wants to bring in more corporations and therefore more money.*

*What security regulations are in place at the Airport since 9/11? I know that I can drive up right now*

MEMORANDUM

March 16, 2006

Page 5

*onto the airfield.*

G. Horst indicated that an eight foot high fence was recently installed and the Airport is not accessible as the citizen mentioned.

*What will happen when the plan is adopted. We feel as though there is a conspiracy theory and we feel excluded. Since we are just receiving this information now, we would like to know how we can find out about the Commissioners meeting before hand.*

M. Waibel stated that the TAC meetings are open to the public. A notice is placed in the local newspaper and also on the County website. This mailer was sent to the surrounding community to also get community involvement. There has been no attempt to mislead or exclude the community. G. Horst indicated that the same type of general notice will be placed when the Commissioners are to meet.

*How many people on the TAC are pilots?*

J. Smith indicated that the TAC was appointed to provide technical advice to URS and the County during the Master Plan process. This Master Plan is part of the planning process and nothing has been funded to date.

*Does the County currently plow snow at the Airport?*

G. Horst indicated that the County does maintain the Airport and plows snow. The Airport is County owned; however, the employees who plow the snow are not the same ones that plow the roads.

*Can I sell my property to the County?*

M. Waibel indicated that part of the ALP is to prepare a sheet called an Exhibit A, which documents the adjacent property owners and what action would need to be taken on that property, if applicable.

*If I am not located within the RPZ and not within the DNL 65 contour, will the County not buy me out?*

M. Waibel stated that if you are located outside of these areas, the County will not likely buy your property.

*The County just passed a noise ordinance. How does this affect the Airport?*

A citizen stated that this ordinance exempts the Airport, fire and rescue, etc from its provisions.

*How long does it take to wind up an aircraft?*

B. Stites stated that aircraft do not do a static run. They run up on the runway only as it is part of take off. Taxi time is all that is needed to warm up the aircraft. It takes 3 minutes to taxi, 30 seconds to take off, and 20 seconds on landing. With a longer landing distance, there is less reverse thrust.

*What is the length of the extension?*

M. Waibel stated that the extension would be 1,300 feet.

T. Zaleski commented for the Commissioners in saying that no decision has been made. They should hear all of the citizens' comments. Therefore, the Commissioners should be contacted; however anger towards this Plan should not be directed at them.

After much discussion as noted above, G. Horst asked the public attendees to wait until after M. Waibel makes his presentation to voice their additional concerns, comments, and questions.

M. Waibel, through the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, then proceeded to describe the Alternatives developed for mitigation of impacts to Pinch Valley Road caused by the proposed extension of Runway 16-34. Three alternatives were discussed for Pinch Valley Road. Alternative 1 proposes two cul-de-sacs

MEMORANDUM

March 16, 2006

Page 6

constructed on either side of the extended runway with through traffic routed along Indian Valley Trail. No houses are located between the two cul-de-sacs. With Alternative 1, an additional 1.2 miles and 5 minutes would be added to the travel time. This travel time was calculated with existing road conditions at posted speed.

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.

M. Waibel then explained the costs associated with each Alternative. 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. Should the road be paved, the road would meet County requirements.

M. Waibel then explained the mailer that was sent to the residents that would be impacted by the relocation/closure of Pinch Valley Road. URS sent 122 mailers and received 14 responses (10 returned forms, 2 record of conversations with County staff, and 2 emails). He indicated that copies of the comment form were located at the Sign-In table and that more comments are welcomed. M. Waibel then summarized the 14 comments received to date.

M. Waibel then discussed the next steps in the Master Plan process: to finalize the ALP, to present the alternatives to the Commissioners, and to begin scoping for the Environmental Assessment should the Commissioners approve plans contained in the Master Plan.

Additional comments and questions were generated by the public in attendance.

*Would paving the road increase our property assessment?*

*From a topography standpoint, how feasible is Alternative 2?*

M. Waibel stated that the topography is the reason Alternative 2 is so costly. He indicated that the fill the construction of the runway extension would require an abundance of fill; this fill would be taken from the hillside of where the realigned Pinch Valley Road would be located.

*It would be difficult to maintain Alternative 2 or 3 if the roadway was unpaved.*

*Based on these costs, why would the County chose Alternative 2 or 3?*

*If you have the road, traffic will increase. Homeowners insurance might also increase with an increase in travel time for the emergency providers.*

*What height would be a penetration once the runway is extended?*

For roadways, M. Waibel explained that the FAA requires a 17 foot clearance.

*How many feet off the top of my house would planes be flying?*

If the house is penetrating the 34:1 slope (Runway 16 end) or the 50:1 (Runway 34 end), this will be identified on the ALP.

MEMORANDUM

March 16, 2006

Page 7

*How do pilots communicate?*

W. Mowbray indicated that there is no Air Traffic Control Tower at DMW; there is a recommended pattern that pilots should follow. They communicate using radios.

*For the properties outside of the RPZ, what land use restrictions will be placed on the land?*

M. Waibel indicated that typically municipalities have an airport overlay zone. G. Horst indicated that Carroll County does have this; however it only applies to cell towers currently.

*Who decides and when about Pinch Valley Road?*

G. Horst indicated that the Commissioners will decide when they review the Master Plan Update. No date has been set.

*Some people do not favor a paved road since the width required would take more land.*

M. Waibel stated that municipalities typically will not create a new dirt road. T. Zaleski indicated that the state of the County gravel roads has been a topic for the Commissioners lately. The County has over 90 miles of gravel roads. With or without the Airport expanding, the County is discussing the fate of all gravel roads. The County is studying ways to stabilize the gravel roads without paving.

G. Horst then called for a short break before the second portion of the meeting would resume. This second portion is to discuss Alternative 2 Modified and the business plan; however, given the amount of comments and questions that the attendees had for the TAC and URS, this break extended for an hour at which time G. Horst indicated that the second portion of the meeting would not occur. The County would meet with URS to discuss the business plan at a later date. This information would then be submitted to the TAC. No additional TAC meetings are scheduled.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45pm.

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

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

  
 Carroll County Regional Airport  
 Airport Master Plan Update  
 February 13, 2006

PLEASE SIGN IN!

NAME	AFFILIATION	TELEPHONE	E-MAIL
Arlene Russell Cook	fund owner	410 840-8040	
Edwold + Betty Klobe	Neighborhood	410-848-1890	enake@GIS.net
Bobby Graham	fund owner	410 848-1787	
Angela Baker	land owner	410-840-2709	Agribby@aol.com
Raymond T. Bunker		410-852-4838	
Ann Buckler		410-848-9132	
Mary Munday	fund owner		
Shelagh Osborne / Kathy Dink	Kendama	410-857-7464	Source @ driveway.com
Tina Hesse		410-848-1115	PAUL@PORT@MSN.COM
Fran Miller	TAC		
Karl Buczkowski		4	
Sue MARRARO		410 876 6411	
Jeff Hunt	TAC		
John Stephens	None Owner	410 844-3722	
Bob Kramer	None Owner	410-848-4748	
Kathy Buckner Trank	Home Owner	410-857-5376	
Dorinda Dorning Taylor	TAC	757-6963	

